



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held as an online virtual meeting on Wednesday 28 April 2021 at 4.00 pm

PRESENT (in virtual attendance): Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Johnson (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Maurice, S Butt, Dixon, Chappell, Kennelly

Also present (in virtual attendance): Councillor Georgiou

Apologies: Councillor J Mitchell-Murray

1. Declarations of interests

None.

APPROACHES:

18/4767 - Access Storage, First Way, Wembley, HA9 0JD

- All members declared that they had received an approach from the Football Association (FA).

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meetings held on 29 March 2021 and 7 April 2021 be approved as accurate record of the meetings.

3. 20/3914 - 330 Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 4LL

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of the existing buildings and structures, the erection of a building ranging in height up to 28 storeys, incorporating residential units and industrial, community and commercial uses, together with associated landscaping, access arrangements, car and cycle parking, servicing and refuse and recycling.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to referral to the Mayor of London (stage II referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as set out in the report.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

That, if by the "expiry date" of this application (subject to any amendments/extensions to the expiry date agreed by both parties) the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions and obligations, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

June Taylor, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Principal Planning Officer advised that a total of 461 residential units would be provided in three blocks. The blocks would be linked at ground and first floor by a single storey building with industrial floorspace in addition to a unit for community use, a café and cycle and bin storage. Vehicle access and residential parking would also be provided within the site.

Chirag Gir, objector, then raised several concerns including:

- The development would be out-of-scale and out of character with existing developments within the vicinity.
- The development would burden neighbouring properties and local infrastructure due to its size and scale.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

- The development would adversely affect highway safety, and the convenience of road users, as there were no plans to mitigate the increased number of cars.

In response to questions from members, Chirag Gir made the following points:

- The development should ensure that adequate parking be provided for new residents, as existing residents feared that new residents would park on residential side streets. Concerns were also raised about the cost of Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to residents.
- The height of the blocks was deemed excessive and would change the character of the local area. Concern was also raised over the impact on essential services in what was seen as an already densely area.

Paul Lorber, objector, raised several concerns including:

- The height of the blocks was deemed excessive and beyond the 17-storey limit set out in the previously adopted Alperton Masterplan SPD 2011. Developments in the local area were mostly low-rise and so the proposed development would be out of character.
- Traffic around Bridgewater Road and Ealing Road was congested during peak hours and it was feared that the proposed development would make this worse.
- The car-free nature of the development would lead to new residents, delivery drivers and visitors parking on existing side streets. It was feared that this would force existing residents to use their front gardens or driveways.

Councillor Georgiou, objector and ward member, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- The objections of several local residents, which were related to: parking, design, scale and appearance, traffic congestion, local amenity space, associated infrastructure needs, the relationship with neighbouring sites including Alperton Community School, fire safety and the density of the development.

Kate Hale, the applicant, Emiliano Acciarito, the architect and Eve Ladden Timbers, the agent, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

- The collaborative nature of the application, which involved engaging with Planning Officers, the Design Review Panel, the local community and neighbourhood groups.
- The development would consist of several workshops and studios situated around a shared open space. This would provide an opportunity to integrate employment use into the scheme and enhance the character of the site. It would also offer the opportunity to host seasonal markets which would be open to the wider public.
- The design and materiality of the development was inspired by the distinctive industrial heritage of the area including Alpertons Station and the area along the Grand Union Canal.
- The development minimised embodied carbon and utilised a ground source heat pump system. New landscaping and resident gardens would enhance the biodiversity of the site.
- The scheme included 40% additional housing, of which 70% would be secured as London Affordable Rent. 52% of these units would be family sized.
- The proposals would generate a substantial CIL contribution for the Council and commit a further £950,000, of which £583,000 was for step-free access at Alpertons Station.

In response to questions from members, Kate Hale, Emiliano Acciarito and Eve Ladden Timbers made the following points:

- Telford Homes had been trading for over 20 years and had developed many homes in and around London – many of which were affordable homes. The company did not have any outstanding cladding issues and fire safety was a key consideration for new developments.
- Telford Homes employed the London Communications Agency to lead on its public engagement. While the pandemic had made engagement difficult, two public engagement events had been undertaken and regular updates had been communicated with residents and ward members.
- The development would provide 40.2% affordable housing by habitable room. The tenure split would be 73% London Affordable Rent and 17% shared ownership units. There would be both three and four-bed London Affordable Rent units provided.
- In accordance with policies which emphasised the importance of wind microclimate created by new developments involving tall buildings, a Wind

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

Microclimate Assessment was submitted. A number of locations were identified where conditions would be windier than suitable for the intended use. Mitigation measures were proposed in these locations, including landscaping proposals throughout the site and along street frontages and porous screens on balconies affected.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including parking, design, scale and appearance, traffic congestion and affordable housing and housing mix. Officers then clarified a number of key points including:

- Alperton did not currently have a comprehensive CPZ. Officers were securing contributions for a CPZ from a number of proposed developments within the area, and were confident that the level of contribution would be sufficient.
- The proposal would not harm the setting of Alperton Station. Whilst the Greater London Authority (GLA) considered that less than substantial harm would occur, officers consider that if that view was taken the harm would be considerably outweighed by the benefits of the development.
- The Alperton Masterplan SPD 2011 was no longer an adopted document having been revoked by Cabinet on 14 October 2019. The application had been considered in line with current policies including the London Plan 2021 and Brent's Draft Local Plan 2021 which sought higher housing targets. The height of the building was considered appropriate in the context of other recently consented schemes nearby.
- Public transport to the site was considered good, with Alperton station and seven bus services within the locality. New services with bigger capacities were expected to be introduced on the Piccadilly line which serviced Alperton station. Transport for London (TfL) had been consulted with throughout the application and had not raise any objections in regard to public transport provision.
- Each unit would have adequate internal space, complying with or exceeding minimum standards. The three blocks would be positioned to provide adequate levels of privacy for residents. Each unit would have access to a balcony or terrace complying with minimum standards which would be supplemented by a communal podium garden accessible for all residents and roof gardens accessible to residents of that block. Whilst there would be no on-site provision for older children, the site would be within walking distance of One Tree Hill Park and a financial contribution towards enhanced amenity space provision would be secured.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

- Various infrastructure needs to support Alpertons growth had been identified as part of Brents new Local Plan Policy BH1. Officers had secured a number of these after consultation with the applicant, including community floorspace, employment and training opportunities, contribution towards carbon offset, contribution towards play provision at One Tree Hill Park, contribution towards a CPZ, contribution towards step-free access and public realm improvements at Alpertons station, tree planting and highway improvement works.
- Two points of vehicular access to the site are proposed, which would provide a one-way route for vehicular access and access to a shared service yard for the commercial units against the railway line. The one-way route was deemed acceptable in highways terms as it removed the need for traffic to exit onto the heavily trafficked Bridgewater Road. Redundant areas of vehicle crossover would be restored to footways at the developers expense, and a traffic island may be required on Bridgewater Road to prevent vehicles from turning right into the site.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation.

Councillor Johnson advised that he would not vote on the recommendation as he had joined the discussion late.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London, s106 agreement and conditions and informatives as set out in the main and supplementary reports.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 5, Against 1)

4. 18/4767 - Access Storage, First Way, Wembley, HA9 0JD

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of the existing building and erection of five buildings comprising self-storage space (Use Class B8), office space (Use Class B1) and retail/commercial space (A1/A3), with residential units (Use Class C3) on the upper levels, new landscaping and public realm, ancillary servicing and plant, car and cycle parking, and associated works.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order, any direction by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Consultation Direction and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Neil Quinn, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Principal Planning Officer advised that a number of revisions to the scheme had been received since its submission in 2018. These included the addition of two storeys on all blocks except on the tallest element of Block a1, resulting in additional office space and the addition of three-bedroom family units and the Southern building line along South Way being set back by between 1-2m from edge of site to enable highways improvements to incorporate two-way working along South Way.

In reference to the supplementary report, Neil Quinn drew members' attention to the following point:

- Additional representations had been received from the GLA and FA since the publication of the main report. The representations were addressed in the supplementary report.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

Faaizia Lalji, the applicant, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- Access Self Storage was a family owned multi-generational firm which sought to hold its assets long-term. It held assets across hospitality, industrial, office and retail sectors and was working to deliver build to rent accommodation on land it already owned.
- Access Self Storage was committed to excellence in design and believed the development was an attractive addition to the Wembley Park area, as well as being policy compliant.
- As proposed, the development would be a loss-making venture in the short term. The development would use a longer-term investment return timeframe to ensure the delivery of 60 new affordable homes could be included from the outset. A review mechanism was built into the application to allow for additional affordable homes should the financial situation improve.

In response to questions from members, Faaizia Lalji made the following points:

- Although the affordable housing mix was below target, it had been demonstrated by a financial viability appraisal to exceed the maximum amount of affordable housing which could viably be provided on-site. It would also be subject to a late stage review mechanism to be secured within the S106 agreement.
- The proposed height and scale of development was considered acceptable. Whilst the FA had raised concerns in relation to the proximity of the tallest building to Wembley Stadium, these issues had since been addressed.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including design, layout and height and affordable housing and housing mix. Officers then clarified a number of key points including:

- The addition of two storeys would result in the addition of three-bedroom family units, increasing the overall number of proposed homes from 555 to 600. The affordable housing offer would increase from 10% to 12.4%. There would be a total of 60 affordable units, 36 of which would be three-bed homes at London Living Rent and 24 of which would be one-bed homes at a Discount Market Rate.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

- The applicant's revised Financial Viability Appraisal had been reviewed independently for the Council and concluded that the scheme was significantly in deficit. A re-appraisal and further independent review was undertaken in light of the applicant's increased affordable housing offer to 12.4%. Both appraisals found that the offer would exceed the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing on site. Following review of these results, and the offer presented by the applicant, officers considered that the provision of 60 affordable homes would be a significant benefit of the scheme, particularly as a high proportion of these homes (75%) would be family-sized units, which the borough was in acute need of to meet housing demand.
- The FA had raised concerns regarding the proximity of the tallest block to Wembley Stadium, particularly due to the potential trajectory into the stadium bowl from the highest apartments. The revised proposals had been reviewed by the FA and Metropolitan Police who had confirmed that any concerns of views into the stadium had been resolved.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London, s106 agreement and conditions and informatives as set out in the main and supplementary reports.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 4, Against 3)

5. **19/3396 - Land next to 1 Gaytor Terrace, Mulgrave Road, London**

PROPOSAL:

Erection of 2x two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouses (2x 3 bed) with converted loft space, erection of fencing, provision of cycle parking, waste storage and amenity space with associated landscaping and front boundary walls/gates.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the report.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

Sarah Dilley, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Principal Planning Officer advised that two previous applications on the site had been refused, the latter of which was for the construction of five two-storey three-bedroom terraced houses and the former for the construction of four two-storey three-bedroom terraced houses.

In reference to the supplementary report, Sarah Dilley drew members' attention to the following point:

- A further representation had been received from a local resident since the publishing of the main report. The representation was addressed in the supplementary report.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised an issue regarding the character and appearance of the development. Officers clarified that the proposal was considered to be of good quality design that had regard to the character of its surroundings and would have an appropriate relationship with the surrounding buildings and streetscene.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 7, Against 0)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2021

6. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 6.15pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER
Chair