



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Thursday 26 November 2020 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Kelcher (Chair), Johnson (Vice-Chair), S Butt, Chappell, Dar, Dixon, Maurice and J Mitchell Murray

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Colacicco, Councillor Kansagra and Councillor Kennelly.

1. Declarations of interests

None.

Approaches.

97 Woodcock Hill

Councillor Maurice declared that he had had interacted with residents in the past in relation to this property, but not in relation to this application.

90 Anson Road

Councillor Dar declared that he was approached by a resident but had no discussion with the residents.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting - 14 October 2020

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14th October 2020 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. 20/0967 Wembley Park Station Car Park and Train Crew Centre, Brook Avenue, Wembley, HA

PROPOSAL:

Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the site comprising the phased demolition of the existing buildings and structures on site and the phased development comprising site preparation works, provision of five new buildings containing residential uses, replacement train crew accommodation and flexible retail floorspace, basement, private and communal amenity space, associated car parking (including the part re-provision of station car parking), cycle parking, refuse storage, plant and other associated works.

RECOMMENDATION:

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 set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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 be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

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.

Mr Toby Huntingford (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, setting out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He referenced the supplementary report that informed of additional objections and added that they did not raise new issues. He drew Members' attention to the amendment to the Heads of terms of the Section 106 legal agreement.

Ms Nicoleta Benga objected to the grant of planning permission for reasons including the following:

- The proposed development would add to overcrowding of the nearby public park in an area that was already "deficient" of open space as outlined in the objectors' section of the main report.
- The proposal would cause parking and traffic congestion particularly on Brook Avenue despite being a car free development and the anticipated consultation for the introduction of CPZ.
- The proposed tall blocks are much higher than the other buildings in the street and would cause overshadowing and loss of light to existing homes, including nearby Matthews Close.

Mr Phillip Grant (objector) raised several issues including the following:

The application site would be inappropriate for tall buildings in breach of adopted policy. He continued that the proposed 454 homes constituted an over-intensive use of the site within a residential area site and in his view the site could accommodate no more than 300 homes.

Councillor Kennelly (ward member) welcomed the proposal in particular the opportunity to increase housing provision by delivering 40% affordable housing

however, he emphasised the need for the Committee to consider the views of local residents on the proposal. These included the scheme not being in keeping with the local area, amplifying the challenges that the community faced on Brook Avenue including parking, traffic congestion, pollution, anti- social behaviour and excessive height. He referred to Block E that local residents considered excessively high and urged the Committee to consider carefully the benefits of keeping the development in line with the local area in particular in line with the height of the neighbouring “Smith” Block on St. Matthew’s Close.

Councillor Kansagra stated that he had not been approached in connection with the application. He echoed the views expressed by Mr Grant and added his objections to the application for several reasons including the following;

- The excessive height of the scheme was a departure from the Wembley Area Action Plan (WAAP).
- Detrimental impact on the residential amenities of existing and future residents.
- The loss of Wembley Park station car park resulting in an increase in parking and traffic congestion on Brook Avenue.
- The possible introduction of CPZ would result in parking displacement in nearby streets.

Ms Katie Savin-Taylor (agent) addressed the Committee and answered Members’ questions. She outlined the benefits of the scheme including the provision of 454 new homes, of which 40% will be affordable by habitable room, a new flexible retail space and train crew accommodation and public realm along Brook Avenue. She continued that the applicant had worked with the CABI Design Review Panel and local community in order to create this exciting new addition to Wembley Park. Members heard that in response to the consultation, the applicant made a number of changes including the following:

- A reduction in the maximum height from 30 to 21 storeys;
- An increased number of affordable rented units, directly addressing Brent’s housing needs; and,
- The creation of an enhanced and widened public realm along Brook Avenue.

In response to Members’ questions, the agent submitted the following answers:

- The scheme would be ‘car free’ for new residents, with the exception of 14 accessible blue badge spaces, encouraging sustainable transport movements.
- Officers had addressed service and delivery facilities in the main report.
- The application complied with the site allocation and its impact assessment was considered appropriate with the emerging Local Plan.

During question time, members raised issues mainly relating to the height of the scheme, parking and traffic impact. Officers responded that the application materially complied with the Local Plan and Emerging Plan for the Wembley Park area which was now considered a “tall buildings” zone. However, officers highlighted that the site allocation within emerging policy specified that buildings

could be 10-storeys, rising slightly toward the station, and that 13-storeys were proposed to the west, and that the maximum height was not “slightly” higher than 10-storeys. Nevertheless, officers advised that when looking at the development plan as a whole, and weighing the benefits of the scheme that the additional height beyond that specified within the site allocation was considered to be acceptable. The height, which would vary from 21 to 13 storeys, would maintain an acceptable relationship with Matthew Close and maintain the evolving character of the area. They added that a survey undertaken in February 2020 confirmed a modest use of the existing car park and thus the parking provision including disabled spaces coupled with permit restriction and the possible introduction of CPZ would ensure that the scheme would not give rise to parking problems. Officers referenced the sustainable measures including the Travel Plan, provision of cycle spaces and the free 3-year car club membership for residents.

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. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted consent, subject to the Section 106 heads of terms as amended in the supplementary report, conditions and informatives as set out in the committee report and subject to the Stage 2 referral of the application to the Mayor of London.

(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 7; Against 1)

4. 20/2473 6 and 6A Coombe Road, London, NW10 0EB

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a part three, four, six and seven storey building providing flexible employment workspace on ground and part of first floor, and self-contained flats with associated car and cycle parking spaces, refuse and recycling stores, amenity space, landscaping and associated development.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT planning permission subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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 application "expiry date" the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

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. She drew Members' attention to the supplementary report that clarified the affordable housing at London Affordable Rent levels, the removal of short-term cycle parking stands from the public footway (amendment to condition 2) and reported that Environmental Health officers had confirmed that the air quality assessment submitted is acceptable.

Ms June Taylor (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report setting out the key issues, outlining the differences between the current application and the extant consent and answered Members' questions. She referenced the supplementary report that clarified the scheme at London Affordable Rent levels, the removal of short-term cycle parking stands from the public footway, to provide more information on the relationship with neighbouring properties (amendment to condition 2) and the acceptance of the submitted air quality assessment by Environmental Health officers.

Ms Mary Duffy objected to the proposed development for several reasons including the following:

- The proposed height of the flats (now seven storeys), being several times the height of the existing structure and those of the nearby street of Braemar Avenue and that of nearby Roger Stone Court would be imposing.
- The excessive height would crowd and overlook and possibly block light to existing residential properties to an unacceptable degree, resulting in overlooking and detrimental to Braemar Avenue, a residential street, with houses of no more than two storeys
- The proposal would not be appropriate in an area that mixes many low-rise residential houses, few flats and very few commercial properties.
- The revision of the application from the previous 31 to now 52 flats would be detrimental to the environmental and residential amenities.

Mr Luke Cadman (agent) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions. He submitted several points including the following:

- The application would allow a better configured scheme than the consented scheme in terms of number of units, mix and layout and replacement employment space provision.
- The application complied with the wider site allocation in emerging Local Plan for the area and whilst the heights proposed slightly would exceed the

site allocation, the surrounding area is high density urban area that would benefit from maximised affordable housing and family sized units.

- Roof level high-quality amenity space has been maximised with improved pedestrian links along river to Welsh Harp Reservoir to offset the slight shortfall in amenity for residents.
- Despite its urban location, the proposal would ensure sufficient separation distances to existing neighbouring residents and that the scheme would not be unduly detrimental to the daylight/sunlight of neighbouring windows given its urban context.

Members discussed the application and noted officers' responses on questions relating to noise, compliance with the emerging Local Plan and the character of the Coombe Road area.

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. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to an amended condition 2 as set out within the supplementary report.

(Voting on the decision unanimous as follows: For 8; Against 0)

5. 18/2006 97 Woodcock Hill, Harrow, HA3 0JJ

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing sheltered housing (Use Class C2) and erection of a three storey building to provide 9 residential flats with associated landscaping, car parking and amenity space.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

Mr Toby Huntingford (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered Members' questions.

Councillor Kansagra (ward member) stated that he had not been approached in connection with the application. Councillor Kansagra whilst welcoming the application stated that its height would exceed the height of surrounding houses and by not being in line with top of the roofs of 93, 95 and 99 Woodcock Hill would be out of character and set a precedent for similar developments in the area.

Mr Adrian Campbell objected to the application raising several issues including the following:

- The application would breach a covenant attached to the property deeds that requires that any alterations to the original property size should not exceed the original size or location.
- The development (as with the current building) would be out of character with the surrounding properties on the road.
- Inadequate provision of only 9 on site car parking spaces which was likely to result in parking overspill to the neighbouring streets with potential increases in safety risk and vehicular accidents.

Mr Reginald Lake (objector) echoed similar sentiments.

Mr Bryan Staff and Mr Joao Goncalves (project planner and architect respectively) addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions. The following points were noted:

- The use of the property for sheltered housing was no longer required (as confirmed by Council's adult social care services) and as such the loss of the facilities would not have a negative impact on Brent's ability to appropriately meet the needs of residents in the borough.
- The existing building is an anomaly in the street scene and contributed very little to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the locality.
- The development of 9 flats, predominantly comprising family sized accommodation would be of a high quality and a sustainable design, making efficient and effective use of a brownfield site which national, regional (London Plan) and local planning policies strongly advocate to ensure the successful delivery of housing for a sustainable future.
- The revisions made to the scheme through consultation with neighbours and officers had addressed previous concerns, resulting in a design that respected the characteristics and the streetscene of the locality.
- The minor shortcomings in relation to the guidance set out within SPD1, was not as excessive compared to the existing development and thus no demonstrable harm would result.
- The redevelopment of the site would include a significant proportion of soft landscaping, softening elements of the built form, particularly in relation to the adjacent residential properties and allowing the proposal to assimilate successfully with its surroundings and with suitable levels of off street parking proposed to lessen the visual impact.

Members asked officers to clarify issues relating to the covenant, style and scale of the proposal, parking and impact on the nearby conservation areas. The following responses were note:

- The covenant to which the objector referred was not a valid planning consideration.
- The scale of the building incorporating flat roof instead of pitched roof would be sympathetic to the streetscene.
- The scheme would provide adequate for car parking than would be required and although not envisaged, any unlikely parking overspill could be accommodated in the street without impact on vehicular safety.
- Although situated in between 2 conservation areas, the application would not have any impact on the conservation areas.

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. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended within the Committee report.

(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 7; Against 1)

6. 18/4777 All Units at 4-9 INC, and Garages rear of 4-9 Gladstone Parade, Edgware Road, Cricklewood, London

Application withdrawn from the Planning Committee meeting as the Affordable Housing offer was reverted to reflect the proposal previously considered Planning Committee.

7. 20/0174 90 Anson Road, London, NW2 6AG

PROPOSAL:

Conversion of dwellinghouse into 3 self-contained flats and works to include a gable end roof extension, rear dormer window and 2 front rooflights to convert loft, a single storey side and rear extensions, demolition of outbuilding to rear and creation of parking space with new vehicular access, associated landscaping, new boundary wall, provision for refuse and bicycle storage and removal of existing vehicular access.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

The Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives 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.

Mr Damian Manhertz (Development Management Team Leader) introduced the report setting out the key issues and answered Members questions. He referenced the supplementary report and drew Members' attention to the outcome of discussions with the applicant's agent over the provision of garden space for the upper floors and the consequent amendment to condition 8 as set out within the supplementary report.

Mr Gavin Selerie objected to the application for several reasons including the following:

- The planning permission for conversion of the property into three flats would change the character and aesthetic of the house, to the detriment of the area and unlikely to comply with STD2 corner property guidance.
- There were no outdoor amenities for the occupants specified in the plan.
- The parking situation in the area which was already a difficult issue, would be exacerbated by the proposed development.
- The proposal would set a precedent for similar developments in the Anson Road area.

Mr Kane Johnson-Bennett (objector) echoed similar sentiments and adding that the loss of garden space would aggravate flash flooding in the area. He also highlighted inadequate infrastructure (lack of school places) to support the application.

Councillor Colacicco (ward member) also expressed similar views as above.

In response to the issues raised, officers stated that the Council's drainage officer had assessed the flood risk and concluded that the additional amount of modest hard surfacing would not be an issue for flash flooding. Members heard that the application complied with the parameters of the design guide and parking standards. Officers also highlighted the amendment to condition 8 as set out within the supplementary report to require details of the access to and allocation of the rear garden to ensure that upper floor flats have access to an appropriate area of outside garden space.

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. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to an amended landscaping condition (8) to require details of the access to and allocation of the rear garden to ensure that upper floor flats have access to an appropriate area of outside garden space.

(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 7; Against 1)

8. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 11.00 pm

COUNCILLOR M. KELCHER
Chair