



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 12 November 2014 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Marquis (Chair), Councillor Colacicco (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Agha, S Choudhary, Filson, Kansagra and Mahmood

Also present: Councillors Carr and Pavey

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hylton

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

4. 37 Lydford Road, London NW2 5QN

All members declared that they had received email correspondence from the applicant and the Mapesbury Residents Association (MAPRA) but would consider the application with an open mind except Councillor Colacicco who declared a prejudicial interest that she had been actively involved with the application and would therefore withdraw from the meeting room when the application was being considered after she had addressed the Committee.

5. Former Cricklewood Library, 152 Olive Road NW2 6UY

Councillors Colacicco and Choudhary declared prejudicial interests and stated that they would withdraw from the meeting room during consideration of the application and take no part in the discussion and voting. Councillor Colacicco indicated however that she would address the Committee.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 October 2014**

A speaker from the previous meeting had raised a concern that his representations had not been recorded in full in the minutes. This was discussed by the committee and it was agreed that the minutes should stand as the speaker's representation had been taken into consideration had been taken into consideration at the meeting. It was noted that the minutes were not supposed to be a full account of each speakers' comments, but a summary of the points they had raised.

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 October 2014 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. 15 Summit Close, London NW9 0UL (Ref.14/2690)

PROPOSAL:

Sub-division of the site to provide a detached 2-storey three bedroom dwelling house to include a new vehicular crossover, provision for off-street car parking, bin stores and associated landscaping, and alterations to existing dwelling house (15 Summit Close) involving demolition of existing side garage and erection of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, rear dormer window, alterations to existing vehicular crossover and landscaping to the frontage (as amended).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions listed after paragraph 35 of the report.

With reference to the supplementary report, Stephen Weeks (Head of Planning) clarified the issues raised by members at the site visit. He informed members that the proposed dwelling would respect the established building line along the established patterns of development of Summit Close whilst maintaining sufficient amenity space for both the existing house and the proposed dwelling. He submitted that the development would not be out of character or cause harm to the borough's suburban character. He continued that the level of parking (2 off-street spaces for the existing dwelling and 1 off-street space for the proposed dwelling) and access arrangements were supported by the Council's Transportation officers as they accorded with Brent's Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (2008). The Head of Planning also confirmed the distances of the proposed dwelling to the existing house and the boundary treatments as set out in the supplementary report. He added that the issue about the applicant's future intentions for the development was not a material planning consideration.

Members noted that the neighbour who had requested to speak in objection did not attend the meeting.

Derrick Harrison (applicant's representative) and Rupert S (architect) were in attendance to respond to members' queries. Members heard that the parking provision for the new property was reduced on advice of Transportation officers in order to minimise impact and that an accurate survey and measurement of the site were undertaken. The architect continued that following a tree survey and in order to maintain the character of the area, key trees would not be removed except for one small apple tree. He clarified that the applicant's intention was to enhance habitable space and there was no intention to submit an application in future for conversion of the dwellings into flats.

In response to member's questions as to development of a garden area and whether the proposal would be overbearing and out of character, the Head of Planning advised that in the specific circumstances where there was an unusually large side garden with a street frontage and retention of a garden reflecting the size of the adjoining house, and where side gardens were not a characteristic of the street scene, that as the application complied with the Supplementary Planning

Guidance (SPG), and in also taking into account its design, the proposal was considered acceptable. He added that a condition had been recommended which would restrict future permitted development rights for the two sites.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.

4. 37 Lydford Road NW2 5QN (Ref. 14/2952)

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing office to builders' yard and erection of a 3 bedroom, three storey (including basement) dwelling house erection of a boundary treatment and associated hard and soft landscaping

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed after paragraph 25 of the report as amended in condition 2 and as set out in the supplementary report.

Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) in response to a query raised by Mapesbury Residents Association (MAPRA) about the correct number of objections recorded in the report stated that since the report was published, an additional objection had been received, bringing the total to 89. He added that the additional objection raised no new issues. He drew members' attention to the plan numbers as set out in the supplementary report which amended condition 2.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Colacicco stated that she had been approached by members of MAPRA in connection with the application. Councillor Colacicco stated that the proposed development would detract from the character of Mapesbury Conservation Area, resulting in a detrimental impact on the area. In urging members to refuse the application, Councillor Colacicco requested members to have regard to the existing Conservation Area Design Guide for Mapesbury. She also referred to chapter three of the Local Development Framework which stated that "boundary treatments should be retained where they form an integral part of the character or appearance of a Conservation Area" and BE27 which states that "Consent will not be given for the demolition of a building... in a conservation area unless the building, or part of the building, positively detracts from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area."

Councillor Colacicco then left the meeting room and took no part in the ensuing discussions and voting on the application.

David Gee (Secretary MAPRA), an objector, by reference to the Committee report stated that only minor changes had been made to the proposed development which would have a fundamental impact on the conservation area. He added that the proposal would be inconsistent with, and contrary to, the design guide policy which sought to resist any development that resulted in garden impact. He stressed the importance of the gardens to the character of the conservation area. He also stated that the proposal would not enhance or preserve the character of

the area and would set a dangerous precedent for future undesirable developments within the conservation area. In response to a member's question, David Gee clarified that the site was a garden which was converted to a builders' yard and therefore the proposal should be viewed as a back garden development.

Eric Cliff of MAPRA circulated a paper which highlighted the Council's successes in appeals to the Planning Inspectorate relating to sites within the conservation area. He urged members to refuse the application and offered the full support of MAPRA if the applicant chose to lodge an appeal.

Darren Stewart and one other neighbour (Marcia) of Teignmouth Road spoke in similar terms adding that the proposed development which they considered to be out of character would obstruct their garden views without enhancing or preserving the conservation area.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Carr stated that she had been approached by members of MAPRA in connection with the application. Councillor Carr objected to the proposed development on the grounds that it would not preserve or enhance the status of Mapesbury Conservation Area. She emphasised the need to preserve and enhance the conservation area.

Peter Benda, a supporter stated that the proposed development, which would be sited on a builders' yard, would enhance and improve the conservation area. He added that 89 objections received to the application was not significant relative to the number of residents in the area. He also stated that he was a member of MAPRA, but did not oppose the application. Peter Frank echoed similar views adding that most of the residents were unconcerned about the development as it would not result in any detriment.

Christopher Campbell (applicant) informed members that the scheme had been revised to ensure that it complied with the Conservation Area Design Guide, preserved and enhanced the conservation area. He added that the scale and massing had been reduced and that a new landscaped area would be created which would preserve the open character of the area. The applicant continued that the proposal, which would replace a builders' yard, would enhance the conservation area. In response to members' questions, David Campbell stated that the proposal which incorporated improved design and accorded with local planning and national policies, would be used as single family dwelling. He clarified that he did not incorporate a pitched roof so as to preserve the openness of the development and reduce its impact and that by condition 4, the brick selected would match the brick that is prevalent in the Mapesbury Conservation Area.

In response to a question raised, the Head of Planning confirmed that the house erected on the other side of the road dated from the 1980's prior to the declaration of the conservation area.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended in the supplementary report.

5. 152 Olive Road, London NW2 6UY (Ref.14/2548)

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of former Cricklewood Library building and erection of a four storey building comprising 6 self-contained flats (1 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) and 187m² of D1 (multi-functional community) floor space, with provision for bike and bin stores, associated landscaping and temporary retention of site hoarding for site security (to be removed on completion of development).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) reported that the applicant had reconfirmed their intention that the Friends of Cricklewood Library (FoCL) would occupy the community floor space and that significant pre-application discussions had been held with the FoCL to influence the size and layout of the community space.. He understood that the FoCL had submitted an outline business plan to the applicant, a condition precedent to the offer of a lease to the FoCL.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Colacicco declared that she had been working with the FoCL on the library. Councillor Colacicco spoke in support of the application and welcomed the offer of ground floor space for community use. She then withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting.

Councillor Carr, ward member, indicated her support for the application.

Sally Long (Chair and Edward Lazarus (Finance Director) of FoCL spoke in support of the application, adding that the FoCL were in a position to run the library using the ground floor D1 space which they considered most suitable as a hub for the community to meet. In response to members' questions, Edward Lazarus stated that the FoCL were still negotiating on the annual service charge of £2,500, however, this would not pose a significant problem as FoCL had access to grant giving organisations to fund the project.

Mandip Sahota (applicant's agent) informed members that the ground floor D1 community use had been arrived at following consultations with community groups including FoCL. He confirmed that the applicants had notified FoCL that the space would be let out to them. He continued that the scheme had the support of residents and the general community and that the residential flats also complied with space standards. Mr Sahota then invited the applicant's architect to respond to members' questions on technical aspects of the scheme. The architect stated that an amended elevation which would ensure additional daylight was provided had been submitted since the report was published. He clarified that the ground

floor D1 use had been given a stronger presence and that the residential element had been set back appropriately.

In respect of the bin store and waste management, members' attention was drawn to condition 3 as set out in the main report. The Head of Planning advised against a member's suggestion for an informative on FoCL as the preferred tenant adding that this was best captured in the Section 106 legal agreement.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.

Notes:

Councillors Colacicco and Choudhary having declared prejudicial interests in the application at the start of the meeting took no part in the discussion or voting.

After the consideration of the above applications, the Councillor Marquis (Chair) had to leave the meeting. The remainder of the meeting was chaired by Councillor Colacicco (Vice-Chair).

6. 1-25 New Crescent Yard, London NW10 (Ref. 14/1309)

PROPOSAL:

Erection of metal railing adjacent to boundary between Shrine of Our Lady of Willesden Church and New Crescent Yard

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed after paragraph 8 of the report and as amended in condition 2 and as set out in the supplementary report.

Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) informed members that the Church had withdrawn their objection to the scheme. He clarified that the proposed perspex screen to the railings would be transparent and would only be installed to a small section of the railings. Andy Bates drew members' attention to revised plan numbers which amended condition 2 as set out in the supplementary report.

In approving the application, members added a condition for the material selected to be maintained in clean condition.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to additional conditions on maintenance and that the screen on the railings be transparent.

7. 58 Brondesbury Road, London NW6 6BS (Ref.14/2026)

PROPOSAL:

Conversion of existing hostel into 4 self-contained flats (3 x 2 beds and 1 x 3 bed) involving excavation and alterations to existing partial basement level, lightwell to the front and sunken patio to the rear, blocking up and alterations to some of the existing windows and doors and front garden changes to include provision for single car parking space, bin storage and new hard and soft landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed after paragraph 19 of the report as amended in condition 3.

Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) in reference to the supplementary report informed members that the scaling of the front garden was correct and that the proposed arrangement showing one car parking space, enhanced landscaping and bin storage could be accommodated on the site. He reported that although the applicant had confirmed that the outbuilding would be removed, he recommended an amended condition 3 as set out in the supplementary report. He continued that other than the excavation of the rear patio level for the lower ground floor flat, the applicant did not propose to make any change to the ground level of the site.

In response to members' questions, the Head of Planning stated that the proposal did not constitute an overdevelopment of the site and that there was no extension proposed into the garden. Members heard that there was an approach to limit to the size of lightwells in the conservation area and that condition 4 which required that the person carrying out the works was a member of Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) would minimise construction noise.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and a condition that the windows overlooking the garden have permanent obscured glazing.

8. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

Note: At 9.15pm the meeting was adjourned for 2 minutes.

The meeting ended at 9.47pm

S MARQUIS
Chair