

**Committee Report
Planning Committee on 2 February, 2011**

Item No. 7
Case No. 10/2452

RECEIVED: 28 October, 2010

WARD: Brondesbury Park

PLANNING AREA: Kilburn & Kensal Consultative Forum

LOCATION: 63 Christchurch Avenue, London, NW6 7BL

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing two-storey dwellinghouse and erection of 2 x three-storey blocks, comprising 6 dwellinghouses, and car-parking with provision of private amenity space and landscaping to site.

APPLICANT: Desmond and Diana O'Reardon

CONTACT: PAD Consultancy Ltd

PLAN NO'S:
Please See Condition 4.

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 to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

SECTION 106 DETAILS

The application requires a Section 106 Agreement, in order to secure the following benefits:-

- Payment of the Council's legal and other professional costs in (a) preparing and completing the agreement and (b) monitoring and enforcing its performance
- Join and adhere to the "Considerate Contractors Scheme".
- Terms to ensure the payment of £3,000 for each net additional bedroom on material start (Total £63,000).

And, to authorise the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission if the applicant has failed to demonstrate the ability to provide for the above terms and meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document by concluding an appropriate agreement.

EXISTING

The site is located on the North - Western side of Christchurch Ave within Brondesbury Park. The property is currently occupied by a vacant two storey family dwellinghouse. The property is not within a conservation area nor is the building listed.

PROPOSAL

See above.

HISTORY

Full planning permission Ref No: 08/1276 for Demolition of existing 2-storey dwelling and erection of 4-storey terraced block to front, comprising 3 self-contained dwellings, erection of 3-storey terraced block to rear of site comprising 5 self-contained flats, installation of vehicle crossover and provision of 8 car-parking spaces, refuse and cycle storage to side and associated landscaping to site was refused planning permission in October 2008 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the design, overall size, siting, bulk, proximity to side/rear boundaries, prominence and the provision of an excessive amount of hardstanding on site would constitute an unacceptable form of development, detracting from the character of the locality and relating poorly to surrounding forms of development. The proposal would thus result in a development that is to the detriment of the visual character and appearance of this area. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to policies BE9 and H12 of the adopted Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004.

2. The proposed development would, by reason of its height, size and siting, be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in particular Paul Daisley Court, by reason of loss of light, loss of outlook from, and the creation of an overbearing impact on, the existing property. The proposal would be contrary to policies BE9 and H16 of the adopted Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG17: "Design Guide for New Development."

3. The proposed development, by virtue of the location of habitable-room windows in relation to the site boundaries, is considered to present unacceptable levels of outlook and residential amenity for future residents. As a result, the proposal is contrary to policies H12 and BE9 of Brent's adopted Unitary Development Plan 2004 and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG17: "Design Guide for New Development." Furthermore the proposal results in poor quality and quantity of external amenity space due to the proximity of this space to the parking and refuse/cycle areas, the space being dominated by parking and manoeuvring and the lack of suitable landscaping. This is contrary to policies BE2, BE9 of the Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 and Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 17.

4. In the absence of a legal agreement to control the matter, the development would result in additional pressure on transport infrastructure, without any contribution to sustainable transport improvements in the area and increased pressure for the use of existing open space, without contributions to enhance open space or make other contributions to improve the environment, and increased pressure on education infrastructure, without any contribution to education improvements. As a result, the proposal is contrary to policies TRN4, TRN11, OS7 and CF6 of Brent's adopted Unitary Development Plan 2004 and SPD 'Legal Agreements'

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS **Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004**

STRATEGIC POLICIES

STR1 Housing (particularly affordable) is Priority Land-Use
STR3 Sustainable Development
STR5 Reducing the need to Travel
STR11 Built and Natural Environment
STR14 Quality of the Urban Environment
STR18 Additional Housing
STR19 New Housing Development

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

BE1 Urban Design Statements
BE2 Townscape: Local Context and Character
BE3 Urban Structure

BE5 Urban Clarity and Safety
BE6 Public Realm: Landscape Design
BE7 Public Realm: Streetscape
BE9 Architectural Quality
BE12 Environmental Design Principles.

HOUSING

H8 Resisting loss of housing.
H9 Dwelling Mix
H12 Residential Quality – Layout Considerations
H13 Residential Density

TRANSPORT

TRN3 Environmental Impact of Traffic
TRN10 Walkable Environments
TRN14 Highway Design
TRN23 Parking Standards – Residential Developments
TRN35 Transport Access for Disabled People and others with Mobility Difficulties
PS14 Parking Standards – Residential Development
PS15 Parking for Disabled People
PS16 Bicycle Parking

Brent Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG 17 "Design Guide for New Development" Adopted October 2001

Provides comprehensive and detailed design guidance for new development within the borough. The guidance specifically sets out advice relating to siting, landscaping, parking, design, scale, density and layout.

CONSULTATION

On 23 November 2010, a total of 188 neighbouring properties were consulted, along with Ward Councillors. The Council has received a total of 31 letters of objection, 29 of which are standard pro-forma letters. The objections are summarised below:

- The dustbins will cause increase bad odour and rodent numbers
- Security of gardens abutting the Western Boundary will be compromised by way of the new access
- Windows on house 3 will create a loss of privacy
- House 3 is located less than 10m away from the western boundary
- Increase car accessibility will increase noise on the property
- No detail on planting to the western boundary
- No guarantee that the development will not look tired in time
- Details on financial contributions the development will make to compensate for the increased strain caused on existing service, specifically on the education services.
- Strongly resist the building over gardens
- The high density of the development is resisted
- Loss of amenity space
- Irreversible loss of habitat to wild life
- light pollution

REMARKS

Introduction and principle of Development

The building is not sited within one of the Council's designated Conservation Areas nor an ADRC (area of distinctive residential character). As a result, the area does not provide the same level of protection to existing buildings as would be the case if it was so designated or, even more sensitive, the building was statutorily listed.

This is not to say that the area does not have a character worthy of acknowledgement, but it does mean that it would be difficult for the Council to say that the demolition of buildings will never be allowed in this locality. Instead, the Council's approach should be that if buildings are to be removed, any replacement building should be of the necessary design quality, relating well to what is in the area.

In this case, whilst the building is not without merit, it is not considered that the existing house at No. 63 Christchurch Ave is of such architectural quality that the Council should object, in principle, to its loss. The elevations of the building are considered to be fairly ordinary in terms of their architectural quality, but as indicated above, its demolition would only be considered once a replacement scheme has been formally approved by the Planning Authority and that is considered to be the key consideration at this time.

Policies BE2, BE3, BE7, BE9 and H12 of the UDP seek to ensure that new development positively enhances the character and amenity of an area. The character here is generally mixed with the subject site sited between a 3 storey housing scheme to the east and the long residential gardens of properties to the west, most of which have been converted into flats. Neighbouring the Stadium Social Housing scheme is a detached Church. It is considered that there is no objection to a redevelopment, per se, in this location. However, this would be on the basis that the resulting development would not detract from the well-established character of the area, and would positively enhance the area thereby.

Paragraph 36 of PPS3 advises that housing should be located in suitable locations and that this *should be achieved by making effective use of land... The priority for development should be previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings.* This would not preclude development on land that does not fall within the definition of previously developed land. Furthermore, whilst the definition in Annex B states that there is not a presumption in favour of development on land that falls outside the definition of previously developed land, it does not preclude such development. As such, applications that are for development on land not defined as previously developed land should be assessed on their merits with reference to the development plan. In this case Core Strategy Policy CP17 which states:

Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent *The distinctive suburban character of Brent will be protected from inappropriate development. The council will bring forward design guidance that limits development, outside of the main town centres and away from corner plots on main road frontages, which would erode the character of suburban housing. Development of garden space and infilling of plots with out-of-scale buildings that do not respect the settings of the existing dwellings will not be acceptable.*

Policy CP17 does not preclude development on back gardens. The last sentence of this policy is very clear; development that is out of scale and does not respect the setting of other buildings will not be acceptable on garden land. Conversely, development that does respect the setting of other buildings and is of an appropriate scale could be acceptable on garden land. The proposal does not just include development on garden land; it actually proposes a comprehensive development of a site that currently accommodates a large 20th century house that is of limited architectural merit. The proposal makes efficient use of an otherwise underused site which proposes 6 houses. The proposal respects the existing building line on Christchurch Avenue not only on the street frontage but also at the rear.

Although the matter of backland development, or 'Garden Grabbing,' must be addressed in assessing the principle of the development, 'Garden Grabbing' relates to taking a rear garden of a house and seeking to build more houses. The Council supports emerging London Plan Policy to limit the inappropriate development of back gardens that erode the character of suburban areas, as reflected in the Council's Core Strategy. As explained, Policy CP17 does not preclude development on back gardens, but rather requires development to be of an appropriate scale and to respect the setting of surrounding buildings. The proposal envisages a comprehensive scheme which includes the demolition of the existing house. Therefore such these concerns are not considered to be relevant. The proposed building is no higher than neighbouring buildings and therefore Officers feel that it complies with CP 17 in principle.

Loss of a family unit

The UDP states that "where a development proposal entails demolition or change of use of residential accommodation, the Council will seek replacement dwellings comparable with the standard and amount of accommodation lost. This is to maintain the overall amount and quality of the dwelling stock and to ensure that the dwelling target policy STR18 is not jeopardised." Policy H8 goes on to state:

"Development should not result in the net loss of residential housing accommodation where such accommodation can still be used, with or without adaptation, for permanent residential purposes, or loss of land within the boundary of sites in housing use to non housing uses. Where development entails demolition or other loss of dwellings, comparable replacement will be required. Specific exceptions to this policy are set out in the Community Facilities chapter."

The proposed development seeks approval for the demolition of the existing 2-storey dwelling and erection of 6 family sized houses. As a result, the proposal does not result in a net loss of housing and it also provides replacement large units comparable in size to the unit being removed and is, therefore, acceptable, in principle.

Density of the Development

Policy H13 of the adopted UDP and SPG17 include criteria designed to ensure that new development is of an appropriate scale and density for the locality. SPG17 sets out a number of development characteristics (Table 1 para. 2.3) that can be used to assist in the consideration of the appropriate density for a particular scheme. In addition, the guidance sets out a quantitative test in order to assess the appropriate density for any particular new or existing site.

No. 63 Christchurch Ave has a PTAL rating of 3, meaning that it falls into the category of moderate accessibility. The provision of 6 houses, would have a density in the appropriate level, totalling approx i.e. 247 habitable rooms per hectare. For the information of Members, this site could accommodate a higher density given its size, however owing to the low PTAL rating and the consequent car parking demand, the lower density is considered to be more appropriate here.

Size, Scale and Design

The Council's SPG17: "Design Guide for New Development" is the starting point for the assessment of this residential development. Following on from the refusal of 08/1276 the scheme has been designed to now comply with the adopted guidance set down in the Council's guidance.

The proposal envisages two flat roofed blocks each two and three storeys in height. The proposal is considered to be better than the previously refused scheme, by way of reduced height, the absence of balconies and the siting of the buildings further away from site boundaries. A further consideration here is that the existing building on the site already has an impact on both the established streetscene and the people living next to it.

When the current proposal is compared with the existing dwellinghouse, and assessed against SPG 17, the proposed street facing block is considered to be less dominant and, indeed, more in proportion with the neighbouring property, Paul Daisley Court. The proposed development has

been designed to respect the established building line of Christchurch Avenue and the scale and design of the surrounding streetscene.

The proposed part two and three storey rear block will have a staggered form. This staggered block is an attempt to reduce the impact on the neighbouring rear block at Paul Daisley Court. Officers consider the benefits to be two fold, ie. reduce the bulk of the building and mitigates impact of impact on Paul Daisley Court. As such officers find the rear block to be acceptable. The siting could be changed as far as it relates to house 4 in order to increase the rear garden area, but this would result in the impact on the adjoining property being increased. The issues is balanced, but Officers consider that the impact on neighbours should be minimised and the quality of external space for future residents of house 4 is already acceptable.

The Council's Design Officer has commented on the proposal and considers that the new development is appropriately sited and laid out, whilst maintaining the existing street formation and grain. The proposed elevations represent a simplistic design approach and a contemporary development is proposed. The simple palette of materials is welcomed and details will be secured by condition.

Impact on neighbouring properties

SPG 17 normally requires a 10m separation between habitable room windows and boundaries. Notwithstanding this, Members will be aware that each application needs to be considered on its own merits and the particular circumstances of the case need to be considered in every instance. In this case, the neighbouring garden of Young Court to the rear is used communally and, as such, it is considered that separation distances can be relaxed. For information, the neighbouring block at Paul Daisley Court is positioned closer to the rear boundary than that of the new rear block and this sets the context within which this proposal is to be considered. On balance, Officers consider the proposal to be acceptable in this regard.

All flank windows are to be obscure glazed, preventing any overlooking to directly adjoining properties. As explained above, the scale, mass and positioning of the buildings complies with the Council's SPG17 Guidance. As a result, whilst matters will inevitably change for those residents of Brondesbury Park who look out towards the application site, the physical impact of the buildings (as assessed by SPG17) will be within acceptable limits and the erection of the two blocks, presenting their flank walls and with a distance in excess of 20 metres between them, will not have such an unacceptable visual impact so as to justify refusing the scheme on this ground. As explained, due consideration has been given to these gardens, but the proposed development is considered to be of an appropriate scale.

The flank wall of the nearest frontage block of Paul Daisley Court has a kitchen window on the ground floor. In order to take account of this point, the proposed street fronting block will be two storeys in height and is further away than the previously refused scheme. The block then steps up into form an additional third floor. In this case, the new building will have less of an impact than the existing house and on this basis this relationship is acceptable.

Quality of accommodation

SPG17 sets out the minimum unit sizes for residential units having different numbers of bedrooms. The Council's current standards seek the following sizes as a minimum:

- 3-bedroom (4-person) unit – 85 square metres.
- 4-bedroom flat – 95 square metres.

An assessment of the current proposal indicates that the proposed houses shown on the plans do exceed the Council's guidelines, in quantitative terms, all by a significant amount.

SPG17 requires 50 square metres of space for each house, meaning that a total of 300 square metres should be proposed here. Each house has a minimum of 50m². The previously refused scheme envisaged a courtyard dominated by car parking and manoeuvring of vehicles. However, the current proposal has aimed to address the problem by reducing the number of car parking bays, concentrating four of the six bays in the North Eastern corner of the site and placing the remaining two bay adjacent to units 3 and 6. This allows the remainder of the forecourt to be used as external amenity space. Each garden will be screened to provide privacy. That said, the area in the centre of the site between the two blocks does have a relatively large area of hardstanding and, therefore, details of the hard surfacing is considered to be important in the assessment of the development. If the application is to be approved details of hardsurfacing and screening will be secured by condition.

The kitchens of some units are considered to have limited outlook with the smallest garden being 4m in depth, but these are front facing and the front gardens will be planted up and appropriately screened so that the development will continue to have the appropriate quality of accommodation, inside and out. For clarity, the unit with the smallest front garden (house 6) has the largest rear garden.

Highway Matters

The application site is located on Christchurch Avenue, a local access road which is not defined as being heavily parked. The site lies within a CPZ and has a moderate accessibility with a PTAL rating of 3.

The existing house will attract a maximum standard of 2.0 car spaces, which is currently provided along the street frontage. The proposed development will clearly attract a significant increase in the car parking standard, as each 4 bed will attract of 2.0 spaces and the 3 bed flat 1.6 spaces. Resulting in a site maximum of 10.8 car spaces. 6 car spaces have been provided within the development, and at least 2 spaces can be provided on-street on the site frontage. This is an acceptable level of car parking provision, as 75% of the maximum standard can be taken as an informal minimum provision of parking for residential development.

Initially the Council's Transportation Engineers objected to the application on the basis that the proposed vehicular access was not wide enough. The proposal has been subsequently altered to provide an access that is 5.2m in width plus 0.45m protective margin resulting in a 5m access strip. Officers now consider this arrangement to be acceptable

Bicycle storage has been suitably provided, in the form of an individual lock-up/shed for each dwelling. This is welcomed. Each unit will have a private storage area for refuse and recycling area and the site will be serviced by way of a communal refuse area towards the front of the site where refuse and recycling waste will be collected. This arrangement would be similar to numerous other residential developments.

Landscaping

An area of concern that required attention was the landscape treatment of the Western boundary, as the boundary will serve as a buffer between the new access and neighbouring residential gardens. The applicant has confirmed the 1m wide planting strip will be treated with a 1.8m high beech hedge. Officers consider that a 1.8m hedge, augmented by tree planting, may be the most appropriate treatment of the boundary, having the associated benefit of effectively greening this boundary and the views of the site from Brondesbury Park. These details will be secured by condition

Your officers have reviewed the arboricultural implications of the proposals and consider them to be acceptable, but do require further detail on a (min 5 year) landscape management plan showing requirements for the ongoing maintenance of hard and soft landscape. This will be secured by condition

S106

For the avoidance of doubt, this particular scheme would attract the following requirements:

- Payment of the Council's legal and other professional costs in (a) preparing and completing the agreement and (b) monitoring and enforcing its performance
- Join and adhere to the Considerate Contractors scheme.
- Terms to ensure the payment of £3,000 for each net additional bedroom on material start (Total £63,000).

Other

The applicant has proposed a sedum roof. The sedum roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.

The applicant has also proposed solar panels on the roofs, details of which will be secured by condition. These features should not be visible from the streetscene. A further condition deals with the possible proliferation of satellite dishes, air-conditioning units and other similar paraphernalia. The carefully thought out design and appearance of the proposed buildings would certainly not benefit from uncontrolled features appearing on them and it is considered that this should be dealt with at this stage, rather than as an afterthought at a later date.

Response to Objectors Concerns

Objection has been raised with the noise created by building works and noise created by an additional five families on the site. As a part of any legal agreement the applicant will be required to sign up to a Considerate Contractors Scheme and the Building Regulations would require adequate insulation of the property to prevent noise transmission.

Having viewed the proposal specifically assessing the western boundary treatment officers do not consider the development will cause any more of a security threat than any other neighbouring property.

Whilst officers note the new access will facilitate access for 6 vehicles on site, they are not of the view that the numbers of vehicle movements will be such so as to cause so much harm, whether by noise, disturbance or fumes, that it would be detrimental to neighbouring residents

An issue has been raised with the increased light caused by the erection of a rear block on the site. Whilst the development will inevitably create additional sources of light, the context of the area must be considered and this site is bordered by flatted developments at Young Court and Paul Daisley Court. It would be difficult to justify refusing consent on this ground alone.

All other grounds of objection have been discussed in the main body of the report.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Consent subject to Legal agreement

- (1) The proposed development is in general accordance with policies contained in the:-

Brent's Unitary Development Plan 2004
Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 17:-Design Guide For New
Development

Relevant policies in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan are those in the following chapters:-

Built Environment: in terms of the protection and enhancement of the environment

Housing: in terms of protecting residential amenities and guiding new development

Transport: in terms of sustainability, safety and servicing needs

CONDITIONS/REASONS:

- (1) Details of a scheme showing those areas to be treated by means of hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Such details shall include detailed drawing(s) of those areas to be so treated, a schedule of materials and samples if appropriate. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of local visual amenity.

- (2) Notwithstanding any details of landscape works referred to in the submitted application, a scheme for the landscape works and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development (including species, plant sizes and planting densities) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any site clearance, demolition or construction works on the site. Any approved planting, turfing or seeding included in such details shall be completed in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include:-

- The identification and protection of existing trees and shrubs not directly affected by the building works and which are to be retained;
- Screen planting along the Western boundary, including additional tree planting;
- Details of the proposed arrangements for the maintenance of the landscape works.

Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of *five* years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season and all planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species and in the same positions, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the proposed development and ensure that it enhances the visual amenity of the area.

- (3) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning on the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- (4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing:

5048/31b

5048/65
5048/40a
5048/21a
5048/20a
5048/06
5048/07
5048/30
5048/41a
5048/42
5048/60
5048/62
5048/70
5048/80
5048/CGI 1
5048/CGI 2

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- (5) The sedum roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.

Reason: To safeguard neighbouring amenity

- (6) All flank windows on the buildings shall be constructed with obscure glazing and non-opening or with openings at high level only (not less than 1.8m above floor level) and shall be permanently retained and maintained in that condition thereafter unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained.

Reason: To minimise interference with the privacy of the adjoining occupiers

- (7) Details of materials for all external work including samples, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work (save for demolition and works relating to site preparation) is commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. These details shall include:-

- timber louvres
- windows/doors.
- roof details.
- canopies.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development which does not prejudice the amenity of the locality.

- (8) No water tank, air-conditioning or ventilation plant, extraction equipment or other roof structure hereby approved shall be erected above the level of the roof hereby approved without the further written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Details of any air-conditioning, ventilation and flue extraction systems including particulars of noise levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the systems being installed and the approved details should be fully implemented.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers and in the interests of visual amenity.

- (9) In order to mitigate against the possibility of numerous satellite dishes being installed on the buildings hereby approved, details of a communal television system/satellite dish provision shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be fully implemented.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development in particular and the locality in general.

- (10) The bicycle and refuse/recycling storage facilities hereby permitted shall be retained as such, and shall not be altered or removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to meet the likely future demands of residents.

- (11) Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, a scheme for the treatment throughout the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development (to exclude the remediation and demolition works) on the site. Once approved, such details shall be completed in strict accordance with the details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include:-

- (a) proposed railings, walls and fences indicating materials and heights
- (b) adequate physical separation, such as protective walls and fencing between landscaped and paved areas.
- (c) areas of hard landscape works and proposed materials

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the proposed development, to ensure that it enhances the visual amenity of the area and in the interests of future residential occupiers of the scheme.

- (12) Further details of the solar panels on the roof of the building shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, prior to the development hereby approved commencing. The panels should not be visible from any public vantage point and once approved the details shall be fully implemented.

Reason: In order to allow the Planning Authority to exercise proper control over the development.

INFORMATIVES:

None Specified

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Tanusha Naidoo, The Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5245



Planning Committee Map

Site address: 63 Christchurch Avenue, London, NW6 7BL

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping data with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Brent, DBRE201 2005



London Borough of Brent - Copyright (C)

This map is indicative only.