



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 11 February 2015 at 7.00 pm

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

Also present: Councillors Daly, Hoda-Benn, McLennan, Pavey and Perrin

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

3. Land adjacent to Quality Hotel and Dexion House, Fulton Road  
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
4. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Roaf (Ref. 14/4541)  
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
5. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Roaf (Ref. 14/4555)  
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
7. Car Park next to 34, Rokesby Place, Wembley  
All members received representations from Mr Paul Lorber.  
Councillor Marquis received an email from Councillor Daly.
8. Land at junction of Yeats Close and Great Central Way NW10  
Councillor Choudhary declared pecuniary interest as a board member of Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), he vacated the meeting room when this application was heard and took no part in the discussion and voting on the application.

### 2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 January 2015 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

### 3. **Land adj to Quality Hotel and Dexion House, Fulton Road Wembley (Ref. 14/4330)**

PROPOSAL:

Proposed erection of 1- to 20-storey building comprising 370 residential units, 693 sqm of non-residential floor space (use class A1 (retail), A2 (financial and professional), A3 (cafe/restaurant), B1(Business), D1 (community) or D2 (assembly and leisure)) and associated residential parking spaces, private

communal landscaped garden, ancillary spaces, and associated plant, landscaping, cycle storage and refuse provision.

The application is submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters in relation to Layout, Scale, Appearance, Access and Landscape), 9 (Noise), 23 (Sustainability Implementation Strategy) and 28 (Affordable Housing Storage) in relation to Plot NW06 of outline planning permission reference 14/3054 which varied outline planning consent reference 13/1323 (section 73 application) and 10/3032 (original consent), with details also submitted pursuant to paragraphs 4 (Affordable Housing), 10.5 (Demolition), 12 (sport and play space) and 19 (Brent Access Forum) of the first schedule of the Section 106 legal agreement.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant approval of the Reserved Matters subject to conditions after paragraph 45 and approve details pursuant to conditions 1, 9, 23 and 28 in relation to plot NW06.

Members agreed that the Area Planning Manager be allowed to introduce application reference numbers 14/4330, 14/4541 and 14/4555 simultaneously as they were interlinked. Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) explained the description of the applications with the help of a slide presentation. In reference to condition 8 which required the provision of at least 8 additional three-bedroom flats within the building she confirmed that the applicant had submitted revised drawings showing that 3 bedroom flats had been incorporated into the development on floors 15 to 19 of the proposed building. The revised plans therefore updated condition 1 and omitted condition 8. Members heard that the three applications that are being considered would deliver 370 homes together with some key elements of social and physical infrastructure including the 0.4 Ha park and the 300 square metre community hall.

The Area Planning Manager added that the design and layout of the proposed park and pocket park was considered to be acceptable subject to the approval of further details regarding hard landscaping, planting and play provision pursuant to conditions already attached to the outline consent. The proposed road layout was also considered to be acceptable subject to a new condition requiring a 10m kerb radii and raised table at the junction of “Wealdstone Road” and Fulton Road. Rachel Murrell also recommended a further condition to ensure that noise and disturbance from construction was minimised.

Anne Clements (on behalf of the applicant) stated that the linked applications would provide a reduced number of 362 homes, each dwelling unit with an appropriate quantum of open space, a proportion of which would be for affordable homes. She continued that the development would also provide a community hall (D1 use) and combined heating for sustainability. Members heard that the development would also provide employment to assist with the on-going wider regeneration of the Wembley Park area.

Members raised questions about affordable homes that the proposed development would deliver in terms of quantity and size of dwelling units. Anne Clements was also asked to clarify issues regarding Section 106 social infrastructure including the provision of education and the review mechanism for the value of homes built on NW01 lands which could trigger an increase in affordable homes that could

eventually become available. In general members expressed a view that the Council was disappointed in the total number of affordable homes that would be made available from such a significant development in the Wembley regeneration area.

In response Anne Clements stated that all of the homes would be built to Lifetime Homes standard with 10% wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable and 33 affordable homes were proposed. Quintain would partner a registered social landlord (RSL) and housing officers to deliver the allocation of homes. She added that under the Section 106 agreement the number of affordable homes would be reviewed in 2016 when the buildings on NW01 lands were completed. This allowed for the current 10% level of affordable homes to be increased up to 17.5%. Members heard that a Section 106 infrastructure requirement would provide space for D1 use which could be used either as a General Practitioner (GP) surgery or community hall. She continued that some £11million had been provided towards the provision of education subject to the Council identifying a suitable piece of land for that purpose. Anne Clements continued that Quintain would also provide a sum of £60,000 towards the improvement of bus shelters in the local area.

In bringing the discussion to a close, the Chair reiterated the Committee's disappointment at the low number of affordable homes that would be made available regardless of the review clause. The Chair also expressed hope that the developers would listen to the concerns of the Committee and work with the Council to increase the level of affordable housing in their future developments to be more in line with the 50% target set by the Council.

DECISION: Planning approval granted as recommended.

#### **4. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref. 14/4541)**

PROPOSAL: Proposed construction of park (publicly accessible open space), a "pocket park", access roads and other associated hard and soft landscaping works and infrastructure and alteration to existing access roads, and access to Fulton Road.

This application is submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters), 7 (visibility spay), 8 (c) Layout of internal and external spaces, 8(k) wind mitigation and 12 (Noise) of outline planning permission reference 14/3054 which varied outline planning consent reference 13/1323 (section 73 application) and 10/3032 (original consent), with details also submitted pursuant to paragraphs 4 (Affordable Housing), 10.5 (Demolition), 12 (sport and play space) and 19 (Brent Access Forum) of the first schedule of the Section 106 legal agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant approval of the Reserved Matters and details pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters), 7 (visibility spay), 8 (c) Layout of internal and external spaces, 8(k) wind mitigation and 12 (Noise) in relation to the park and associated access roads.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

**5. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref. 14/4555)**

PROPOSAL: Proposed hard and soft landscaping works involving the construction of a new access road adjacent to the rear boundary of the Quality Hotel and Dexion House including footway and loading bays, substations and other associated hard and soft landscaping works.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant permission subject to conditions detailed after paragraph 7 of the Remarks Section of the this report.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

**6. Uxendon Manor Primary School, Vista Way, Harrow (Ref. 14/3781)**

PROPOSAL: Installation of single storey modular temporary classrooms in the playground of Uxendon Manor School

RECOMMENDATION: Grant temporary planning permission subject to conditions set out after paragraph 19.

Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) clarified that the proposal was for a temporary permission for a classroom with no additional increase in pupil numbers.

John Poole (objector) informed members that due to flash floods, the existing drainage and sewerage systems would not be able to cope with the increase in new buildings and thus population. He added that the proposal would have implications for Wealdstone Brook, the provision of playground and playing field facilities. In order to address this, he urged Planning Services to request Thames Water to enter into a binding commitment to review and upgrade the drainage and sewerage systems. John Poole continued that the increase in pupil numbers would lead to an increase in vehicular activity, pick up and drop off of pupils, resulting in noise nuisance and detrimental impact to pedestrian safety.

Rachel Murrell, Area Planning Manager clarified that the proposal was for a temporary classroom which would allow the school to re-instate the facilities lost in September 2014. She added that the School's existing travel plan was accredited with a silver award by the Council's school road safety team. In response to the request for network capacity investigation, she drew members' attention to the informative advising Thames Water as such, although there should not be a net impact on the rate or volume of water entering the drainage system. She advised that the applicant had provided details of flood management for the proposal which included a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with the Environment Agency's standing advice, drawing members' attention to the applicant's comments as set out in the main report. She however added a further condition that the School's flood management plan be updated prior to the occupation of the unit.

Members emphasised the need for the school to work towards achieving a high level travel plan, a gold award and added that the concerns expressed at the meeting be passed on to Thames Water and the Council's Transportation unit.

DECISION: Granted temporary planning permission subject to conditions set out after paragraph 19 of the main report and subject to additional informative reminding of the importance of objectives of School Travel Plan with an aim to achieve a gold award.

## **7. Car Park Next to Rokesby Place, Wembley (Ref. 14/4078)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2 semi-detached houses and associated hard and soft landscaping including the provision of parking spaces, bins and bike stores, and alterations to existing parking and landscaped areas (as amended plans).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions listed after paragraph 51 of the remarks section of the main report and an additional condition to secure the applicant's agreement to carry out a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation..

With reference to the supplementary report, Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) summarised the additional list of objections received since the report was published. These included reference to the use of the car park, Rokesby Place as an adopted road, turning room for lorries, parking facilities for local residents and, over-development of the site. She informed members that in an attempt to address residents' concerns, the applicant, Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) had removed the proposed changes to the parking arrangements. She added that as the land was not within the control of BHP, they withdrew their 'Wings' permit scheme and agreed to fund consultation on the CPZ. She recommended an additional condition to secure that. In respect of concerns for over-development, with regards to the turning head, the Area Planning Manager advised that as refuse vehicles were not currently using the car park for turning but rather reversing up Rokesby Place, the proposal would not alter the current situation. Members heard that as the minimum distance between the proposal and 24 Crawford Avenue was in excess of the standard set out in SPG17, the proposal complied with guidance in terms of protecting the privacy of adjoining occupiers and would not result in overlooking.

In respect of disabled parking provision, Rachel Murrell noted that whilst currently there was no dedicated disabled parking provision, as an adopted highway, residents could make an application for a marked bay to be provided which would be considered by Transportation. The third space proposed as part of the application (the 'visitor space) was not of sufficient size to accommodate a disabled space. In terms of impact on amenity, she advised that as the site was a car park, limited weight could be given to any value as an amenity/play area in the assessment. She confirmed that the tree identified would be removed.

Nila Gor (objector) informed members that the withdrawal of the 'Wings' permit scheme had resulted in inadequate parking spaces for residents, adding that the car park had been in regular use rather than being redundant. She also expressed concerns about inadequate turning room for vehicles and lack of disabled parking spaces. In response to members' questions, the objector stated

that there were only 17 spaces and that vehicles reversed in from Copland Avenue due to inadequate turning room, particularly for refuse vehicles.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, the following Councillors made representations:-

Councillor Hoda-Benn stated that she had been approached by an objector for whom she read out a statement to the Committee. Councillor Hoda-Benn highlighted the loss of car park, especially for disabled persons, loss of safe play area and accessibility issues which residents felt had not been addressed by BHP. Members heard that there were about 8 blue badge holders on the estate who would be deprived of parking facilities.

Councillor Daly stated that she had been approached by local residents. Councillor Daly echoed similar sentiments and added that the application did not comply with the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act (Equality Act) and policy BE4 on access for disabled people. She urged members to refuse the application.

Councillor McLennan (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing) informed the Committee that part of the current administration's target was to build affordable homes so as to be able to release families trapped in temporary accommodation and the private sector housing. She urged members to approve the application.

Keith Harley (Director of Development, BHP) stated that the proposed development which complied with design guidance and lifetime homes would provide increased family sized accommodation with an appropriate standard quality of accommodation in the Borough. The design of the new dwelling houses which was considered acceptable would not adversely impact on the amenities of adjoining properties as was the layout and parking provision for the site which were also considered acceptable. He added that in light of comments from residents, changes were made to the scheme to ensure it complied with the Council Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Officers had ensured that outstanding issues including the cost of consultation for CPZ would be addressed by imposition of conditions.

In response to members' questions on parking issues, Keith Harley stated that the majority of the parking spaces would be on-street and that as Rokesby Place was an adopted road, BHP could not make changes to its layout. Mr Harley was not able to indicate to the Committee where the proposed 20 parking spaces would be situated but stated that BHP would work with Transportation Officers to progress the parking issues raised. Patricia Bramwell, legal representative, advised that members' questions on refund of money to residents for the 'Wings' scheme were not relevant for planning consideration.

Councillor Kansagra noted that the tightness of the site would reduce parking spaces and worsen the area's parking situation and urged refusal. The Chair moved an amended motion for deferral for further consideration of matters relating to access for emergency vehicles/servicing, provision of parking spaces, scope for disabled parking and the width of the pavement. This was put to the vote and

declared carried. Voting on the amended motion for deferral was recorded as follows:

FOR:	Councillors Marquis, Agha, Filson, Hylton and Mahmood	(5)
AGAINST:	Councillor Colacicco	(1)
ABSTENTION:	Councillor Kansagra	(1)

DECISION: Deferred for further consideration of matters relating to access for emergency vehicles/servicing, provision of parking spaces, scope for disabled parking and the width of the pavement.

## **8. Land Junction at Yeats Close and Great Central Way, NW10 (Ref. 14/4469)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of a warehouse / industrial building for flexible use within Use Class B1(b) (research and development), B1(c) (light industry), B2 (general industry) and/or B8 (storage or distribution) purposes with ancillary B1(a) (office) floor space on the first and second floors; vehicle, cycle and bike parking, landscaping and fencing.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed after paragraph 27, 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 Chief Legal Officer.

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) informed members that the site was owned by Brent Council and that Oxfordshire County Council provided day to day management of the fixed travellers site opposite the development site. Residents parked their vehicles on the travellers' site with overspill on Yeats Close, although management ensured that the road way into the site was not blocked in order to allow access for emergency and refuse vehicles. Officers reviewed the site to see if there were access alternatives but could not identify any. He continued that if a new main entrance was created on Yeats Close it would need to be at least 40m from the roundabout junction at Great Central Way, so as to minimise the risk of queuing back from the roundabout and avoid blocking access into the site. This arrangement would give sufficient space for articulated lorries to straighten up and get into position to turn into the site. He continued that if double yellow lines were painted on both sides of Yeats Close, parking which would otherwise be available on the southern side of the road would be removed.

The arrangement as currently proposed had a secondary opening onto Yeats Close, which would not be used as an entrance for large vehicles and as such would not require yellow lines on both sides of the road. Members heard that Transportation had accepted a request for a Traffic Regulation Order which would add parking controls (double yellow lines) to the northern side of the road along the development site. The proposal would allow for parking to be maintained on the southern side to accommodate overspill parking from Lynton Close. He advised that the height of the fence had been proposed at 4m to follow the recommendations of the acoustic report and to allow access for vehicles with

refrigeration units to access the site and also minimise potential noise from such machinery. The proposed height of the building was noted but, in terms of the local context, it was not considered a significant reason for refusal. Andy Bates also referred to two additional conditions as set out in the supplementary report.

Sara Corchran (objector) informed the Committee that due to over-occupation of the travellers' site, residents were experiencing problems with parking and expressed concerns about the safety of children on the estate as HGV vehicles reversed into Lynton Close. She continued that as a result of the over-occupation, the residents of Lynton Close were having to park on Yeats Close. In her view, measures suggested by officers to address the parking problems would not work.

Les West (applicant's agent) stated that the application was in accordance with National Planning Framework. He added that impact from the proposal had been kept to the minimum with an acoustic fence and improved visual amenity. He continued that Yeats Close was suitable for heavy traffic and that there was no need for vehicles to reverse into Yeats Close. In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent stated that it was the responsibility of the Council's Highways Authority rather than the applicant to ensure that public highways were kept free of traffic. He added that an acoustic fence would be erected as an additional measure to alleviate and mitigate pollution.

In bringing the discussion to an end, the Chair observed that there were unanswered questions regarding parking issues including the width of the entrance to the site. She therefore moved an amendment for deferral for investigations into issues relating to the parking facilities and the impact of double yellow lines on lorries using the site and residents of Lynton Close. In addition the Chair indicated that members also had concerns about the width of the entrance, airborne pollution in connection with the use of the site, whether speed humps would be appropriate, 24 hour access and waiting of HGV, location of the gates and recommended the applicant consider clear signage to warn HGV drivers to be alert to the residential area and children's play area.

The amendment was put to the vote and declared carried. Voting on the amended motion for deferral was recoded as follows:

FOR: Councillors Marquis, Choudhary, Filson, Hylton, Kansagra and Mahmood	(6)
AGAINST: None	(0)
ABSTENTION: Councillors Agha and Colacicco	(2)

DECISION: Deferred for investigations into the parking and access to the development site. The following issues were raised for further review by the Council and the applicant - the width of the entrance, airborne pollution in connection with the use of the site, speed humps, 24 hour access and waiting vehicles, location of the gate and tracking information about vehicles entering the site and signage.

**9. Land rear of 114-116 Dollis Hill Lane, London NW2 6JA (Ref. 14/3953)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of four (x4 bed) semi detached dwelling houses including formation of off street parking and associated landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions listed after paragraph 21

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) clarified the position on drainage and added that surface water had been satisfactorily considered to ensure that the development did not result in excessive run off to drains from the site. In respect of neighbours' comments, he clarified that Homestead Park to the west of Orchard Close was within a conservation area but Orchard Close was not and that the proposal incorporated comprehensive landscaping scheme which would maintain the existing trees where appropriate and additional planting of 4 new trees to enhance the northern end of the site.

Mark Pender (applicant's agent) informed members that the revised scheme complied with Council planning policies and the London Plan with acceptable density levels, better layout and high quality design. He added that the Council's Transportation Officers were satisfied with the scheme which would deliver 8 car parking spaces in an area with a low PTAL and without controlled parking.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

**10. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting ended at 10.20pm

S MARQUIS  
CHAIR

**Note:** at 10.00pm, the Committee voted to disapply the guillotine procedure to allow all applications to be considered on the night.