

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

24 May, 2017

16/4478

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	13 October, 2016
WARD	Alperton
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Wembley
LOCATION	All Units at Abbey Wharf & Delta Centre and All of 152, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HA0
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing buildings at Abbey Wharf, Delta Centre and all of 152 Mount Pleasant and redevelopment to provide a residential-led, mixed-use development of up to 6 storeys comprising 135 residential units (34 x 1bed, 79 x 2bed and 22 x 3bed) and 247sqm of commercial space (A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 and D2), landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and associated works.
APPLICANT	Inland New Homes Ltd
CONTACT	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
PLAN NO'S	Site Location Plan - IH-BM31497001-ZZ-DR-A-3_02-001 Rev D0-1 Existing Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-002 Rev D0-1 Existing Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-010ZZ-DR-A-3_05-000 Rev D0-1 Proposed lower ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-B1-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-3 Proposed upper ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-00-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-4 Proposed first floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-01-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2 Proposed second floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-02-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2 Proposed third floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-03-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2 Proposed fourth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-04-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2 Proposed fifth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-05-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1 Proposed Block Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_02-002 Rev D0-1 Proposed Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1 Proposed North & East Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-001 Rev D0-3 Proposed South & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-002 Rev D0-1 Proposed Internal East & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-003 Rev D0-2 Proposed Internal South, Setback North & South Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-004 Rev D0-1 Proposed Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-005 Rev D0-1 Plot Schedule - IH-BM31497-00-ZZ-SH-A-4_401-010-PlotScheduleOptB Rev C Landscape Masterplan - INL20351-10E Rev G Air Quality Assessment prepared by Entran dated: July 2016 Tree Report prepared by ACD Environmental dated 23/02/2016 Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement prepared by ACD Environmental dated 17/06/16 Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs dated September 2016 Daylight, Sunlight and Shadow Assessment prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners dated September 2016 Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental dated June 2016

	<p>Energy Strategy prepared by Metropolis dated 06/09/2016</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Rogers Cory Partnership dated August 2016</p> <p>Geo-Environmental Report prepared by WDE Consulting dated September 2016</p> <p>Noise Assessment prepared by Entran dated 25/07/16</p> <p>Sustainability Statement prepared by Metropolis dated 07/09/2016</p> <p>Transport Assessment prepared by Phil Jones Associates dated September 2016</p>
<p>LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION</p>	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_130695</p> <p><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy _</u></p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk 2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "16/4478" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box 3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION Resolve to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement

Section 106 Heads of Terms

1. Payment of Council's legal and other professional costs in preparing and completing agreement, and monitoring and enforcing its performance
1. Securing 24 affordable rental units and 11 intermediate units (*The unit size mix is detailed in the affordable housing section below*), and a post implementation review.
2. A detailed 'Sustainability Implementation Strategy'
 1. CPZ contribution of £68,000 and the removal of future resident's ability to apply for parking permits
2. Training and employment
 1. Review and monitoring of a travel plan
1. The provision of the two non-residential units as Affordable workspace
1. Securing public access to the areas of the site surrounding the building
2. Requirement to enter into legal agreement under Section 38 and 278 of the Highways Act 1980 for removal of redundant crossovers

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and Impose conditions (and informatives) to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Standard 3 year permission
2. List of all approved plan numbers/documents
3. Noise from plant and machinery
4. Sound insulation
5. Private and communal amenity space
6. Servicing and delivery bay
7. Car Parking Management Plan
8. D1 restriction
9. Accessible Homes
10. Air quality mitigation
11. Car parking layout
12. Satellite dishes
13. Delivery and Servicing Management Plan
14. Water Use
15. Considerate Constructors Scheme
16. Ecology
17. Construction and Demolition Environmental Management Plan
18. Air Quality Neutral Assessment
19. Land contamination (investigation)
20. External lighting
 1. Children's playspace
1. Landscaping
2. Car parking – electric vehicle charging points
3. Cycle parking
4. Canal and River Trust – Waterway wall
5. Surface water drainage
6. Canal and River Trust – Risk assessment and method statement
7. Materials
8. Drainage Strategy
9. Piling - Thames Water
10. Extract systems
1. Refuse storage

Informatives

1. CIL Liable approval
2. Asbestos
3. Thames Water
4. Canal and River Trust

5. Highways

SITE MAP



Planning Committee Map

Site address: All Units at Abbey Wharf & Delta Centre and All of 152, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HA0

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings on site and erect a residential led, mixed use development of up to 6 storeys. This would contain 136 residential units, consisting of 34 one bedroom units, 80 two bedroom units, and 22 three bedroom units. There are also commercial units proposed, measuring 247sqm. This has been put forward as being flexible space for retail (A1), financial and professional services (A2), café and restaurant (A3), office (B1), D1 (Non-residential institutions) and D2 (Assembly and leisure).

There is a change of level across the site with a fall from north to south. There would be a lower ground floor level, which would appear as ground level on the canalside. This would mostly contain the car parking, but there would also be 4 flats, and the communal refuse and cycling storage with some plant space. The car parking would be accessed from a ramp at the eastern side of the site adjacent to the Liberty Centre. In front of this would be a walkway alongside the canal and an area of landscaping. The upper ground floor level would be in an inverted 'U' shape, with the two commercial units facing on to Mount Pleasant, separated by a residential entrance. There would then be two blocks of residential units running from the front of the site to the south. They would not be absolutely parallel and the distance between them would steadily increase. In between would be communal open space.

Above this the form of the building would remain the same at first and second floors. At third floor level changes with a section cut out in the middle of each block. At fourth floor level the middle section of the front is cut out, and then the element in the north west of the site extends up a further storey to reach its highest point.

EXISTING

The site is approximately 0.76 hectares and includes a number of buildings, which are single or double storey. This includes Abbey Wharf, Delta Centre and all of 152 Mount Pleasant. Some have flat roof and others pitched roofs, and all are currently in commercial uses. The site is well occupied by a number of different uses including car washing, repair and sales, and a tyre business, and scrap metal storage. The site backs on to the Grand Union Canal.

To the north the site is bounded by Mount Pleasant, which runs from east to west and ultimately links Alperton with Stonebridge Park. In this section, the northern side is characterised by traditional semi-detached dwellings, with commercial units to the south. To the east is the Liberty Centre, which is a collection of light industrial and office buildings some of which have been subject to prior approval applications to change the use to residential. To the south is the Grand Union Canal, with some scrap metal storage and used car components being immediately adjacent to it. To the west are industrial buildings, which also form part of the wider Abbey Industrial Estate.

The site is within walking distance of the stations at Alperton and Stonebridge Park, and the 224 bus route runs along Mount Pleasant. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed or locally listed buildings on the site itself or nearby.

Significantly, the site is within the Alperton Growth Area, which is designated within the Core Strategy as one of the areas within the borough where the majority of the planned growth is expected to occur. It is part of site allocation A.7 (Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue). In July 2015 Alperton was designated as a Housing Zone by the Mayor of London. It is also shown on the Council's Geographical Information System (GIS) as being Waterside Development which is a buffered area around the Grand Union Canal.

Finally, the entire borough is designated as an Air Quality Management Area.

AMENDMENTS SINCE SUBMISSION

There was an amendment made to the submitted plans in order to resolve the issue of how the refuse would be collected. The initial attempt to resolve this issue was to remove the shared surface area previously shown on the footway of Mount Pleasant, however, this proposal still retained the temporary collection day bin storage alongside the entrance to the basement car park and failed to provide any means by which refuse vehicles could turn around within the site. This was contrary to Brent's Waste & Recycling Storage and

Collection Guidance which expresses a preference that collection vehicles should not be required to reverse. Another option put forward by the applicant to resolve this issue was to have the refuse vehicle move around the building on a shared surface. This option was not supported as the proposal would create safety concerns as the tracking is very tight at certain points, and the area was meant to be exclusively for pedestrians. There were also concerns of whether the canal would take the weight of a heavy refuse truck and what would happen if the refuse truck came across pedestrians.

The final resolution through these amendments was to address the issue of the headroom at the entrance to the car park by raising the floor to ceiling height. This means that the bin store was repositioned to the front of the buildings and a lift is used to take bins to the upper ground floor on collection days. This solution resulted in the loss of one 2b4p unit. This proposed solution was accepted.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key issues for consideration are as follows:

- **Representations Received:** A total of 5 objections have been received principally raising concerns regarding land use, scale & design of the proposal, the impact on neighbours and local infrastructure.
- **Land use:** –The loss of the existing uses on site is considered alongside the promotion of the site as a residential-led mixed led development within the Housing Zone.
- **Design:** – The height of the building would be taller than those immediately around it, but the Alpertown Masterplan considers the area appropriate for high density flatted developments. The proposal is considered to be high quality design.
- **Housing density:** –The density is high and the site has a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) at the moment.
- **Quality of the resulting residential accommodation:** – The residential accommodation proposed is of sufficiently high quality. The mix of units is broadly in accordance with the standards within the Alpertown Masterplan, and the flats would have good outlook. There is a reasonable amount of amenity space.
- **Affordable housing:** –The viability has been tested and it has been demonstrated that the proposal is providing the maximum reasonable amount that can be provided on site.
- **Neighbouring amenity:** – The impact on neighbours is considered relatively minor, and some conditions are suggested would ensure that there is no detrimental impact.
- **Highways and transportation:** –The alterations to the public highway would be acceptable, considering the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Following amendments servicing and deliveries could take place without detriment to the highway and have an acceptable impact on traffic in the area.
- **Trees, landscaping and public realm:** – One tree is proposed to be removed but additional trees would be provided as part of a wider landscaping along the canal and along the access from Mount Pleasant. The canalside walk and open space created are strongly supported.
- **Environmental impact, sustainability and energy:** –The measures outlined by the applicant are considered to maximise the carbon savings. There are also other measures proposed., and these are supported

MONITORING

The table(s) below indicate the existing and proposed uses at the site and their respective floorspace and a breakdown of any dwellings proposed at the site.

Floorspace Breakdown

Primary Use	Existing	Retained	Lost	New	Net Gain (sqm)
Assembly and leisure	0		0	0	
Businesses / research and development	0		0	0	
Businesses and light industry	0		0	0	
Businesses and offices	0		0	0	
Drinking establishments (2004)	0		0	0	
Financial and professional services	0		0	0	
General industrial	0		0	0	
Hot food take away (2004)	0		0	0	
Hotels	0		0	0	
Non-residential institutions	0		0	0	
Residential institutions	0		0	0	
Restaurants and cafes	0		0	0	
Shops	0		0	0	

Storage and distribution	0	0	0
--------------------------	---	---	---

Monitoring Residential Breakdown

Description	1Bed	2Bed	3Bed	4Bed	5Bed	6Bed	7Bed	8Bed	Unk	Total
EXISTING (Flats û Market)										
PROPOSED (Flats û Market)	34	80	22							136

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

August 2016: Prior notification for demolition (ref: 16/2901) of Unit 4 and 5, Abbey Wharf, Mount Pleasant, Wembley. No objection was raised

December 2013: Planning application (ref: 13/4046) for planning permission at Unit 2 of Abbey Wharf for “Change of use of vacant premises into a community hall (Use class D1)”. This was withdrawn by the Council due to the applicant not providing all of the information required to determine the application.

CONSULTATIONS

Consultation with neighbours

A press notice advertising the proposal was published on 10 November 2016, and a site notice was displayed on 4 November 2016. In addition, letters were sent to 156 neighbouring properties on 12 December 2016.

Following this, 5 representations have been received, from the Delta Centre (on the site) and the Liberty Centre (to the east) and they raised the following issues:

Objection	Paragraph discussed in / response
Land use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some support for the regeneration. Concern that existing businesses would be forced to move, impacting on the existing staff. Long established businesses would be at risk of closure. It has been queried who would assist the businesses to move. Similar properties are hard to find in Brent at a similar rent. Concern about the demise of local enterprise in Brent. The Council has a duty to look after small businesses and encourage entrepreneurs in keeping with what the government and Mayor of London are doing. There is a need for commercial floorspace as well as residential. 	See paragraphs 6 - 13.
Design, conservation and heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height of the buildings is out of character with the area, and concern that the large buildings along Ealing Road will be continued along this section of the canal. 	See paragraphs 14 - 20.
Neighbouring amenity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The eastern elevation of the proposed buildings have windows and balconies facing the Liberty Centre. Given that there is potential for a future redevelopment of the Liberty Centre assurance is sought that the proposed buildings will be at least the required distance away from the boundary, so as not to prejudice long term development. Concern that the proposed flats will encroach on the amenity of existing properties on Mount Pleasant and Carlyon Road, resulting in overlooking, loss of privacy, reduction in light to houses and gardens. This could be addressed by proposing something more similar in scale to the existing 1930s houses. 	See paragraphs 36 - 47.
Other matters <i>Document Imaged</i>	See paragraphs 107

- | | |
|--|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the level of infrastructure does not exist in the area to support the level of development (for example, schools, doctors surgeries). | - 109. |
|--|--------|

Internal consultations

Councillors for Alperton Ward were also consulted. No responses received.

The following consultees were consulted, and made comments as detailed:

- Environmental Health - Following queries there are no objections raised. Conditions are suggested to cover issues including noise, construction impacts, air quality, contaminated land, and odour.
- Local Lead Flood Authority - No response received as yet.

External consultations

The following consultees were consulted, and made comments as detailed:

- Transport for London** - Support for the restriction the ability of residents to be able to obtain on-street car parking permits, a road safety audit, provision of electric vehicle charging points, the level of cycle parking proposed. A request is made to secure a full Delivery and Servicing Plan, a residential travel plan, a Construction Management Plan and a Construction Logistics Plan via condition.
- Thames Water** - No objections, but request for a condition requiring a piling method statement to be submitted, including measures to prevent and minimise potential damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with Thames Water.
- Canal and River Trust** - Support for the improved access to the canalside, the setback from the water's edge and the canal focussed 'pocket park'. Some concern about the blank wall to the park with a large expanse of ventilation grille, which could impact on its usage and become a focus for anti-social behaviour. Also concern about the access to the waterfront via a side street seeming to be compromised by a lack of active frontage. Further details requested relating to drainage from the car park to the canal, and on sustainable urban drainage. Measures to ensure that contaminated water does not enter the canal, and comments on landscaping and lighting to ensure that it is appropriate alongside the canal. A condition is requested requiring a Construction and Environmental Management Plan.
- The Environment Agency** - No comments as there are no constraints on the site.
- Historic England (Archaeology)** - The site is not within an archaeological priority area, and there is low archaeological potential.
- Natural England** - Advised that they do not wish to make comments on the application, on the basis that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites. Also, noted is it that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether the proposal is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment.

Community groups

- Alperton Riverside Forum - No response received.
- Alperton Area Friends - No response received.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following planning policy documents and guidance are considered to be of relevance to the determination of the current application:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- Technical Housing Standards 2015
- London Plan Consolidated with amendments since 2011 (March 2016)
 - Policy 1.1 - Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
 - Policy 2.6 - Outer London: vision and strategy
 - Policy 2.7 - Outer London: economy
 - Policy 2.8 - Outer London: transport
 - Policy 3.1 - Ensuring equal life chances for all
 - Policy 3.2 - Improving health and addressing health inequalities

- Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
- Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 3.6 - Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
- Policy 3.7 - Large residential developments
- Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
- Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 3.10 - Definition of affordable housing
- Policy 3.11 - Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
- Policy 3.13 - Affordable housing thresholds
- Policy 3.15 - Co-ordination of housing development and investment
- Policy 3.16 - Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
- Policy 3.17 - Health and social care facilities
- Policy 3.18 - Education facilities
- Policy 4.1 - Developing London's economy
- Policy 4.2 - Offices
- Policy 4.3 - Mixed use development and offices
- Policy 4.10 - New and emerging economic sectors
- Policy 4.11 - Encouraging a connected economy
- Policy 4.12 - Improving opportunities for all
- Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.5 - Decentralised energy networks
- Policy 5.6 - Decentralised energy in development proposals
- Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy
- Policy 5.9 - Overheating and cooling
- Policy 5.10 - Urban greening
- Policy 5.11 - Green roofs and development site environs
- Policy 5.13 - Sustainable drainage
- Policy 5.14 - Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
- Policy 5.15 - Water use and supplies
- Policy 5.17 - Waste capacity
- Policy 5.18 - Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- Policy 5.21 - Contaminated land
- Policy 6.1 - Strategic approach
- Policy 6.2 - Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport
- Policy 6.3 - Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- Policy 6.4 - Enhancing London's transport connectivity
- Policy 6.7 - Better streets and surface transport
- Policy 6.9 - Cycling
- Policy 6.10 - Walking
- Policy 6.11 - Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- Policy 6.12 - Road network capacity
- Policy 6.13 - Parking
- Policy 7.1 - Lifetime neighbourhoods
- Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime
- Policy 7.4 - Local character
- Policy 7.5 - Public realm
- Policy 7.6 - Architecture
- Policy 7.7 - Location and design of tall and large buildings
- Policy 7.14 - Improving air quality
- Policy 7.15 - Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- Policy 7.19 - Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy 7.21 - Trees and woodlands

- Policy 7.30 - London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces
- Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations
- Policy 8.3 - Community infrastructure levy
- Policy 8.4 - Monitoring and review
- Mayors Housing SPG 2016
- London Borough of Brent Core Strategy 2010
 - CP 1 - Spatial Development Strategy
 - CP 2 - Population and Housing Growth
 - CP 3 - Commercial Regeneration
 - CP 5 - Placemaking
 - CP 6 - Design & Density in Place Shaping
 - CP 8 - Alperton Growth Area
 - CP 14 - Public Transport Improvements
 - CP 15 - Infrastructure to Support Development
 - CP 17 - Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent
 - CP 18 - Protection and Enhancement of Open Space, Sports and Biodiversity
 - CP 19 - Brent Strategic Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Measures
 - CP 21 - A Balanced Housing Stock
 - CP 23 - Protection of existing and provision of new Community and Cultural Facilities
- London Borough of Brent Development Management Policies 2016
 - DMP 1 Development Management General Policy
 - DMP 6 Visitor Accommodation and Attractions
 - DMP 7 Brent's Heritage Assets
 - DMP 8 Open Space
 - DMP 9 Waterside Development
 - DMP9A Managing Flood Risk
 - DMP 11 Forming an Access on to a Road
 - DMP 12 Parking
 - DMP 13 Movement of Goods and Materials
 - DMP 14 Employment Sites
 - DMP 15 Affordable Housing
 - DMP 18 Dwelling Size and Residential Outbuildings
 - DMP 19 Residential Amenity Space
- London Borough of Brent Site Specific Allocations 2011
 - A.7. Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue
- Brent Supplementary Planning Guidance 17:- Design Guide For New Development
- Brent's 106 Supplementary Planning Document
- Brent's Supplementary Planning Guidance 13 - Roads - Layout standards for access roads
- Brent Waste planning guide

Alperton Masterplan 2012

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Land use

1. Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy promotes the Alperton Growth Area as mixed use regeneration along the Grand Union Canal. It seeks a compact and sustainable waterside community, and an enterprise hub with modern light industrial units, studios and managed workspaces. Across the entire area a minimum of 1,600 new homes are to be promoted between 2010 and 2026.

2. The site is allocated within the Site Specific Allocations (SSA), which was adopted in 2011. It is listed as Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue. The allocation is described in the document as:

Mixed use development including residential, work/live, managed affordable workspace and amenity/open space. Proposals should seek to introduce active frontages along Mount Pleasant as well as improve canal side access for pedestrians, with moorings for canal users as well as conserve and enhance the canal's Site of Metropolitan Nature Conservation Importance designation. Access to remaining industrial area to the west will be improved. Improvements will be sought to public transport as part of any proposal to develop the site.

3. The indicative capacity is listed as 100 units, and it was expected that it may come forward for development in 2017-18. The justification for this is stated within the document:

This industrial area is becoming increasingly marginalised with ageing buildings, poor pedestrian and vehicular access and vacant and derelict units. The canal side location raises the possibility of introducing higher value uses to improve the local environment and the development of new workspace.

4. This is a significant material consideration.

5. The proposal would result in 247sqm of commercial floorspace in place of the existing 5,007sqm, so representing a loss of 4,760sqm. The residential would be 12,510.1sqm in area.

Loss of existing employment floorspace

6. Policy DMP14 of the Development Management Policies concerns employment sites. It advises that Local Employment Sites will be released to non-employment uses where a continued wholly employment use is unviable or there are significant benefits consistent with the wider objectives of the Development Plan. Where non-employment uses are proposed the maximum amount of existing floorspace type or Managed Affordable Workspace shall be incorporated. The site allocation is significant, and it clearly indicates that the future of this site is envisaged to be as a mixed use site with residential and commercial uses. Objections raised concern about the loss of existing businesses, some of which are longstanding. The justification for the site allocation cited above is relevant, although it does need to be acknowledged that the buildings have not become so outdated that vacancy has developed into a real issue on this part of the site allocation, but this is likely to become more acute over time. Poor pedestrian and vehicular access is an issue currently. This, coupled with the stated vision for the site allocation suggests that it is not possible to protect the uses in their current form. The more recent designation of Alpertown as a Housing Zone (by the GLA) adds further weight to the push for housing on this and other nearby sites. The existing businesses on site are not compatible with residential uses, hence why the proposal is for different commercial uses than are currently on site, particularly given the size of this site. The question then is whether or not the proposed uses are acceptable, and this is discussed below.

7. The proposal would include two units which would face onto Mount Pleasant, and collectively they would measure 247sqm, with one of the units being slightly larger than the other. They are shown as being separated by a residential entrance and lobby so could not be combined, but they could be subdivided if required. These units are proposed to be used for purposes within Use Classes A1 to A3, B1, D1 and/or D2.

Office/light industrial uses

8. Referring back to the site allocation it is clear that office space (B1) is envisaged to form part of the redevelopment. There is no objection to provision of B1 floorspace, as there is generic support for additional employment generating floorspace within policy 4.3 of the London Plan and CP3 of the Core Strategy, and the site allocation specifically refers to managed affordable workspace, which the applicant has referred to this being provided at affordable rent. This has been factored into the wider viability assessment, and the proposal is for this to be secured via the Section 106 agreement. As such, while a suite of potential uses is proposed and the general principle of those other uses discussed in this report, it is considered that the provision of these two units as Affordable Workspace at rates significantly discounted from market rents, is essential to mitigate the loss of employment floorspace within the site. As such, the provision of these two units as Affordable Workspace is recommended to be secured through the Section 106 agreement.

Retail and other 'A' class uses

9. Notwithstanding the comments made in paragraph 8, the general principle of Use Class A1 to A3 floorspace has been considered. Policy 2.15 of the London Plan considers town centres to be the main focus for commercial development beyond the Central Activity Zone. Policy CP16 seeks to focus major new retail

and other town centre uses within centres before out of centre sites are considered. 'A' class uses are considered to be town centre uses, and so there is no desire for them to be provided outside of town centres to a significant extent. This site is not within a town centre and Ealing Road is the nearest. The text accompanying the site allocation refers to mixed uses, and although it does not specifically refer to 'A' class uses, there is logic to such uses being provided as part of a residential led development. It therefore needs to be considered how much floorspace would be acceptable, before the impact on the town centre becomes unacceptable.

10. Policy DMP2 requires that a Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) is submitted for proposals involving 500sqm or more of gross retail floorspace, so implying that less than this would usually have an acceptable impact (although it cannot be concluded that this would always be the case). Reference to the immediate vicinity indicates that there is relatively little provision nearby currently: there is an A3 use just to the north west, and an A1 use to the east. However, there is not so much to consider that an additional 247sqm would impact unacceptably on Ealing Road town centre, which is a few minutes walk away. Within the broad heading of 'A' class uses, the applicant has proposed a flexible use of A1, A2, and A3. All of these could sit alongside the proposed residential units, and the surrounding context of existing residential and commercial.

'D' class uses

11. Notwithstanding the comments made in paragraph 8, the general principle of Use Class D1 and D2 floorspace has been considered. The other uses proposed are described under the broad heading of non-residential institutions and assembly and leisure. The former includes clinics, health centres, day nurseries, schools, places of worships, and museums. The latter includes cinemas, gymnasiums, and indoor sports. Many of these uses are unrealistic given the size of the units and the floor to ceiling height, but many could occur and would be positive. For example, CP8 describes some of the infrastructure sought in the growth area, and this includes nursery facilities, health facilities, and a multi-use community centre, and these units would be small but could accommodate these uses. Some of the others, however, could create nuisance to nearby residential uses. For example, places of worship (even small ones) can create traffic and noise, and conditions are suggested to restrict the units being used for some of these disruptive uses. With this condition the remaining uses which fall within D1 and D2 are considered acceptable.

Residential

12. Finally, policy CP2 of the Core Strategy seeks to increase the supply of housing, and Alperton is expected to make a significant contribution to this. The site allocation anticipates 100 units as the capacity. This is only one part of the allocation, and is exceeding this in its own right. Although the specifics of the design, the quality of the accommodation, and the impact on neighbours is discussed below, the principle of increasing this number is considered acceptable. The designation of the Alperton Housing Zone suggests a greater emphasis on housing than was the case when the site allocation was originally designated. Therefore, this is considered acceptable and would contribute to meeting the housing needs of the borough.

Land Use conclusion

13. It is considered that the mix of uses proposed for the site are acceptable. Whilst there is a loss of commercial floorspace, the rationale for having a residential led mixed use development is supported through the Site Specific Allocations for Alperton and the Housing Zone designation by the GLA as the industrial area has become increasingly marginalised with ageing buildings, poor pedestrian and vehicular access and vacant and derelict units. The canal side location also assists in the introduction of higher value uses to improve the local environment and the development of new workspace. The proposed 247sqm of commercial space (A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 and D2) is considered acceptable. In regards to retail, it is of a scale which will not affect Ealing Road town centre but will help to activate the frontage of the development. If there is provision of B1 floorspace then this would be provided at affordable rent. D1 and D2 uses could occur and be positive, with a restrictive condition.

Design, conservation and heritage

14. Design is an important consideration, and buildings need to be high quality. This is promoted by policy 7.6 of the London Plan, CP6, CP8 of the Core Strategy and DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies. The applicant has provided a Design and Access Statement in support of the proposal. The site is not within a conservation area and does not contain listed buildings, and there are none nearby which would be impacted on by the proposal. The existing buildings on site are not considered of any great merit and their demolition is supported.

15. The layout is essentially two long blocks with a shorter block connecting them at the front of the site. This particular arrangement is considered to optimise the amount of development on the site. It has been considered if an alternative arrangement could be used instead, but the proposal does respond to the size and shape of the site (and this needs to be read alongside comments below on the Quality of the resulting residential accommodation). It allows for space on the east and west side of the site which allows for vehicular and pedestrian access. There would be a car parking ramp leading down to the lower ground floor car parking to the west. To the east would be a road, with a wide landscaped pavement leading to the canal and the pocket park which is proposed in front of the site. Some concern has been raised by the Canals and River Trust about this access for pedestrian and the lack of surveillance. The northern part of the access would have residential units at upper ground level opening out on to it, but the sloping gradient means that the grilles of the car parking would face the southern part. However, there would be flats on the upper floors which would look on to this space, so the relationship is considered acceptable. It is not considered feasible to have commercial uses in this location, as they are away from the focus of activity (which is the north and south of the site).

16. It needs to be acknowledged that the intention is for the sites either side to be developed, and it is hoped that this occurs in due course even if there are no specific plans in place currently. One of the comments received is from the Liberty Centre which confirms this intention. In the absence of firm plans the relationship either side appears somewhat odd as it would sit against the existing commercial units. The applicant has set back the development by 10m from either side (as required by SPG17) to ensure that it does not prejudice the development potential of these sites, and if they are developed the highways and public realm should mesh together.

17. A key aspect of the layout is the creation of the pocket park and canalside path. Improving access to the canal for pedestrians is referred to in the site allocation as is the need for amenity/open space. Therefore, this is strongly supported. It would provide an attractive space for people to pass through (when the other sites are developed), or to sit. The relationship of the space to the grilles which serve the car parking is a little unfortunate, but there would be overlooking of the space from the flats above so as to reduce the chances of anti-social behaviour. Details of landscaping could be provided via a condition to minimise the visible impact of the grilles and noise from cars as far as is possible.

18. The building would be most visible from Mount Pleasant in the north, and the canal towpath to the south. From Mount Pleasant it would be 6 storeys in height at its north western corner, before dropping to 4 storeys and increasing to 5 storeys moving east. The eastern elevation would be slightly less visible, but would maintain the 5 storeys, but with the slope down this becomes 6 storeys, before dropping to 4 and then rising again to 6 storeys towards the canal. The southern elevation which faces on to the canal would be 6 storeys, and it is here that the concept of the two blocks is apparent, with the lower ground floor parking linking the two. The western elevation is then 6 storeys adjacent to the canal, dropping to 4 further north and then rising to 6 storeys. The Alperton Masterplan indicates that building heights in this area should mainly be three storeys. The proposal does exceed this, and this has also been raised by an objector. It should be noted that the Alperton Masterplan is planning guidance rather than policy, with planning policy seeking to ensure that development is appropriate for its context. There is a degree of separation between the southern side of Mount Pleasant and the north, resulting in an acceptable relationship between the suburban housing to the north and the new urban developments that is proposed to the south. The proposed scale of development is accordingly considered to be acceptable and appropriate for its context.

19. The applicant has provided details of the materials and the specific design features. There would be a regular pattern of windows and balconies in a grid. The buildings would be split into sections by vertical detailing, which allows for the width of the building to be broken down. The ground floor entrances to the commercial units and residential flats would be legible, and the shopfronts predominantly glazed. Brick is proposed, but with two colours: one slightly lighter than the other. There would also be bronze coloured window panels. The balconies would be bronze metal to match. Brick is the predominant material in the surrounding area and the overall appearance is considered to be high quality.

20. Overall, the building's design and appearance is considered acceptable. It would be taller than the guidance specifically states, but the overall impact would be positive. The materials proposed are considered high quality but specific details would be required by condition.

Quality of the resulting residential accommodation (including housing density and mix)

21. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan seeks high quality residential units. Based on a PTAL of 2, the density matrix within the London Plan suggests that 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare is appropriate on the basis that the site is considered urban. This drops to 15-250 if it is considered suburban. However, the

development would have a density of 518 habitable rooms per hectare, so beyond this. The guide is important but is inevitably very broad and applies across London. It is within walking distance of public transport, and there is potential for this to be improved (see later section on Highways and transportation). The designation of Alperton as a Housing Zone, also implies a high density.

22. The units themselves are considered to be high quality. There would be secure entrances in locations which are overlooked so as to maintain security, and in turn would overlook public areas in a more positive way than the existing buildings do. The number of units per core is no more than 6 across the development, and the units themselves exceed the minimum sizes within the London Plan. They would be logically laid out. The majority of the units are single aspect, but daylight would be received through the generous windows. This arrangement is largely a result of the layout and the depth of the buildings, which results in a central corridor with flats either side. As noted above, it is considered the most appropriate layout for the site to optimise the level of development, and importantly the number of north facing single aspect units has been minimised.

23. An assessment has been provided which assessed the levels of daylight and sunlight that each flat would receive. This is based on Vertical Sky Component (VSC), Average Daylight Factor (ADF), and Daylight Distribution (DD), all of which are acknowledged measures of daylight. In total, 52.9% of the windows would receive an acceptable level of daylight when assessed against VSC. Part of this is due to the presence of balconies which does reduce the light available, and the light at the lower levels is inevitably lower. When ADF and DD are used to test the daylight, the percentage increases to 79.1% and 85.8% respectively. Whilst it is always hoped that this would be 100%, it is recognised that this is not always achievable within urban areas where there are inevitably obstructions. Therefore, overall there is no objection made to the internal daylight.

24. Private balconies are a feature of the development. There are some areas where overlooking between units may be possible, and they are around the internal corners of the site. This is where some units on each floor facing south could potentially see into units facing east and west, and vice versa. At one point the distance between some windows and balconies drops as low as approximately 7.25m. There is a further point where the distance between a balcony and a bedroom window is approximately 9.2m. To address this it is recommended that a condition is imposed to require details of privacy screens to be submitted for approval. On a general note the form of the development, and the width of the site, means that some units which face into the site towards its north are less than 20m from each other (as recommended by SPG17), so implying a level of overlooking. This is approximately 17m at the closest points, and as the two blocks are slightly splayed this steadily increases to exceed the 20m guide. This is considered to be acceptable given the splayed nature of this space, its orientation and the scale of development that is proposed.

25. In addition to the private amenity space, and the new open space adjacent to the canal there would be a substantial communal amenity space between the two blocks, which is welcomed. The London Plan includes guidance on this, which is based on the GLA's requirement for 10sqm for each child. There are no specific details of playspace equipment on the drawings, but this is where it could be provided. The space is large enough to serve a dual purpose of playspace for children and amenity space for everyone. A condition is suggesting seeking further information.

26. The applicant has indicated that the units would accord with Building Regulations requirement M4(2) 'Accessible and adaptable dwellings', and that 10% would meet M4(3), which is designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable. This accords with adopted policy. A condition would be imposed to require that this is done. Comments below on transportation are also relevant to the wheelchair units.

27. The mix of units is:

	NUMBERS				PERCENTAGE			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	Total
Affordable rent	9	7	8	24	38%	29%	33%	100%
Intermediate	3	8	0	11	27%	73%	0%	100%
Private	24	58	18	100	24%	58%	18%	100%

TOTAL	36	73	26	135	27%	54%	19%	100%

28. 19% of the units would be family sized, with the others being 1 and 2 bedrooms. Policy CP2 seeks 25% to be family units (with 3 bedrooms or more). The Alpertown Masterplan contains a different mix.

	PERCENTAGE			
	1	2	3	Total
Affordable rent	15%	45%	40%	100%
Intermediate	45%	45%	10%	100%
Private	45%	45%	10%	100%

29. This only seeks 10% of intermediate units and family sized units as family sized, with 40% for affordable rent. The mix is closer to this than the borough wide target. It is clearly not identical, but there is recognition that this is a dense development and so lends itself more to smaller units. Therefore, this is considered acceptable.

30. The applicant has provided a noise impact assessment, which has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. This included measurements of the existing background noise levels as a baseline on which to assess the suitability of the site for residential usage. Noise from road traffic and commercial operations are a factor, and the proposal would introduce new commercial uses which would generate noise. In particular, break-out noise from the commercial units needs to be considered, and there is inevitably plant and machinery required for commercial units. Mitigation measures focus on the separating floor between the car parking, commercial units and residential units. The Environmental Health Officer has endorsed the methodology used, but has suggested conditions to ensure that the internal noise environment is appropriate. These conditions would ensure that the mitigation is included within the final design of the building (including sound insulation), and that noise restrictions are placed on the plant and machinery.

31. In addition to noise, ventilation and extraction equipment can also result in odour. With potential for an A3 use or certain A1 uses this needs to be considered. To address this, a condition could be imposed to require further details in the event that there are commercial kitchens. This is a usual approach, and has been agreed with the Environmental Health Officer.

32. A separate assessment into air quality has been submitted, reflecting that the site is within an Air Quality Management Area. There is potential exposure from traffic and from commercial uses nearby. The existing residential units to the north do not generate poor air quality. The Environmental Health Officer has endorsed the approach, and there are no specific mitigation measures required. However, a condition is proposed to require that an Air Quality Neutral Assessment is undertaken and submitted for approval.

33. Overall, the quality of the accommodation is considered to be high. The units would be well laid out with good outlook, although there would be some areas where overlooking could occur they are mitigated by conditions and are not considered to be sufficiently bad as to result in an objection. Additional conditions are also suggested seeking further details.

Affordable housing, tenure and viability assessment

34. London Plan Policy 3.12 requires boroughs seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on private and mixed use developments, having regard to a number of factors, including development viability. Policy CP2 of Brent's Core Strategy sets a strategic target that 50% of new homes delivered in the borough should be affordable. Brent's DMP15 reinforces the 50% target set by policy CP2 and the need to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. It also notes that 70% of new affordable housing provision should be social/affordable rented housing and 30% should be intermediate housing in order to meet local housing needs in Brent. London Plan Policy 3.11 sets a ratio of 60% social/affordable rented housing and 40% intermediate housing for new affordable housing across London.

35. The applicant submitted a Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) to support this application. The Council appointed consultants to independently assess this FVA. The Council has evaluated the appraisal in order to ensure that the proposed affordable housing represents the maximum reasonable amount. The applicant initially concluded that the scheme could not provide any Affordable Housing. However, following the assessment process, it was concluded that the scheme could viably provided 26 % Affordable Housing,

assuming that Affordable Housing grant is available. Given the location of the site within a Housing Zone, grant is likely to be available. The applicant subsequently submitted revised Affordable Housing proposals, proposing 26 % Affordable Housing (by unit) with a 68.6 : 31.4 ratio of Affordable rent to intermediate shared ownership. The Affordable Housing proposals therefore represent the provision of the maximum reasonable proportion of Affordable Housing, with a tenure split that reflects the Council's adopted policies. Nevertheless, relatively small changes in the key parameters can have a significant impact on scheme viability and the level of Affordable Housing that the scheme can deliver, particularly in an area where significant change is envisaged through the consent and build-out period. A post-implementation review of the financial viability of the scheme is accordingly considered to be necessary. The Affordable Housing proposals are considered to be acceptable

Neighbouring amenity

36. The impact on neighbours is also a significant consideration, and policy DMP1 seeks to ensure that this is acceptable. The buildings to the east and west are currently commercial and so are not as sensitive to noise as residential uses, the nearest of which are opposite on the northern side of Mount Pleasant and on the southern side of the canal.

37. As noted above the applicant has submitted information relating to daylight and sunlight. This identifies a number of residential properties which were included in the assessment. They are on Mount Pleasant, Belmont Avenue, Stanley Park Drive, Beresford Avenue and Carlyon Road. All windows were assessed in terms of daylight. For sunlight, only those which face the site and are within 90 degrees of due south are considered.

38. The impact on daylight to existing properties is different to levels proposed within the development itself, as they are already inhabited. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) is a measure of daylight. The criteria to consider are whether the resulting levels of daylight are less than 27%, and if not then does the level remain above 80% of the existing level. The results show that there would not be an unduly detrimental impact on the daylight received by the 81 windows which are within a reasonable distance of the site, and which has been tested.

39. Sunlight is expressed as a percentage of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). Similarly to daylight, the assessment shows that all windows would pass the relevant tests, and so there would not be a material reduction in the amount of sunlight received by neighbouring units.

40. Overshadowing concerns existing amenity spaces, and involves calculating the effects of these spaces being in permanent shadow on 21 March (the spring equinox), when at least half of the space should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight. There are no existing areas of open space or amenity space which are close enough to be overshadowed, and the new pocket park would be to the south of the buildings proposed. The internal courtyard is more susceptible to shade, as it is flanked by the blocks on either side. The single storey element between the two would allow sunlight to reach the site. Overall, 96% of the courtyard would pass the test, which is considered acceptable.

41. As discussed above, issues relating to privacy and overlooking can occur where windows or amenity areas are introduced within 20m of existing windows to habitable rooms. The nearest residential units are on Mount Pleasant. Opposite, the distance to the nearest is in excess of 20m and separated by a public highway. To the west the residential units are at an angle approaching 90 degrees to the site itself, and so the windows themselves would not face each other.

42. Vibration is unlikely to occur from the completed development, even for a use such as gymnasium. It is possible that vehicles making deliveries could cause some vibration, but this would be limited and localised to the site itself. It is also unlikely to be frequent enough as to cause prolonged nuisance. There is potential for vibration during the construction period. Some of this is inevitable, and by definition would be temporary. However, the requirement for a Construction Management Plan would ensure that this is managed as much as is possible.

43. The impact on air quality has been considered above in terms of future occupants. Existing nearby occupants are not expected to be impacted on in a significant way by the proposal, which would not have inherently detrimental impacts on air quality in the way an industrial use may have. There is potential for an improvement over and above the current situation. Nevertheless it is suggested that a condition is imposed to ensure that the development is air quality neutral.

44. Obtrusive light can be a problem. The commercial units would be well lit, but the level of light spill is likely

to be negligible. Lighting along the canal would need to be appropriate, and a condition would be imposed seeking further details. This is based on the impact on neighbours and the canal. The Canal and River Trust are keen to ensure that there is no light spill from the development will affect the water.

45. There is an overlap between the comments above on noise and odour as it could affect both future occupiers of the development and neighbouring properties. The condition requiring details of ventilation and extraction equipment proposed within the development would assist surrounding properties as well as future residents. The same is true of the condition suggested to require that plant and equipment proposed does not exceed certain noise levels. Residential uses are generally more susceptible to noise than generating it.

46. The building is not so tall that any issues of microclimate are expected. Tall buildings can create canyon effects with increased wind. However, this proposal is only 6 storeys at its highest point and it relatively open to both the front and rear.

47. Security is an issue which can affect neighbours and visitors to the area. Comments above on natural surveillance are relevant. There would be a significant number of windows facing out from the site as to discourage anti-social behaviour. There is no guarantee that there will be no instances, but the proposal is likely to improve the situation when compared to now, with flats occupied throughout the day and night as opposed to the commercial units.

Highways and Transportation

48. Car parking allowances for the existing and proposed uses on the site are set out in Appendix 1 of the adopted DMP 2016, with servicing requirements set out in Appendix 2. As the site does not have good access to public transport services and is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone, the higher residential allowances apply.

49. The existing warehouses and industrial units would therefore be permitted about 25 car parking spaces. No formal marked spaces are provided within the sites at present, but the existing roads and concrete aprons around the buildings would be capable of accommodating up to about 40-50 cars, which exceeds allowances. The warehouses also require servicing by full-size lorries, but the tightness of the roads and service yards around the site means servicing requirements would be difficult to fully accommodate.

50. The parking allowance for the 136 proposed flats totals 146 spaces, whilst up to about five spaces would be allowed for the two commercial units, depending on their precise use. The proposed provision of 82 spaces within the proposed basement car park would therefore accord with maximum standards.

51. The provision of eight wide bays designated for use by Blue Badge holders (10% of the total) meets the requirements of the DMP. The headroom provides suitable clearance for high-top conversion vehicles for wheelchairs.

52. The layout of the basement car park meets standards in terms of dimensions and the inclusion of 34 electric vehicle charging points (17 active & 17 passive) meets London Plan requirements for 40% of spaces to have charging facilities.

53. The proposed 6.3m width of the driveway to the car park (narrowing to 4.8m as it enters the building) will allow two-way flow and is fine, whilst the gradient (8.2%) is also within acceptable limits. Key-fob controlled gates to the driveway are also shown set 5m from the highway boundary, allowing cars to sit clear of Mount Pleasant whilst they are opened and closed.

54. Policy DMP12 also requires that any overspill parking generated on the highway can be safely accommodated though, so that it does not harm existing on-street parking conditions in the area. As a proxy, it is generally assumed that residential demand will average 75% of the maximum parking allowance, which would translate to demand for 111 spaces and result in a potential overspill of 28 cars from the site.

55. However, the basement access driveway and the road on the western side of the site together offer potential for 24 cars to park parallel to the building clear of the public highway and there is also potential scope for five further cars to park along the Mount Pleasant frontage of the site once the crossovers to the site are reinstated to footway (which will need to be done at the developer's expense as part of any S278 works). As such, it is considered that potential overspill parking can be safely accommodated around the site without compromising highway safety, particularly as car ownership data from the 2011 Census suggests that car ownership for flats in this area averages little more than 0.5 cars per flat.

56. Nevertheless, to help to mitigate any future parking problems that may arise, funding towards the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone should be sought, to include subsidising the cost of parking permits in the area for existing local residents. This will need to be secured through a S106 Agreement rather than the CIL and to be consistent with other developments in the area, a sum of £500 per flat (total £68,000) is sought. A condition removing the right of future residents of this development to parking permits should the CPZ be introduced is also sought to limit the potential for overspill parking.

57. The London Plan requires the provision of a secure long-term bicycle parking space for every 1-bed flat and two spaces for all larger flats. The five proposed storage rooms around the edge of the car park have capacity for 238 bicycles, which provides sufficient parking in a secure and sheltered location close to the various entrance cores for the flats.

58. For short term bicycle parking, four spaces are required for the flats and up to 12 spaces for the commercial units, depending on their exact use. The proposed provision of eight 'Sheffield' stands (16 spaces) on the newly landscaped footway will satisfy requirements.

59. Bin storage areas are proposed alongside each entrance core to the building, allowing residents easy access to refuse and recycling bins. A large temporary communal bin storage area for 34 Eurobins and 15 wheeled bins is also proposed on the eastern side of the site, adjoining the driveway to the basement car park, with the site management company moving bins to and from the temporary store on collection days.

60. The initially proposed intention for refuse vehicles to reverse about 30m along the car park access from Mount Pleasant to reach the refuse store was considered unacceptable. Reversing into the site from Mount Pleasant is not considered to be safe and is contrary to Brent's Waste & Recycling Storage Guidelines, which state that reversing of refuse vehicles should be avoided for safety reasons, particularly as vehicles will back into the site from a busy distributor road.

61. Amended refuse collection arrangements were received, with refuse vehicles proposed to stop within a new servicing, adjacent to the highway. At a distance of 13 m, it is marginally over the 10 m distance to the refuse store referred to with waste planning guidance. However, this is considered to be acceptable. As the servicing bay will be on land that is currently used as footway, additional land will need to be provided to the rear of the servicing bay as adopted highway to re-provide the footway along Mount Pleasant.

62. Servicing for the commercial and residential units can also be undertaken from this new bay.

63. Otherwise, a Delivery & Servicing Management Plan is proposed for the development, which will include measures such as pre-booking of deliveries to the retail units to avoid peak hours, use of local suppliers where possible and operation of a goods holding facility for the residential flats. Surveys will then be undertaken annually for the first three years from occupation to review the success of the Plan and update it where necessary.

64. The use of such a plan to pro-actively manage deliveries to the site is welcomed, but can only be of limited use for a residential scheme where the majority of deliveries cannot be pre-booked. It is not therefore sufficient to mitigate the servicing problems identified above.

65. Fire access is generally required around 50% of the building perimeter and whilst this is available, reversing is required to access the eastern and western sides of the building. Two dry risers are proposed on the western side of the building though to assist with tackling a fire though and this is fine.

66. The proposed location of the new access onto Mount Pleasant is acceptable, with its position on the outside of a bend providing suitable sightlines for both vehicles and pedestrians. Indeed, the reduction in the number of access points from Mount Pleasant is welcomed in highway safety terms.

67. It is recommended that an entry table with tactile paving be incorporated into the design of the access though, whilst the cost of removing the three existing crossovers that will become redundant and reinstating them to footway with full height kerbs will need to be met by the developer.

68. It is also proposed to widen and re-landscape the Mount Pleasant footway along the site frontage and it is recommended that the widened area of footway be offered for adoption as publicly maintainable highway under an agreement under S38 of the Highways Act 1980, with the works in the existing highway undertaken through S278 of this Act.

69. Pedestrian access to the main building is provided directly from Beresford Avenue, with steps up to an

internal courtyard area from which access to other residential cores is provided. Further pedestrian access to the rear flats is proposed from via a new footpath alongside the private access road on the western side of the building and from the proposed canalside path.

70. The provision of these paths, allowing connection through to a future footpath along the northern bank of the Grand Union Canal is welcomed and should be secured for future public use as a condition of any approval.

71. The size of the proposal is such that it should be supported by a Transport Assessment.

72. The assessment has considered likely future trips to and from the site, based on comparisons with surveys of journeys to and from six other blocks of flats in inner and outer London with low to moderate access to public transport services and varying levels of off-street parking.

73. The sites chosen were from the discontinued TRAVL database though, so are all quite old (1999-2012). Nevertheless, a comparison by Brent's officers with more recent survey sites from the TRICS database showed lower trip rates and on this basis, the data used is considered to be robust.

74. The TA therefore estimates future peak hour trips to and from the site of 13 arrivals/73 departures in the morning peak (8-9am) and 46 arrivals/28 departures in the evening peak (5-6pm).

75. There may also be further trips associated with the two proposed retail units, but being of a small scale, these have been assumed to serve the local population only with most journeys by foot or by people passing the site anyway on their way elsewhere and this is accepted.

76. Modal share figures from the 2011 Census for Brent were then applied to these trips, based on 27.5% of those residents in employment travelling as car drivers. On this basis, peak hour vehicular trips to and from the site are estimated at 4 arrivals/22 departures in the morning peak hour and 14 arrivals/8 departures in the evening peak hour (5-6pm).

77. These vehicular flows have then been added to existing traffic flows along Mount Pleasant, using the assumption that two-thirds of trips will be to and from the east (i.e. North Circular Road). This exercise results in predicted increases in peak hour traffic flow along Mount Pleasant of less than 3%, which is not considered to be significant enough to warrant any further examination of highway or junction capacity in the area.

78. In terms of public transport impact, the development is estimated to add 29 additional passengers to morning Underground services and 28 to evening Underground services, the majority of whom are likely to use the Piccadilly line from Alperton station (although some may use alternative lines at Stonebridge Park and Hangar Lane).

79. Data for existing passenger flows through Alperton station has been obtained from TfL and comparing figures suggests that even if all passengers from this development use Alperton station, flows through the station would increase by only 2.7% in each peak hour, with less than two additional passengers per train on average. This increase is not considered to be significant, particularly since planned upgrades by TfL to the Piccadilly line will increase capacity by 60% by 2026.

80. Bus journeys to and from the site are estimated at 15 trips in the morning peak hour and 13 trips in the evening peak hour. Only one bus route (no. 224) currently serves the site at a frequency of four buses per hour in each direction, so no more than two additional passengers per bus would be expected on average. This is again not considered significant enough to warrant further analysis. Bus route extensions (e.g. routes 83 and 440) to serve future further redevelopment in this area have been proposed as the Alperton Masterplan is developed and built-out, but the scale of this development is not sufficient by itself to warrant any such route extensions at this time. However, the nearby bus stops would benefit from upgrades such as shelters for the stops to the west and real-time countdown information for the stops to the east.

81. A total of 55 walking trips are estimated to be generated in the morning peak hour and 49 in the evening peak hour, whilst peak hour cycling trips are estimated at five trips in the morning and three in the evening. There are again proposals to improve walking and cycling links through the area as the Masterplan is developed and individual sites come forward. This particular development will play its part in that respect by providing a canalside path and link from Mount Pleasant, with future developments aiming to improve pedestrian and cyclist links to Alperton station.

82. The road accident history for the area was examined for the wider area between Ealing Road and North

Circular Road (service road) for the three year period January 2013 - December 2015. Although a large number of accidents were recorded on Ealing Road and North Circular Road service road, only seven personal injury accidents were recorded within about 250 metres of the site, of which one resulted in serious injury and one involved a pedestrian. These accidents were spread around the area and there were therefore no common factors between them, although parked cars were involved in three of these accidents, indicating the relatively high levels of on-street parking in the area. However, there are no particular problems identified that would be likely to be worsened by this proposed development, with no accidents recorded along the site frontage.

83. In conclusion, the transport impact of the proposal on all modes of transport is considered acceptable, with a number of improvements to sustainable transport proposed in the area to support regeneration.

84. To help to deliver a sustainable development, a draft Residential Travel Plan has been incorporated into the Transport Assessment, setting out an outline structure of content from which a full Travel Plan can be developed that will satisfy an assessment using TfL's ATTrBuTE programme.

85. The objective will be to promote alternative modes of transport to the car and ensure more efficient use of vehicles, with the aim of reducing car trips to and from the site by 10% below the predicted baseline set out in the Transport Assessment within five years of occupation. This target will be reviewed once an initial survey of trips has been undertaken, within six months of 75% of the flats being occupied.

86. The Travel Plan will be managed by a Travel Plan Co-ordinator employed by the Site Management Company. This person will provide travel information and promotional material to residents through Welcome Packs and a Residents' Forum and ensure that all residents are notified of the car-free agreement.

87. The outline Travel Plan measures are a little flimsy at present and will need to be developed much further. In particular, promotion of local Car Clubs in the area, including subsidised membership for residents, will be required and dialogue should be held with Car Club operators on the possibility of providing a Car Club vehicle on or near the site, either on completion of the development or at a later date as more development is built out.

88. The success of the plan will be monitored using i-TRACE compliant surveys undertaken three and five years after occupation of the development, in accordance with standard practice.

89. A S106 Agreement is recommended to secure the submission and approval of a full Travel Plan prior to a material start of sufficient quality to score a PASS rating using ATTrBuTE, which will thus need to include confirmed details of adequate funding.

90. Finally, a draft Construction Logistics Plan has been included in the Transport Assessment for the estimated two year construction period for the development, setting out issues that will need to be addressed.

91. The estimated maximum volume of daily deliveries is predicted at 40 and these will be unloaded on-site where possible. No mention is made of pre-booking and this is essential to ensure this volume of daily deliveries can be accommodated at all times on site or in the designated loading bays.

92. Access arrangements onto the site will be considered in more detail through the final CLP and a temporary construction crossover may be required, which will require a licence from Brent's Public Realm Protection team. Banksman will also be required to assist safe access onto the site, particularly if vehicles need to reverse in from Mount Pleasant.

93. Unloading on site may not always be possible, particularly for abnormal loads, so a temporary on-street loading bay may be required and if so, a suitable temporary Traffic Regulation Order will need to be secured through Brent's Highways & Infrastructure service.

94. The site is located close to the North Circular Road, so all deliveries are expected to use that route, reaching the site via either Ealing Road/Mount Pleasant or via Beresford Avenue, which is acceptable.

95. It is not expected that the footway of Mount Pleasant will need to be closed and a gantry will be provided if necessary. This would require a licence from the Public Realm Protection team.

96. No off-street car parking is proposed for staff, although cycle parking will be provided. As the surrounding roads are not within a Controlled Parking Zone, Travel Plan measures should be employed to discourage car use amongst construction workers.

97. In general, the draft CLP is fine and will need to be developed further prior to a material start as a condition of any approval. Overall, with mitigation measures which would be secured through a mixture of conditions and legal agreement the proposal is considered acceptable in transportation terms.

Trees, Landscaping and Public Realm

98. There are no trees on site which are subject to a Tree Protection Order. An assessment of the trees on the site has been provided. There are 3 trees growing on the landscape verges in front of the site. One of them is a willow, which has been damaged. It is proposed to remove this, and there is no objection raised to this. As noted above there is a tangible improvement to the public realm proposed. The frontage would be more attractive than is currently the case, and there would be access from Mount Pleasant to the canal where the walkway and pocket park would be. Until the sites either side are redeveloped then it would be a place to sit, but it would over time become a walkway which would be a real addition to the local area. This site is playing its part in making this a reality, which is all it can do. Details to be provided by conditions would ensure that the space is high quality with attractive hard and soft landscaping, and the section 106 agreement would ensure that it is made available. There would be an overall increase in the number of trees, and green space, which is strongly supported.

Ecology and Biodiversity

99. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted as part of the application. In March 2016, an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out. The Appraisal states that the buildings adjacent to the canal have a low potential to support bat roosts. Therefore a phase II bat survey was carried out. No bats emerged and therefore no further survey work is required.

100. The offsite canal is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC; Metropolitan tier) and is of County value. Strategic design and landscaping are required to avoid light spill onto the canal. Additional precautionary measures to protect the canal during construction have been recommended and this will be secured by condition. Mitigation measures have also been suggested, and the Appraisal confirms that implementing these recommendations will ensure that there are no significant impacts upon protected species. The mitigation measures include the following:

- tree planting along length of the canal (species to include Goat willow and common alder)
- good practice measures to be taken during the construction phase of the development to avoid unnecessary impacts to the canal
- oil and chemicals will be stored away from the canal and protected by bunding
- machinery and wheels to not be washed within 8 metres of the canal as the washwater could pollute the water course
- the green wall should utilise climbing plants (common ivy; honeysuckle; and golden hop) along its length along with bird boxes (Schwegler 1MR or Vivara Woodstone) and invertebrate boxes (Bee and Bug Biome, Schwegler Clay and Reed box and Schwegler Solitary Insect House)
- it is recommended that the building is demolished within the bat hibernation period (1st October - 1st March). To mitigate for the loss of roosting opportunities on site, it is recommended that two Schwegler 1FR bat tubes are installed within the site
- the removal of any vegetation should ideally be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (which is generally taken to be March to August, inclusive)
- Install five additional bird nest boxes (Schwegler 1MR or any Vivara pro Woodstone nest boxes) into the external walls of new buildings.
- install a group of 9 swift nest boxes (Schwegler swift boxes 1A, 16, 17 or 18) onto the external walls of a new building, thereby increasing nesting opportunities for birds at the site. Install one bat tube (Schwegler 1FR, 1WI or Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box 'C') into the external wall of a new building

101. With conditions in place to ensure these mitigation measures are implemented, the proposal is considered acceptable.

Contaminated Land

102. The applicant has submitted a land contamination assessment, which is appropriate given that the historic uses of the site could have deposited contaminants into the soil, and the site investigations did identify chemicals. The report identifies potential for a number of potential sources of contaminants, including oil drums and industrial machinery. The report includes a risk assessment and soil and groundwater testing. The Environmental Health officer has reviewed the information and requested conditions requiring a further

site investigation following demolition, and a verification report to show that remediation has been carried out. This is particularly important given the relationship with the canal. The Canal and River Trust has identified a risk of contaminated water entering the canal. To discharge the conditions the applicant will need to address this specific point. With these conditions the proposal is considered acceptable.

Sustainability and energy

103. Chapter 5 of the London Plan includes policies requiring that developments are constructed to minimise their carbon emissions. This is based on the energy hierarchy: 'Be lean', 'Be clean', 'Be green'. This can be summarised as firstly reducing the carbon within the building's structure so that less energy is used. Secondly, considering whether there are methods to increase energy efficiency, and this is done through Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and connection to District Wide Heating Networks (DWHN). Finally, renewable energy should be incorporated into the design of the building.

104. The Applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement. The proposal has targeted sustainability throughout the lifetime of the building with a particular focus on energy and water efficiency measures. Passive design measures also feature within the building to prevent overheating and avoid excessive requirements for heating and cooling. The BREEAM New Construction pre-assessment for the proposed non-residential space demonstrates that the development can achieve a BREEAM rating of Excellent with a score of 72.9%. This is supported. The total overall carbon reduction is predicted to be 35% through high fabric efficiency, through the use of PV panels. Appendix B of the submitted Sustainability Statement shows where compliance is achieved and when it has been considered to not be feasible. The priorities which are not considered to be feasible include providing space for food growing, retaining the existing green infrastructure, connecting or establishing a district heating or cooling network and incorporating rainwater harvesting.

105. A positive impact on surface water run-off from the site is anticipated as soft landscaped areas will be installed on site.

106. The London Plan also has a target for water use. Policy 5.15 requires developments to minimise the use of mains water by incorporating water saving measures and achieve a consumption target of 105 litres (or less) per head per day. A condition would be imposed to ensure that this is achieved.

Community Infrastructure Levy / Planning Obligations and Social Infrastructure

107. The GLA and the Brent Council have Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) in place, which the development would be liable for. The GLA is a flat rate of £35 per sqm of floorspace. The Brent CIL has different amounts for different uses, including £200 per sqm for residential floorspace, and £40 for retail, restaurant/café, and office. However, social rented housing is not liable.

108. An objection notes the impact on local infrastructure, in particular schools and doctors. The purpose of CIL is to ensure that infrastructure is provided, and is calculated on a proportionate basis to the size of the development. In addition, the proposal includes the possibility of a medical facility being within provided the development itself, although it is acknowledged that this cannot be guaranteed.

109. A number of planning obligations have been referred to above. In addition, the applicant would pay the Council's legal and other professional fees in preparing and completing the section 106 agreement, and monitoring and enforcing its performance. The applicant would also join and adhere to the Considerate Contractors scheme. Finally, the publicly accessible areas within the site, principally the canal walkway, would need to be made available and maintained by the applicant.

Other Issues

110. Over and above the accessibility to and within the residential units which is discussed above, it is also necessary for the commercial units to be accessible. Those proposed would have level access and meet the requirements of part M of the Building Regulations.

111. The site is classified as Flood Risk Zone 1, which is for land and property which is considered to have a low probability of flooding. Comments above on SUDs and landscaping are relevant, and even though there is not a particular susceptibility to flooding on the site, it would nevertheless represent an improvement on the current situation which is overwhelmingly hardstanding.

112. Details of waste and recycling are referred to above, specifically in relation to vehicular access to the

storage areas. Residential storage is shown at lower ground floor level accessed from the car park. There would be 6 areas associated with the residential cores, and a large temporary waste holding area. This is considered broadly adequate, and a condition would request specific details to be provided in due course.

113. Consultation with Historic England's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has confirmed that this is not within a site of archaeological importance. An assessment has been submitted as part of the planning application regardless. Overall, the conclusion is that the proposal would not impact on any heritage or archaeological features (whether statutory or non-statutory).

114. There is a draft Supplementary Planning Document on Basements (November 2016). This is in its early stages of development, and whilst it is a material consideration limited weight is attached to it until the results of the consultation period have been assessed. Notwithstanding this, much of the content is aimed at basements beneath residential properties, rather than the lower ground floor proposed. It is considered that the issues discussed in the document (such as amenity and design) are covered elsewhere in this assessment.

115. This is the second site along this section of the canal for which planning permission has been sought. The other is 100 Beresford Avenue (16/0389), where a planning application was submitted in January 2016 but is not yet determined. The planning policy for the growth area seeks further developments. At the moment they have not come forward, but if they do and were to receive planning permission then there is a possibility that more than one development could be constructed at the same time. This has the potential to increase the level of disruption during the construction period. The CMP is proposed to minimise the impact of this development. Whether or not more than one development is built in an area at one time cannot be controlled through planning.

Conclusion

116. The site is allocated for a mixed use development, and is an important part of the Mount Pleasant Area given its location on the canal. This allocation includes a significant number of residential units and the residential led proposal accords with this allocation. The proposal would result in the loss of existing occupied industrial/office space, but it has been acknowledged that it is not possible for the exiting provision to be protected in its current form, particularly with the site allocation envisages a residential led scheme. Two commercial units are proposed, with retail being included in the suite of uses that are proposed are proposed for these units. While this is outside of a town centre, the size of the units is such that they are sized to meet a local need and planning policy does not require an assessment of retail impact. The resulting mixed use development, incorporating a substantial amount of residential floorspace alongside retail uses is considered acceptable.

117. The design and appearance of the building is considered to be of high quality, with an appropriate relationship to the surrounding existing uses and also the likely future context. The proposed development is higher than as was set out in the Alperton Masterplan. However, the relation between the existing buildings in the vicinity and the surrounding development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the principles of urban design and the potential impact on light and outlook.

118. Affordable Housing is proposed at a rate of 25 % (by unit) which is considered to represent the maximum reasonable proportion that the scheme could deliver. The split between tenures also accords with the Council's policies. Nevertheless, small changes in scheme viability could affect the viable levels of provision and a post-implementation is accordingly considered to be necessary. This is in line with the relevant policies and guidance.

119. The residential accommodation proposed would be high quality, with the units being well sized with good outlook and amenity space (private and communal). There would be some areas where overlooking could occur between units within the scheme but this can be mitigated through the use of privacy screens for balconies, secured through condition.

120. Following on from this, there would be an impact on the highway and transportation. The creation of a CPZ and the removal of residents' ability to obtain parking permits is crucial to ensuring the impact of a development of this size being acceptable. Section 106 contributions are required to implement the CPZ. The transport impact of the proposal on all modes of transport is considered acceptable, with the level of parking considered to be sufficient. A number of improvements to sustainable transport to be brought forward in the area to support regeneration.

121. The applicant has demonstrated that, with the imposition of conditions and section 106 obligations, the

proposal accords with policies on environmental sustainability, and would have an acceptable impact on existing trees, ecology, and flood risk. Contaminated land has been considered and found to be acceptable, also subject to conditions. The proposed landscaping represents a real positive of the scheme that can also enhance biodiversity.

122. Overall, it is concluded that the development is acceptable, and it is recommended to the committee to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement and conditions.

CIL DETAILS

This application is liable to pay **£2,296,206.06*** under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

We calculated this figure from the following information:

Total amount of eligible** floorspace which on completion is to be demolished (E): 5007 sq. m.

Total amount of floorspace on completion (G): 12757.1 sq. m.

Use	Floorspace on completion (Gr)	Eligible* retained floorspace (Kr)	Net area chargeable at rate R (A)	Rate R: Brent multiplier used	Rate R: Mayoral multiplier used	Brent sub-total	Mayoral sub-total
Dwelling houses	12510.1	0	7600.04436 823416	£200.00	£35.15	£1,940,725.62	£341,082.53
Shops	247	0	150.055631 76584	£40.00	£35.15	£7,663.56	£6,734.35

BCIS figure for year in which the charging schedule took effect (Ic)	224	224
BCIS figure for year in which the planning permission was granted (Ip)	286	
Total chargeable amount	£1,948,389.18	£347,816.88

*All figures are calculated using the formula under Regulation 40(6) and all figures are subject to index linking as per Regulation 40(5). The index linking will be reviewed when a Demand Notice is issued.

****Eligible** means the building contains a part that has been in lawful use for a continuous period of at least six months within the period of three years ending on the day planning permission first permits the chargeable development.

Please Note : CIL liability is calculated at the time at which planning permission first permits development. As such, the CIL liability specified within this report is based on current levels of indexation and is provided for indicative purposes only. It also does not take account of development that may benefit from relief, such as Affordable Housing.

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



Brent

DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: 16/4478

To: Miss K Maurant
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
14 Regents Wharf
All Saints Street
London
N1 9RL

I refer to your application dated 13/10/2016 proposing the following:
Demolition of existing buildings at Abbey Wharf, Delta Centre and all of 152 Mount Pleasant and redevelopment to provide a residential-led, mixed-use development of up to 6 storeys comprising 135 residential units (34 x 1bed, 79 x 2bed and 22 x 3bed) and 247sqm of commercial space (A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 and D2), landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and associated works.

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:

Site Location Plan - IH-BM31497001-ZZ-DR-A-3_02-001 Rev D0-1
Existing Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-002 Rev D0-1
Existing Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-010ZZ-DR-A-3_05-000 Rev D0-1
Proposed lower ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-B1-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-3
Proposed upper ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-00-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-4
Proposed first floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-01-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
Proposed second floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-02-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
Proposed third floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-03-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
Proposed fourth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-04-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
Proposed fifth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-05-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1
Proposed Block Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_02-002 Rev D0-1
Proposed Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1
Proposed North & East Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-001 Rev D0-3
Proposed South & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-002 Rev D0-1
Proposed Internal East & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-003 Rev D0-2
Proposed Internal South, Setback North & South Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-004 Rev D0-1
Proposed Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-005 Rev D0-1
Plot Schedule - IH-BM31497-00-ZZ-SH-A-4_401-010-PlotScheduleOptB Rev C
Landscape Masterplan - INL20351-10E Rev G
Air Quality Assessment prepared by Entran dated: July 2016
Tree Report prepared by ACD Environmental dated 23/02/2016
Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement prepared by ACD Environmental dated 17/06/16
Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs dated September 2016
Daylight, Sunlight and Shadow Assessment prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners dated September 2016
Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental dated June 2016
Energy Strategy prepared by Metropolis dated 06/09/2016
Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Rogers Cory Partnership dated August 2016
Geo-Environmental Report prepared by WDE Consulting dated September 2016
Noise Assessment prepared by Entran dated 25/07/16
Sustainability Statement prepared by Metropolis dated 07/09/2016
Transport Assessment prepared by Phil Jones Associates dated September 2016
at All Units at Abbey Wharf & Delta Centre and All of 152, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HAO

The Council of the London Borough of Brent, the Local Planning Authority, hereby GRANT permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out on the attached Schedule B.

Date: 15/05/2017

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alice Lester". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly informal style.

Alice Lester

Head of Planning, Transport and Licensing

Notes

1. Your attention is drawn to Schedule A of this notice which sets out the rights of applicants who are aggrieved by the decisions of the Local Planning Authority.
2. This decision does not purport to convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or under any enactment other than the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DnStdG

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

- 1 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.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

Site Location Plan - IH-BM31497001-ZZ-DR-A-3_02-001 Rev D0-1
 Existing Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-002 Rev D0-1
 Existing Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-010ZZ-DR-A-3_05-000 Rev D0-1
 Proposed lower ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-B1-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-3
 Proposed upper ground floor - IH-BM31497-01-00-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-4
 Proposed first floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-01-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
 Proposed second floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-02-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
 Proposed third floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-03-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
 Proposed fourth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-04-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-2
 Proposed fifth floor plan - IH-BM31497-01-05-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1
 Proposed Block Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_02-002 Rev D0-1
 Proposed Roof Plan - IH-BM31497-01-RF-DR-A-3_03-001 Rev D0-1
 Proposed North & East Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-001 Rev D0-3
 Proposed South & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-002 Rev D0-1
 Proposed Internal East & West Elevations - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-003 Rev D0-2
 Proposed Internal South, Setback North & South Elevations -
 IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-004 Rev D0-1
 Proposed Street & Canal Elevation - IH-BM31497-01-ZZ-DR-A-3_05-005 Rev D0-1
 Plot Schedule - IH-BM31497-00-ZZ-SH-A-4_401-010-PlotScheduleOptB Rev C
 Landscape Masterplan - INL20351-10E Rev G
 Air Quality Assessment prepared by Entran dated: July 2016
 Tree Report prepared by ACD Environmental dated 23/02/2016
 Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement prepared by ACD Environmental dated 17/06/16
 Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs dated September 2016
 Daylight, Sunlight and Shadow Assessment prepared by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners dated September 2016
 Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental dated June 2016
 Energy Strategy prepared by Metropolis dated 06/09/2016
 Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Rogers Cory Partnership dated August 2016
 Geo-Environmental Report prepared by WDE Consulting dated September 2016
 Noise Assessment prepared by Entran dated 25/07/16
 Sustainability Statement prepared by Metropolis dated 07/09/2016
 Transport Assessment prepared by Phil Jones Associates dated September 2016

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

- 3 Any plant shall be installed, together with any associated ancillary equipment, so as to prevent the transmission of noise and vibration into neighbouring premises. The rated noise level from all plant and ancillary equipment shall be 10dB(A) below the measured background noise level when measured at the nearest noise sensitive premises.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and offer acceptable amenity standards for existing and future residents.

- 4 The insulation for the commercial premises shall be designed so that noise from the commercial premises shall be at least 10 dB(A) below the measured background noise level at the nearest noise sensitive premises.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and offer acceptable amenity standards for future residents.

- 5 Prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby approved the private and communal external amenity space shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and made available. It shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and offer acceptable amenity standards for future residents.

- 6 Prior to the occupation of any part of the development, the delivery bay and temporary refuse area shall be laid out and provided in accordance with the approved drawing, and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the highways network is appropriate.

- 7 The Car Parking Management Plan hereby approved shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the car park is managed appropriately to avoid disruption to the operation of the retail store and residents on the site.

- 8 The non-residential units hereby approved shall not be used as a place of worship within Use Class D1, notwithstanding the provisions set out within the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: In the interests of promoting the vitality and viability of the Ealing Road district centre.

- 9 Not less than 10% of residential units shall be constructed to wheelchair accessible requirements (Building Regulations M4(3), with the Affordable Rented units provided as fully adapted units and the intermediate and private units provided as Easily Adaptable) and the remainder shall meet easily accessible/adaptable standards (Building Regulations M4(2)).

Reason: To ensure suitable facilities for disabled users and to future proof homes.

- 10 The scheme shall be constructed in accordance with the mitigation measures described in the approved Air Quality Impact Assessment

Reason: To ensure the safe development and secure occupancy of the site proposed for residential use.

- 11 The car parking spaces and accesses shall be laid out and made available prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained as such for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the highways network is appropriate.

- 12 A communal television aerial and satellite dish system shall be provided, linking to all residential units unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

- 13 The Deliveries and Servicing Management Plan setting out delivery arrangements hereby approved (including supervision by a trained banksman), shall be fully implemented upon first occupation of the non-residential units within the development, and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of providing sufficient servicing facilities on site, and ensuring that the relationship with the highways network and neighbouring properties is acceptable.

- 14 The building shall be designed so that mains water consumption does not exceed a target of 105 litres or less per person per day, using a fittings-based approach to determine the water consumption of the development in accordance with requirement G2 of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.

Reason: In order to ensure a sustainable development by minimising water consumption.

- 15 No development shall be carried out until the person or organisation carrying out the works is a member of the Considerate Constructors Scheme and its code of practice, and the details of the membership and contact details are clearly displayed on the site so that they can be easily read by members of the public.

Reason: To limit the impact of construction upon the levels of amenity that neighbouring occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.

- 16 Mitigation measures described in the approved Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental dated June 2016 shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal does not adversely impact on ecological habitats..

- 17 A Construction and Demolition Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of any construction works on site (including demolition). This shall outline measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development. The approved Plan shall be fully implemented thereafter throughout the demolition and construction of the development in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To limit the detrimental effects of noise and disturbance from demolition / construction works on adjoining sites and nearby residential occupiers.

- 18 Prior to the commencement of development a scheme an Air Quality Neutral Assessment (including the CHP plant hereby approved) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report must be undertaken in accordance with guidance published by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The assessment shall include mitigation proposals should it be found that the development is not air quality neutral. The approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the development would not result in a detrimental impact on local air quality.

- 19 Prior to the commencement of building works (excluding demolition), a site investigation shall be carried out by competent persons to determine the nature and extent of any soil contamination present. The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the principles of BS 10175:2011. A report shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority, that includes the results of any research and analysis undertaken as well as an assessment of the risks posed by any identified contamination. It shall include an appraisal of remediation options should any contamination be found that presents an unacceptable risk to any identified receptors. Any soil contamination remediation measures required by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out in full.

Reason: To ensure the safe development and secure occupancy of the site, and to prevent harm to the adjacent canal

- 20 Details of the height, type, position, angle and spread of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The external lighting shall be erected and maintained in accordance with the approved details to minimise light spillage and glare outside the designated area.

Reason: To protect the amenity of existing and future residents and in the interest of safety and ecology.

- 21 Within 3 months of commencement of development, a site wide children's play space plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:

- (i) the location of the play area and/or equipment
- (ii) details of the equipment / measures to meet the minimum standards for play

The approved equipment / measures shall be installed prior to the occupation of the residential units and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure there is sufficient provision of areas and equipment for children's play.

- 22 Notwithstanding any details of landscape works referred to in the submitted application, a scheme for the hard and soft 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 within 3 months of commencement of development. Such a scheme shall include:-

- (a) all planting and trees including location, species, size, density and number incorporating native species;
- (b) details of the layouts of the publicly accessible spaces;
- (d) details of the provision of artificial bird and bat boxes;
- (e) areas of all hard landscape works including details of materials and finishes. These shall have a permeable construction and include features to ensure safe use by visually impaired and other users;
- (f) the location of, details of materials and finishes of, all street furniture, drainage and external cycle stands;
- (g) proposed boundary treatments including walls, fencing and retaining walls, indicating materials and height;
- (i) a detailed (minimum 5-year) landscape-management plan showing requirements for the ongoing maintenance of hard and soft landscaping;
- (j) details of materials, lighting, tactile paving, handrails and wayfinding signs;
- (k) details of all tree planting pits (including surfacing);
- (l) details of how the landscaping in front of the 'café' unit at ground floor level would relate to the canal towpath.

The approved 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.

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.

- 23 Within 3 months of commencement of development, full details of electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The spaces shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of any part of the development and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To encourage sustainable forms of transportation.

- 24 Within 3 months of commencement of development, full details of the cycle spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The spaces shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of any part of the development and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To encourage sustainable forms of transportation.

- 25 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a structural survey of the waterway wall should be undertaken, and full details of this and any proposed repairs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Canal and River Trust. The waterway wall works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the proposed works do not have any adverse impact on the safety of waterway users and the integrity of the canal, prior to any proposed works taking place on site which might impact on the waterway wall.

- 26 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details of the proposed surface water drainage, including any SUDs measures and discharge rates, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To determine the potential for pollution of the waterway and likely volume of water. Potential contamination of the waterway and ground water from wind blow, seepage or spillage at the site, and high volumes of water should be avoided to safeguard the waterway environment and integrity of the waterway infrastructure.

- 27 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement outlining all works to be carried out adjacent to the water must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Canal and River Trust. The risk assessment shall also include details of a monitoring strategy for the canal wall during the demolition and construction process. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Statement.

Reason: To ensure the proposed works adjacent to the water do not have any adverse impact on the safety of waterway users and the integrity of the canal, prior to any works taking place.

- 28 Prior to commencement of the development (excluding demolition) details of all exterior materials including samples (which shall be made available for viewing on site or in another location as agreed) and/or manufacturer's literature shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include but not be limited to:

- (i) building envelope materials e.g. bricks, render, cladding;
- (ii) windows, doors and glazing systems including colour samples; and
- (iii) balconies and screens

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is high quality, and in the interest of the privacy of future occupants.

- 29 Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

Reason: The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.

- 30 No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

- 31 The refuse areas shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be provided and made available prior to the occupation of the residential units. They shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and that the development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

- 32 Details of extract system(s) for any Use Class A3 premises within the proposed development, including details of odour and noise control measures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of use of the relevant premises for purposes within Use Class A3 and the approved details shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of the Use Class A3 use and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of occupiers of sensitive premises both within the development and surrounding the development.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at www.brent.gov.uk/CIL.
- 2 Applicants are reminded of hazards caused by asbestos materials especially during demolition and removal works and attention is drawn to the Asbestos Licensing Regulations 1983. Licensed Contractors only are permitted to remove asbestos which must be transferred to a licensed site. For further advice the Council's Chief Environmental Health Officer should be contacted.
- 3 The applicant is advised to contact London Underground Infrastructure Protection in

advance of preparation of final design and associated method statements, in particular with regard to: demolition; excavation; construction methods; use of tall plant and scaffolding.

- 4 Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

Thames Water recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat trap on all catering establishments. We further recommend, in line with best practice for the disposal of Fats, Oils and Grease, the collection of waste oil by a contractor, particularly to recycle for the production of bio diesel. Failure to implement these recommendations may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and pollution to local watercourses.

We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission. A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality."

Water Comments

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

- 5 The applicant/developer should refer to the current "Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust" to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained (<https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice>)."

The applicant/developer is advised that any encroachment or access onto the canal towpath requires written consent from the Canal & River Trust, and they should contact the Canal & River Trust's Estates Surveyor, Jonathan Young (jonathan.young@canalrivertrust.org.uk) regarding the required access agreement.

- 6 The applicant is advised to notify the Council's Highways Service of the intention to commence works prior to commencement. They shall contact Mark O'Brien (Public Realm Monitoring Manager) at Mark.O'Brien@brent.gov.uk, and include photographs showing the condition of highway along the site boundaries.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Claire Steele, Planning and Regeneration,
Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 1075