

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

13 September, 2017
03
17/1829

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	25 April, 2017
WARD	Queensbury
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Kingsbury & Kenton
LOCATION	The Willows, 136 Honeypot Lane, London, NW9 9QA
PROPOSAL	Demolition of the existing care home building and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a five storey building providing 50 self-contained flats (4 studios, 11 x 1bed, 23 x 2bed and 12 x 3bed) with associated basement level, car and cycle parking space, bin stores, amenity space and landscaping
APPLICANT	136 Honeypot Lane LLP
CONTACT	CGMS
PLAN NO'S	Please refer to condition 2.
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<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_133914</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.uk2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "17/1829" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box3. 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 legal and professional costs;
2. Notification of commencement;
3. The provision of the proposed Affordable Housing (10 homes will be affordable intermediate affordable housing)
4. A pre-implementation financial viability review shall be undertaken if construction works not commence within 15 months of the date of decision, to reasonably capture any improvement in viability for deferred Affordable housing planning obligations;
5. That the approved flats are parking permit restricted (and therefore not eligible for on-street parking permits);
6. Undertaking of highway works through an agreement under S38/S278 of the Highways Act 1980, including the realignment of the existing crossover to create the proposed main vehicular access, creation of the crossover associated with the access to the substation (which shall be 2.4 m wide with no radius kerbs and a 50 mm upstand), the implementation of double yellow lines along the adjacent section of Honeypot Lane, all associated all associated changes and proposed new line marking and associated TRO costs; and repositioning of any traffic signs; together with the costs of any changes to statutory undertakers' equipment; The properties shall not be occupied until all associated Highway works have been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority;
7. The payment of £15,000 to mitigate against the impact of the increased emissions related to its transportation during operational phase of the development;
8. Training and employment plan targeting Brent residents;
9. Contribution towards a local carbon off-setting scheme to achieve the London Plan targets for carbon reduction, should those targets not be met through on-site measures.
10. The approval of a revised Travel Plan that achieves a "pass" rating using TfL's ATTrBuTE programme and implementation of that plan, including reviews.
11. Any other planning obligation(s) considered necessary by the Head of Planning

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

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. Time limit for commencement
2. Approved drawings/documents
3. Provision of parking spaces, cycle spaces and refuse storage
4. Membership of Considerate Constructors Scheme
5. Water consumption levels
6. Clearance to take place outside of bird breeding season
7. Implementation of drainage measures
8. Approval of Materials
9. Details of fenestration (to address noise)
10. Contamination - site investigation
11. Contamination - remediation

12. Provision of accessible units
13. Details of lighting
14. Landscaping details
15. Energy strategy
16. Construction Management Plan
17. Badger Survey
18. Parking management and allocation plan
19. Site drainage
20. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Head of Planning

Informatives

1. Community Infrastructure Levy
 2. Photographic survey of footway before works
 3. Contact the Councils Network Management Team (Highways)
 4. Control of Asbestos
 5. Imported soil details
 6. Party Wall Act
 7. Building near boundary
 8. Any [other] informative(s) considered necessary by the Head of Planning
1. That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committees decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee.
 2. That, if by 3 months of the committee date the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission.
 3. That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

SITE MAP



Planning Committee Map

Site address: The Willows, 136 Honeypot Lane, London, NW9 9QA

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The proposal is to demolish the existing care home building and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a five storey building providing 50 self-contained flats (4 studios, 11 x 1bed, 23 x 2bed and 12 x 3bed). The basement level would provide car and cycle parking space and plant rooms. The ground floor would provide bin stores, cycle stores, sub station, 800 sqm of communal amenity space and children's playspace area and landscaping. All flats are also to be provided with a private balcony/terrace or gardens.

Revised plans were received making the following amendments to address issues of outlook and overlooking:

Ground Floor

Swapping the ground floor Unit 06 with the substations providing a dual aspect ground floor 3 bed unit. The bin store is still accessible directly from Honeypot Lane. Whilst the garden area is significantly reduced for Unit 06, it does now provide a dual aspect unit with a better outlook ;

First & Second Floors

Removal of all protruding balconies on the eastern elevation. Inset balconies provided and large south facing studio units introduced in lieu of the 1 beds previously proposed (Units 15, 16, 26 & 27). The inset balconies give a secondary aspect for these units in a westerly direction. Units 14 and 25 have also had inset balconies introduced.

Third Floor

Removal of protruding balconies on the eastern elevation.

EXISTING

The site is located on Honeypot Lane, and is around 0.24 hectare. It is occupied by a two-storey building, which comprises a vacant residential care home of approximately 1,200 sqm in size. The site is set within a mainly residential area and is directly adjacent to a 5-storey residential building, Alpine House to the north. To the east lies an NHS Clinic separated by land that carries a Grade I Site of Importance to Nature Conservation designation. Queensbury Jubilee Line Station are located about 6 minute walk away. The site is within a PTAL rating of 2. The building is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key issues for consideration are as follows:

1. The principle of development: The proposal results in the loss of an elderly care home for which there is an identified need in the borough. However, the care home does not meet current standards and could not be brought up to those standards and the loss is accordingly in line with Brent Policy. The provision of new homes accords with Council policy, also meeting an identified need in the borough.
2. The mix of residential units and the provision of Affordable Housing. The proposal materially accords with the Housing Mix set out within Brent Policy, with 24 % of the units providing family accommodation. 10 intermediate shared ownership affordable units are proposed, which represents the maximum reasonable proportion of Affordable Housing. The non-provision of Affordable Rented units is considered to be acceptable as the submitted financial viability assessment demonstrates that this would not be feasible. A financial viability review is recommended to be secured through the Section 106 agreement to re-test the viability of the scheme should works not commence within 15 months of the date of the decision.
3. The design, appearance and scale of the proposed building. The proposed building is of a similar scale to the adjoining Alpine House development and is considered to pay an appropriate regard to the character of the area. It utilises good architecture with quality detailing and materials in order to maximise the sites potential whilst respecting surrounding development.
4. The potential impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. The proposed development accords with the SPG17 30 degree line in relation to all units but one of the adjoining residential block. The submitted daylight and sunlight assessment shows that the impact on the daylight received by most surrounding windows

Ground of objection	Relevant paragraphs from Detailed Considerations section of report
Parking issues	Please see paragraph 44 to 53

Traffic congestion and increase in traffic accidents	
Increase in traffic	
Cars being vandalised as they have to park on the road	
Construction traffic	
Loss of privacy	Please see paragraphs 19 to 29
Loss of light to Acacia Court	
Overlooking of Acacia Court	
Dust and noise pollution	Please see paragraph 55
Loss of trees	Please see paragraphs 40 to 43
Impact house prices	Please see paragraph 63
Over development of the site	Please see paragraph 64
The dignity and privacy of the NHS Mental Health and Learning Disabilities patients will be compromised with our site being overlooked by an additional private housing.	Please see paragraph 22
The proposed development will directly overlook our current inpatient units and this could be detrimental to the health and well-being of our patients as well as infringe on their dignity and privacy.	

Queensbury Ward Councillors

Cllr Kanapathipillai Naheerathan, Cllr Rameshchandra Patel and Cllr Sandra Kabir

No comments received.

Environmental Health

Environmental health do not object to the proposal but recommend conditions. This is discussed later in this report.

Brent Adult Social Care

It is agreed that the existing building on the site, formerly used a residential care home, does not meet current ASC requirements for older persons accommodation with support. We agree with the applicant that it would not be possible to refurbish the existing building in order to make it fit for purpose. We disagree with JLL's assertion in their 'Use Assessment' report that a scheme would need to be '60+ units' in order to be viable – ASC's assessment is that 40+ units are required for a residential or Extra Care scheme to be viable. However it is agreed that any supported accommodation scheme commissioned by ASC would require all bedrooms to have en-suite bathrooms as a minimum standard, and the existing building would be unable to provide 40+ units of this type.

ASC do consider the site to have considerable potential for a purpose built Extra Care facility to meet Brent's current identified shortfall of 100 units of older persons accommodation with support. The site does have good access to public transport with several bus services stopping nearby, and is located in an area of Brent which has no local Extra Care provision to serve the local population. Whilst the location of facilities such as shops are further away that the 'normally within 400m' stated in DMP20 we would argue that the current shortage of suitable land within the borough realistically requires some flexibility where a site meets most other requirements. In addition there may be scope for developing a large mixed Extra Care/supported housing development in partnership with CNWL NHS Trust who own under-utilised land that adjoins the site.

Given the foregoing factors, ASC's preference would be that the site is used to develop new build supported accommodation for older persons to meet identified local needs. ASC would actively work with the developer to find ways to support the development of a commercially viable Extra Care scheme on this valuable site.

This is discussed in paragraphs 1 to 4 of the detailed considerations part of this report.

Statement of Community Involvement

The applicant has set out the level of pre-consultation that was carried out, as required through the Localism Act (2011). The consultation process was based around the following methods:-

Flyers detailing the proposed scheme were sent to residential properties within close proximity to the site, covering both the London Borough of Brent residents, but also those properties within the London Borough of Harrow. It specifies that limited responses were received.

In addition, the applicant has approached the NHS, representing the land owners surrounding the application site to the east and south. The NHS current position is that the existing facility is to be retained and that as the principal neighbour they are supportive of the principle of redevelopment of the vacant building.

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)
- Mayors Housing SPG 2016
- London Borough of Brent Core Strategy 2010
- London Borough of Brent Development Management Policies 2016
- Brent Supplementary Planning Guidance 17:- Design Guide For New Development

Brent's106 Supplementary Planning Document

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Land Use Principle

1. Core Strategy policy CP 21 and DMP 20 are relevant with regard to housing that meets an identified need in the borough and in this particular case, accommodation with shared facilities or additional support. The borough has a significant need for housing for older people. By 2037 it is projected a third of Brent's overall population will be over 65. The Brent Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a need for an additional 2,900 specialist older persons housing units for the period 2011-37. The London Plan sets an annual target for Brent of 175 units for specialist housing for older people. As such, the proposed development will result in the loss of housing which meets an identified borough need. Policy DMP20 specifies that the loss of such accommodation will only be acceptable where it is demonstrated that there is no Brent need for that type of accommodation or residents' needs can be better met by other existing

accommodation, or that the accommodation is unsatisfactory and cannot be improved to achieve the current standards.

2. The applicant submitted a 'Use Assessment' report produced by JLL in April 2017. The report found the existing building is in a poor state of repair and too small to offer a viable scale for a care home, for which 60+ beds would be required.
3. The Council's Adult Social Care team have acknowledged that the existing building on the site does not meet current Adult Social Care requirements for older persons accommodation with support and that it would not be feasible to refurbish the existing building in order to make it fit for purpose. However, they do not agree with that a replacement care would need 60 or more beds to be feasible. They specify a strong preference for the site to be redeveloped to provide new supported accommodation for older persons to meet identified local needs.
4. Whilst the proposal results in the loss of accommodation for which there is an identified need, that accommodation does not meet current standards and would provide an unsatisfactory standard of accommodation. The accommodation cannot be feasibly improved to achieve the current standards and as such, the loss of the care facilities accords with policy DMP20. It is proposed to provide self contained residential dwellings within this site. The provision of new homes meets an identified need in the borough and the area is considered to be appropriate for the residential accommodation. As such, the general principle of the loss of the care home and the provision of new homes is considered to accord with policy.

Mix of residential accommodation and the provision of Affordable Housing

5. Core Strategy Policy 21 (A Balanced Housing Stock) outlines the need to maintain and provide a balanced housing stock in Brent. These needs include an appropriate range and mix of self-contained accommodation types and sizes, including family sized accommodation (capable of providing three or more bedrooms). Policy CP2 sets a target of 25 % of the new homes in Brent to provide family accommodation.
6. The table below shows the overall proposed housing mix. A total of 12 family sized (3-bedroom units) are proposed, which materially accords with the Council's 25 % target for family housing (12.5 units would represent 25 %). The Affordable Housing proposals are discussed below.

Proposed mix of homes (the number of units is specified in the table):

	Intermediate	Private	Total
1 bed 1 person	0	4	4
1 bed 2 person	2	9	11
2 bed	3	20	23
3 bed	5	7	12
Total	10	40	50

Proposed percentages of units within each tenure:

By tenure	Intermediate	Private	Total
1 bed 1 person	0.0%	10.0%	8%
1 bed 2 person	20.0%	22.5%	22%
2 bed	30.0%	50.0%	46%
3 bed	50.0%	17.5%	24%

7. 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 specifies 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.

8. A total of 10 Intermediate units are proposed, situated on the ground, first and second floor of Core A. This represents 20 % Affordable Housing when calculated using the number of units or 22.4 % when calculated by habitable room. It is normally considered appropriate to calculate the proportion of Affordable Housing by habitable room to give weight to the provision of family sized affordable housing for which there is a significant need within the borough.
9. The applicant submitted a Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) undertaken by Savills which was assessed by consultants instructed by the Council. It was concluded that the scheme showed a deficit of £1.08 million below benchmark land value even if no affordable Housing was proposed, and £1.8464 million below benchmark land value with the proposed provision of 10 intermediate shared ownership units. As such, the proposal represents the provision of the maximum reasonable proportion of Affordable Housing. The provision of all of the Affordable Housing as Intermediate Shared Ownership accommodation does not accord with the Affordable mix set out in Brent Policy. However, the significant deficit even that would be apparent even if no Affordable Housing is provided justifies the absence of Affordable Rented units in this instance. Nevertheless, it is considered that at a pre-commencement viability review should be secured if the scheme does not commence within 15 months of consent as scheme viability is subject to change over time, but the level of change is not likely to be materially significant over time, with the 15 month period being considered to be a reasonable period within which the findings of the current assessment can be treated as being up-to-date. Should scheme viability improve and a higher proportion of Affordable Housing be viable, financial contributions towards Affordable Housing would be applicable. This would be secured through the Section 106 legal agreement.

The proposal includes 5 wheelchair accessible homes, comprising 2 x 1-bed, 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed flat. These would be

10. The housing mix, including the provision of Affordable Housing, is considered to be in accordance with Brent and Mayoral policy, with the scheme providing the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.

Design, Layout, Scale and Appearance

11. The surrounding buildings vary significant in their design, scale and appearance. The existing building on the subject site is a two-storey building with a large pitched roof. To the north lies the Alpine House development, comprising Acacia, Palm, Tulip and Cypress Courts, a 5-storey modern development situated across five blocks. Opposite the application site, the Honeypot Close flatted blocks are three storeys tall, whilst to the south of the site, adjacent to the access to the Kingswood Centre NHS facility, buildings are typically 3- to 4-storeys in height with pitched roofs, with some buildings that are 2-storeys tall. The Kingswood Centre is a NHS facility which specialises in assessing and treating people with learning disabilities. The access to this facility is situated to the south of the subject site whilst the single storey buildings that contain the centre are situated to the rear. The distance between the subject site and the main buildings is around 75 m. Immediately adjoining the eastern boundary of the application site there is a large area of mature vegetation. This area, which is within the Kingswood Centre curtilage, is designated as a Grade I Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC). An element of this designation projects along the northern boundary of the subject site.
12. Objectors have cited concerns about the scheme on the basis that they consider it to be the over-development of the site. Over-development is often interpreted in a number of ways, including the size or form of a building (whether it is in keeping with its context), an excessive intensity of use and/or the excessive level of impacts associated with the building or use. The design, layout, scale and appearance of the building will be discussed in this section whilst impacts on light and outlook and other impacts will be discussed in later sections of the report.
13. The height of the building has regard to that of the Alpine House development which adjoins the northern site boundary. To the South, on the opposite side of the NHS access, the 4-storey (with pitched roof) buildings reach a comparable height, with the three storey buildings within that development slightly lower. Whilst the Kingswood Centre to the east is lower in height (single storey), the height of the proposed building pays an appropriate regard to the context within which the development will be primarily viewed.

14. The proposed development has been set 2.6 m to 5.7 m in from the northern boundary, maintaining a 20 m distance between the northern facade of the proposed building and the opposing (southern) facade of Acacia Court. This spacing reflects the separation distances between the buildings within the Alpine House development, for which there is a distance of between 19 and 20 m between the blocks within this development (between Tulip and Palm Courts, and between Palm and Acacia Courts). The land immediately to the south of the site is relatively open at present, with a 28 m wide strip of land which includes a grassed area and the access to the Kingswood Centre. The proposed building is situated approximately 5 m from this southern boundary (with the Kingswood Centre access). The L-shaped nature of the building results in a number of windows addressing the adjoining land. In terms of the existing context, this helps to provide natural surveillance over this access road and relates well to this space in its current form. Given the width of the adjoining space (within the curtilage of the Kingswood Centre), one could not rule out the redevelopment of that land. Given the likely form of development of that land (if it was to be developed in the future), it is not considered to be materially prejudicial to the redevelopment of the land and is likely to relate appropriately to a future development on this site.
15. The proposed development is situated around 4.5 to 5.5 m from the rear (eastern) boundary of the site. This part of the scheme adjoins the elements of the Kingswood Centre site which contain significant vegetation and the proposed building relates appropriately to this space. The set-back of the building from the street (approximately 5 m from the footway) is comparable to the buildings fronting Honeypot Lane to the south. The set back of the proposed development from Honeypot Lane is also comparable to the set back of the Alpine House blocks from Alpine Road. This road is parallel to and set back from Honeypot Lane, so the frontage of the Alpine House blocks are set further east than the frontage of the proposed building. It is considered that the set-back of the proposed building pays an appropriate regard to the local context. The layout seeks to maximise activity with the street and minimise "dead" frontages at ground floor level and the scheme achieves good levels of activity within the street frontage.
16. The volume of the proposed building has been visually articulated through the use of projecting and recessed elements, with the lower three floors of the building unified through the choice of materials (brick with metal balustrading to balconies). The top floor has been set-back and a different material (timber cladding) has been proposed to pay regard to the design and form of the adjoining Alpine House development. The windows are arranged in multiples of 900mm, either singly, doubled or triples and are organised to prioritise light into the living areas. The window pattern has been designed to have the same arrangement on alternative floors. This ensures that the building remains cohesive with a clear pattern and structure but still has character and expression throughout the mix of floors.
17. The architectural approach of the current proposal is generally supported. The scheme proposes a simple high quality approach to architectural detailing and materials that would complement the form of the building massing.
18. As such, the design, layout and appearance of the proposed development is considered to be of high quality. It is recommended that approval of the final choice of materials is secured through condition. This is commonplace within development consents to ensure that the actual materials are of sufficient quality. However, in this instance, the final choice of the cladding material for the top floor may also require further consideration as some timber cladding materials weather poorly if an appropriate detailing cannot be achieved.

Neighbouring amenity

19. The construction of the proposed building will result in a different relationship with the adjoining dwellings from that of the existing building. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 17 (SPG17) sets out a number of parameters for the consideration of potential impacts on the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers. This is due to be replaced by Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD1) which has been subject to public consultation but has not been adopted yet and therefore can be given some weight.
20. Objectors have raised concern that the proposed development will result in an impact on their amenity. In particular, they have raised concern about the loss of light for Acacia Court homes and the overlooking of these homes.
21. SPG 17 sets out the parameters within which impact on privacy and outlook for schemes within Brent will be considered. With regard to privacy, it sets out that a distance of at least 20 m should normally be achieved between opposing habitable room windows to ensure that an acceptable level of privacy will be maintained. The scheme achieves this distance in relation to the windows of the adjoining block to the

North (Acacia Court). The impact on privacy is accordingly in line with the levels set out within this guidance. The scheme does not directly adjoin any other residential dwellings so there separation distances are exceeded on all sides. To the south lies the open land associated with the Kingswood Centre. As discussed above, the size and siting of this land is such that it is considered unlikely that the inclusion of windows within 5 m of that boundary will unduly restrict the ability to develop that land in the future.

22. Concern has been raised by the NHS Mental Health and Learning Disabilities unit that operates the Kingwood Centre. They consider that the proposed development will overlook their site and the current inpatients unit and will be detrimental to the health and well-being of their patients and will infringe and compromise their dignity and privacy. They highlight that their patients have a number of complex needs, including autism and challenging behaviours and they consider that the building works around their site will affect their recovery pathway. As discussed above, the southern facade of the proposed building over-looks the grass area alongside the access road to the development. It is noted that the windows of the existing Rose Bates Drive properties also over-look parts of this access road. There is a small single storey building within the NHS site that is approximately 8.5 m from the boundary with the application site, with the majority of the buildings within the complex approximately 68 m from the application site. The small single storey building have few windows and the nature of the use of this NHS building is unclear. While the proposed development will over-look the NHS land, this primarily affects the area adjacent to the access road and the heavily vegetated area to the east of the application site. The complex requirements associated with the type of care provided within the Kingswood Centre are acknowledged. However, it is not clear that the level of over-looking associated with the proposed development will be unduly detrimental given the access road is already overlooked by other historical developments.
23. With regard to the light and outlook from the Acacia Court dwellings, SPG17 states that developments should normally be situated below a 30 degree line taken at a 2 m height above floor level within the habitable rooms of the associated dwellings. Where schemes do not accord with this but an adequate separation distance is achieved to ensure adequate outlook, a daylight and sunlight assessment is sought to support the proposal and demonstrate the level of impact. SPD1 maintains this approach for areas with a "Typical (Established) Character" but adopts a different approach for "Transitional" or "Transformational" areas. Typical Character Areas are noted as typically suburban small scale infill sites of low public transport accessibility where significant change is not envisaged. The nature and scale of the surrounding area is clearly not of this character, with the site adjoining a modern 5-storey development. As such, the site is considered to be within a "Transitional" character area. Within such areas, a 45 degree line is taken from habitable room windows (similar to the approach within SPG17 in relation to private amenity space).
24. As a 20 m distance has been achieved (as discussed above), an adequate level of outlook has been achieved as a 20 m separation distance has been proposed. The lower four storeys accord with the 30 degree guidance set out within SPG17. However, the top floor exceeds this by approximately 2 m in relation to the windows of one ground floor flat within Acacia Court. However, given that the Acacia Court building addresses Alpine Road which is parallel to and set back from Honeypot Lane, the Acacia Court building is set considerably back from the proposed building. As such, only a very small element of the top floor of the proposed building (the north eastern corner) is likely to compromise the 30 degree guidance and the outlook will remain considerably more open to the east of this. The proposed building will comply with the 45 degree guidance set out within draft SPG1.
25. A sunlight and daylight study has been submitted to support this application, examining the potential impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight received by the closest neighbouring properties in line with BRE guidance. The study concluded that 100 of the 107 windows (93%) that were assessed within Acacia Court (the adjoining block to the north) achieved daylight levels in line with BRE targets. The seven windows that didn't were set within recessed balconies which limit access to daylight. The siting of these windows limits the amount of daylight that can be received. Tests were undertaken which demonstrated that these windows would accord with BRE guidance for daylight if the balconies were omitted from the model. As such, . 88% of habitable rooms will achieve good levels of daylight in excess of the BRE targets: 1% for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for living/kitchen/diners. The sunlight assessment has shown that the vast majority of the south-facing living rooms will receive levels of sunlight in excess of the BRE targets.
26. With regard to the flats in the Honeypot Close block (situated opposite the site, fronting Honeypot Lane), two windows servicing small galley kitchens on the ground floor of this building will experience reductions in "vertical sky component" (VSC) beyond BRE guideline levels. However, again, levels of daylight are restricted by features of that building (in this case an external walkway) and these windows already

receive very low levels of light (VSC levels of 1% and 1.2% when the BRE guidance recommends 27 %) so the change is unlikely to be significant in reality. The proposal accords with BRE guidance in terms of sunlight to these properties.

27. The nearest residential property to the south (132 Honeypot Lane) accords with the BRE guidance for daylight and sunlight.
28. The sunlight amenity / overshadowing assessment has shown that all of the neighbouring gardens will experience no material change in direct sunlight levels with the proposed development in place.
29. Returning to the discussion of the objection to the proposal in relation to the potential impact on light and outlook, the proposed building is larger than the existing building and the siting of the building differs from the existing, so the level of impact will change and levels of light and outlook will reduce. However, these must be considered against relevant guidance (in this case, the Council's SPG17, draft SPD1 and the BRE guidance relating to daylight and sunlight). For the reasons set out above, the proposal is not considered to result in an unduly detrimental impact on the daylight or sunlight of surrounding properties or to their outlook, having regard to this guidance.

Quality of the resulting residential accommodation

Layout and accommodation

30. The proposal is for a 5 storey 'L' shaped building. The adjacent residential development, Alpine House is 5 storeys tall and would be set 20m away from the proposal. A 5 storey building can therefore be supported in this location.
31. The basement will provide parking, cycle parking and plant rooms. Above this on the ground floor and floors 1 - 4 would comprise 50 flats. The building is served by two separate cores (maximum 7 units per core). Each unit would have private amenity space in the form of balconies, inset balconies or gardens.
32. The proposed building is set in close proximity to the southern, eastern and northern site boundaries and relies on those sites for the provision of light and outlook. The site to the north has been redeveloped recently and is unlikely to change significantly. The land to the east carries a Grade I Site of Importance to Nature Conservation designation and thus is unlikely to come forward for development. The applicant argues the NHS land adjacent to the application site, if a hypothetical mutual 9 metres equidistant from the shared boundary, any development upon the NHS site would still be restricted by the habitable room windows at 132 Honeypot Lane which reduces the developable area of their strip of land considerably as it is only 26.7m wide and must accommodate an access route to the NHS site. However, this scenario does not recognise the potential for a single aspect (south facing) development within the NHS site (fronting the access road to the Kingswood Centre) or development that is parallel to Honeypot Lane which includes a vehicle access through the building. Nevertheless, to improve the relationship between sites, amendments were made so that Unit 06 on the ground floor was swapped with the substations providing a dual aspect ground floor 3 bed unit and protruding balconies on the first, second and third floors have been removed and replaced with inset balconies. Whilst the development is approximately 5 m from the southern boundary (rather than 10 m as often sought), the proposal is not considered likely to prejudice the development of the adjoining site given the potential for of such development.
33. Revised plans were received changing the ground floor layout. A large proportion of the ground floor frontage is now active, with 3 flats fronting Honeypot Lane, improving natural surveillance and provide visual animation to the street frontage. The two entrances to the residential cores also front Honeypot Lane.
34. Access from the undercroft car parking area to the main circulation cores is safe and level. Level threshold access will be provided to all communal and private building entrances. Two passenger lifts are distributed in two cores and will take the residents to the accommodation on the upper floors of the two building sections.
35. The communal amenity spaces and gardens are located on the ground floor. This is discussed in more details below.
36. All dwellings have been designed to meet the space standards as stipulated in the London Plan (2016). Five of these are proposed as wheelchair accessible dwellings, equating to 10% of the units. As all of the

units are private or shared ownership units and the submission shows that the layouts have been designed to be easily adaptable for wheelchair use, conditions will ensure that the dwellings are implemented to be compliant with Building Regulations M4(3) (accessible adaptable dwellings). All units have been designed to meet the requirements of Lifetime Homes and the Mayor's London Housing Design Guide standards. Flats achieve a floor to ceiling height of 2.5 m in accordance with the Mayor's Housing SPG.

37. 36 of the flats are dual aspect while 14 are single aspect facing either south, west or east. All have living rooms with large amounts of glazing as well as private outdoor amenity areas which enhance the quality of the new homes. The submitted daylight and sunlight assessment examines levels within the proposed accommodation. This shows that 129 (88%) of the habitable rooms meet BRE guidance levels, and those that don't are restricted by the presence of over-sailing balconies. It is considered that these balconies provide significant amenity value and it is not unusual for the provision of balconies of the above units to reduce daylight in the unit below. The majority of amenity areas, including the central communal area receive levels of direct sunlight in excess of the BRE targets. There are however 3 private gardens serving ground floor units which receive levels below the targets. Access to sunlight in these areas is constrained by their location within the scheme and their northerly orientation. Whilst they have lower levels of sunlight, they are still useful outdoor spaces that can be supplemented with use of the communal amenity area that receives very good levels of sunlight.
38. The proposed ground floor would have 800 sq.m of communal landscaped garden which includes 120 sq.m of children's playspace area. This equates to an average of 16 sqm per residential unit. In addition to this, balconies or terraces are typically 5.6 to 24 sqm in size. As such, the scheme will accord with the Council's external amenity space standards which seek 20 sqm per flat, or 50 sqm per 3-bedroom ground floor flat.
39. The communal garden and playspace will be overlooked by a number of apartments further promoting safe and amenable recreational areas.

Ecology and Trees

40. The site adjoins a designated Grade I Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC). A thin strip of land with this designation (3 m wide) land projects into site along the northern boundary, but the main area of designated land is situated to the east of the site. The application has been supported by an Arboricultural Assessment and an Ecological Appraisal. Objectors have raised concern regarding the loss of trees within the site.
41. The Arboricultural Assessment identifies a number of trees to be removed, and a number to be protected and retained, including the protection of trees outside of the site. The tree survey identifies 22 trees within or adjoining the application site, including 6 Grade B trees (life expectancy of 20+ years), 14 Grade C trees (life expectancy of 10+ years) and 2 grade U trees (life expectancy of less than 10 years). There are no trees which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order which would be affected by the proposal. The submission identifies the retention of 5 Grade B trees, 8 Grade C trees and 1 grade U tree (outside of the site). The removal of 8 trees is proposed. This primarily involves the removal of a number of low grade trees around the perimeter of the site (6 Grade C trees and 1 Grade U tree). The removal of 1 Grade B tree is proposed, which is necessary to allow the construction of the basement. The planting of 18 replacement trees is specified as a part of a broader landscape plan, which would result in an increase in the number of trees on site. Hedging is also proposed in various locations within the site. The loss of the existing semi-mature trees as highlighted by objects can, in the short term, make a visible difference within an area. However, all but one of the trees that are to be removed are of low quality or have a low life expectancy and their loss is considered to be acceptable given the number and nature of new trees that are proposed. However, additional planting around the perimeter of the site is recommended to respond to address the potential ecological impact of the scheme (see below discussion). A full landscaping plan is recommended to be secured through condition.
42. The Ecological Appraisal examined habitats present following the standard "Phase 1 habitat survey" auditing method and examines the potential impact on protected species. This appraisal examines the potential impacts of the proposal of the SINC. It is specified that the habitats within the application site are common and widespread through the local area. It recommends that semi-mature trees on site are retained where possible or replaced with native species, and that the eastern boundary of the site is enhanced with native species. It finds that none of the voids within the building contain evidence of roosting bats, and that the extensions and sheds were not considered to have potential to support bats. The semi-mature trees on site were considered unsuitable for roosting bats, but the eastern tree line was specified as being likely to provide some opportunities for foraging and commuting bats. The report

recommends that this tree line is enhanced and to remain unlit. No evidence of badgers was found on site. However, an updated badger survey was recommended before works begin. The pond within the SINC was evaluated. However, this was considered to be sub-optimal for Greater Crested Newts and the habitat within the application site was not considered suitable for this species. The Ecological Appraisal recommends that clearance work is undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (March to September) or immediately after a nesting bird check (by a suitably qualified ecologist) as birds may use the trees and shrubs on site. The appraisal sets out that the site is not constrained by other protecting species (including dormice, reptiles, great crested newts, otters or water voles) due to the lack of suitable habitat.

43. The landscaping proposals include some native planting within the area of land along the northern boundary of the site which currently falls within the SINC designation and trees within the adjoining Alpine House site project over some of this land. Whilst some native planting is proposed along of this boundary, much of this 3 m wide strip is proposed to be grassed and a small element of it, adjacent to unit 1 and 8, is proposed to be hard surfaced. It is considered that additional planting should be provided along the northern boundary of the site to ensure that this area of the SINC is suitably maintained and enhanced. It is accordingly considered that a 3 m wide strip along the northern boundary of the site should be planted with suitable native species, which would include a reduction in the width of the proposed hardstanding for unit 1 adjacent to the boundary. Given the size of the space between the northern wall of flat 8 and the boundary, it is not feasible for this planted buffer to project into this space and it is recommended that the hard and soft landscaping proposals remain as currently proposed in this area. This will result in a loss of a very small (3 m x 6 m) strip of the land currently designated as part of the SINC. However, the improvements to the remainder of the SINC are considered to outweigh this very minor reduction. The Ecological Assessment recommended that additional native planting is provided along the eastern boundary of the site. However, only limited plant is shown in the current landscape drawings. As such, details of further native planting along this boundary are recommended to be secured through condition. Measures to protect the existing trees that are proposed to be retained are also recommended to be secured through condition.

Highways and Transportation

44. Honeypot Lane is a London Distributor Road and the borough boundary runs along its centre line. The site has low accessibility to public transport (PTAL 2) with 4 bus routes and Queensbury Station, within walking distance from the site. Objectors have raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on parking and traffic congestion, and that this will result in traffic accidents. Overspill parking associated with the adjoining Alpine House development has resulted in the recent implementation of double yellow lines along Honeypot Lane and requests from residents for the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone to address the parking issues. Brent Highways engineers have had numerous residents' meetings with both Brent and Harrow Councillors, with parking on Honeypot Lane and the surrounding residential streets (which lie within L.B. Harrow). Objectors also highlight concern regarding the impacts of construction traffic.
45. Car parking standards are set out in appendix 1 of the adopted Development Management Policies (DMP). The proposed residential units will have a parking allowance of 1 space per 1-2 bed units and 1.5 spaces per 3 bed units, giving a total allowance of 56 spaces for this development as a whole. A total of 39 parking spaces are proposed within the basement, including 3-4 disabled spaces. This falls marginally (3 spaces) below the 75 % level that is typically considered likely to represent the likely parking demand. However, the applicant considers the proposed level of parking to be sufficient if regard is given to census data. It is specified within the Transport Statement that parking spaces will be allocated to households rather than properties, administered by a management company. This assists in ensuring that parking demand is met as opposed to the parking spaces being purchased or allocated and subsequently kept empty. Furthermore, the scheme is proposed to be supported by a Travel Plan, and the location of nearby Car Club spaces (none are proposed within this scheme, but there is a car in the adjacent Alpine House development) is proposed to be highlighted to residents. With these measures in place, it is considered that the shortfall of 3 spaces (below the 75 % level) is not considered likely to result in significant levels of over-spill parking on the surrounding streets. However, there are current proposals for a controlled parking zone in the area and therefore to mitigate against the potential impact of overspill parking, it is recommended that the development should be parking permit restricted, whereby future residents are not eligible for on-street parking permits. The CPZ is scheduled for

implementation in Spring/Summer 2018 and has sufficient funding, so will be in place prior to first occupation of the proposed development if consent is granted and the scheme goes ahead.

46. The implementation of double yellow lines within the sections of Honeypot Lane outside of the development site is also considered necessary to mitigate against the impacts of potential overspill parking on highway flow and therefore safety, which can be secured as a part of the Section 278 works for the proposed development. These measures are considered to be sufficient to mitigate against the potential impacts of overspill parking associated with the proposed development.
47. The roller shutters for basement parking area are proposed to be set back 5.6 m from the footway to allow vehicles to wait on private property whilst waiting for the roller shutters to open. The ramp down to the basement does allow two way vehicle flow. The width and location of the crossover is considered to be acceptable. However, a front boundary wall should be provided to ensure that vehicles do not drive across the footway outside of the crossover.
48. The crossover for the access to the substation is proposed to be constructed of grasscrete, which is considered to be beneficial given the infrequent future usage of this access. It is proposed to be 6 m from the refuge on the road, which is considered to be sufficient. However, it is proposed to be 3.4 m wide whereas it should not exceed 2.4 m, with no kerb radii and 50 mm margins, which is sufficient for one vehicle to access the substation. A condition is recommended regarding the width of the crossover. Again, the front boundary wall should extend to the edge of the crossover to prevent illegal crossing of the footway.
49. In terms of vehicular trips associated with the development, the submitted Transport Statement projects the estimated number of arrivals and departures having regard to other sites using the TRICS database. It specifies that the development is likely to generate 9 arrivals/departures in the morning peak hour and 6 in the evening peak hour. Whilst many of the selected sites are not considered to be directly relevant (some high a higher PTAL), the number of trips associated with the proposed development is unlikely to give rise to an increase in the amount of traffic that is of significant detriment to highway flow and safety given the scale of the development and the nature of the adjoining road.
50. It is considered important that the approval and implementation of the Travel Plan is secured to support the development, and that the approval and implementation of a Construction Method Statement (CMS) is also secured. The construction of developments does inevitably result in some impacts on local residents whether this relates to an extension to a house or a Major development. Planning cannot reasonably prevent development from taking place because of this impact. However, Major developments consents look to promote best practice in construction through the implementation of a Construction Method Statement. Whilst it is acknowledged that this does not result in zero impact on surrounding residents, it looks to minimise impacts where possible.
51. The bin store will be located on the ground floor on the southern frontage of the site. This will provide a straightforward collection from the Public Highway.
52. Cycle storage will be provided in four locations on the ground and basement levels. This will provide a total of 88 cycle spaces, which is compliant with the London Plan standards. The spaces will be in a secure and covered location.
53. The concerns regarding parking and congestion raised by local residents are recognised. It is also recognised that other recent developments (such as the Alpine House development) have resulted in significant increases in local levels of parking. It is considered that the implementation of the Controlled Parking Zone, the parking permit restriction applied to future residents of this scheme, the additional double yellow lines in Honeypot Lane and the other associated measures discussed above sufficiently mitigate the potential for over-spill parking and the associated potential impacts. The restriction on car parking spaces together with the Travel Plan are such that the levels of additional congestion are not considered likely to result in a significant impact on traffic congestion. As such, it is considered that the proposed measures are sufficient to address the potential impacts raised by objectors. Objectors are also concerned that cars may be vandalised as they have to park on the road. Over-spill parking on the

highway associated with the development is to be controlled through a parking permit restriction. Nevertheless, any on-street parking that may occur is no more likely to suffer from damage through vandalism than parking for any other homes in the area and any risk of vandalism would not be contrary to planning policy.

Noise from end use and impact of existing noise on proposed units

54. The residential nature of the scheme is such that the proposed development is not likely to result in unduly detrimental end use noise issues in itself. However, it is situated on a relatively busy road and a noise assessment has accordingly been submitted to support the proposal. This identifies that noise reduction associated with the fenestration within the scheme will need to achieve noise reduction levels of between 29 and 34 dB, which is easily achievable within the scheme. As such, it is recommended that a condition is attaching requiring the fenestration within the scheme to meet the design levels set out within the Acoustic Assessment.

Construction noise and nuisance

55. Objectors have cited concerns regarding the dust and pollution associated with construction. As with the potential impacts of the construction of the development on the highway network, best practice is also promoted in relation to the noise and other nuisance (e.g. dust and pollution) associated with construction of a development, with measures secured through the Construction Method Statement. It should be noted that in relation to these matters, there is also control through environmental health legislation and a planning cannot duplicate any controls that are available under other legislation. Nevertheless, the submission demonstrates that through good site practice and the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, the impact of dust and particulate matter may be effectively mitigated with the resultant impacts being negligible.

Air quality

56. In terms of the potential impacts of local air quality on future residents, the submitted air quality assessment demonstrates that the predicted concentrations of pollutants are below the relevant objective levels across the sites. An assessment of Air Quality Neutrality has submitted along with the application. This has shown that the Proposed Development is air quality neutral with regards to buildings emissions but not air quality neutral with regards to transportation emissions. Given the need to provide car parking for the site, it is considered impractical to achieve air quality neutral in relation to transport emissions in this instance. London Plan Policy 7.14 specifies that where on-site provision is impractical or inappropriate, that planning obligations should be used to off-set the impact. A contribution of £15,000 is recommended to be secured through Section 106 to mitigate the impacts of the development through a contribution to the implementation of the Air Quality Action Plan.

Sustainability and energy

57. The application has included an Energy and Sustainability Statement. At the time the planning application was submitted London Plan policy 5.2 requires a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 40% based on 2010 Building Regulations (equivalent to 35% based on the 2013 regulations). The Energy Statement indicates the scheme will include fabric efficiency measures and PV panels. The scale of the development is considered to be too small to make include CHP and there are no district wide heat network in this area. A total of 21% reduction in regulated CO₂ emissions is predicted. It has been determined that this is the maximum reduction in CO₂ emissions that can feasibly be achieved from on-site measures. The remaining 14% in CO₂ reductions required to achieve the 35% minimum target as required by The London Plan is to be made up through a carbon offsetting scheme that will need to be secured through the Section 106 legal agreement.
58. London Plan policy 5.15 states residential developments are to be designed to meet the target of 105 litres or less per head per day. It is highlighted this will be sought, but final calculations based on sanitary ware specifics will need to be undertaken. It is recommended that a condition is attached to ensure this standard will be achieved.

Flood Risk and Drainage

59. The site is within flood zone 1 and is therefore considered to be at a low risk from flooding.
60. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment also includes a drainage strategy which examines surface water

run-off from the site. The submitted strategy looks to achieve an urbanised Greenfield run-off rate of 2 l/s for a the design "1 in 100 year plus 40 % climate change" storm. Various sustainable drainage systems were considered, including green roofs, swales, rainwater harvesting, porous paving and an attenuation tank. It is proposed that this design level is achieved through the use of green roofs together with an attenuation tank (a 9.75 m3 tank is proposed to exceed the 84 m3 requirement to achieve this run-off rate). The submission therefore looks to improve the surface water run-off characteristics of the site, achieving Greenfield runoff rates for the design storm event taking into account climate change. The implementation of these measures is recommended to be secured through condition.

Archaeological Impact

61. The site is not within a designated Site of Archaeological Interest. Nevertheless, a Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been submitted which specifies that there is low archaeological potential for all past period, and that the development proposals are very unlikely to have a significant or widespread archaeological impact.

Density

62. This site has a public transport accessibility level of 2 and the site has the characteristics of an "urban" setting. The London Plan density matrix (Table 3.2) therefore suggests a residential density of between 70 and 170 units per hectare and between 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare for this scheme. The density of the proposed development is 197 units per hectare or 580 habitable rooms per hectare. Whilst this exceeds the range set out in the London Plan density matrix, the proposed building represents a form of development that is in keeping with its context, provides a good standard of residential accommodation and provides sufficient (but not excessive) levels of parking. As such, the proposal is considered to optimise the use of the site.

Other matters raised by objectors

63. The majority of issues raised by objectors have been discussed above. Some objectors have cited concern that the proposed development will affect the value of their property. The effect on property value (whether positive or negative) cannot be considered within a planning application.
64. Objectors have also raised concern that the proposal represents the over-development of the site. Whether a proposal represents more development than a site has capacity to accommodate depends on a number of factors which cannot be mitigated. For example, it can exhibit itself as a form of development that is excessively large and out of context with the area, which is not the case for this development. Another example is where a proposal results in the provision of poor quality accommodation which does not meet the appropriate standards, which is not the case. In other instances, it can be seen through an excessive level of impact where such impact should not be apparent, which may relate to the impact on light or outlook, or on the local highway network. Again, the proposal is not considered to result in unduly detrimental impacts with regard to these matters (when considered against planning policy and guidance). The Mayor's Density Matrix does not provide a good indication of over-development as it is a basic methodology which simply looks at site size and public transport access. A scheme that is within the Mayor's density range may propose too much development for a constrained site while another proposal that is above may have appropriate levels of impact and pay an appropriate regard to the character of the area. In this instance, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with policy and guidance and is not considered to represent the over-development of the site.

Conclusion

65. Officers consider that the scheme meets planning policy objectives and is in general conformity with local, regional and national policy. The proposal would make a positive contribution to the area, whilst having an acceptable impact on and relationship with the existing surrounding development. Officers recommend the application for approval subject to the conditions and obligations set out in this report.

CIL DETAILS

This application is liable to pay **£658,417.90*** 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): 1417 sq. m.
Total amount of floorspace on completion (G): 3610 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	3610		2193	£200.00	£35.15	£559,998.21	£98,419.69

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	£559,998.21	£98,419.69

*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: 17/1829

To: Alun Evans
CGMS
140 London Wall
LONDON
EC2Y 5DN

I refer to your application dated **25/04/2017** proposing the following:

Demolition of the existing care home building and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of a five storey building providing 50 self-contained flats (4 studios, 11 x 1bed, 23 x 2bed and 12 x 3bed) with associated basement level, car and cycle parking space, bin stores, amenity space and landscaping

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:
Please refer to condition 2.

at **The Willows, 136 Honeypot Lane, London, NW9 9QA**

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: 05/09/2017

Signature:

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 proposed development is in general accordance with the:-

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
London Plan Consolidated with amendments since 2011 (March 2016)
Brent Core Strategy 2010
Brent Development Management Policies 2016
Brent Supplementary Planning Guidance 17: Design Guide for a New Dwelling

- 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):

489-2b-001_A
489-2b-002_A
489-2b-010
489-2b-011
489-2b-030
489-2b-031
489-2b-100_B
489-2b-101_B
489-2b-110_I
489-2b-111_I
489-2b-112_G
489-2b-113_G
489-2b-114_G
489-2b-115_G
489-2b-116_E
489-2b-200_C
489-2b-300_E
489-2b-301_F
489-2b-310_B
489-2b-320_B
489-2b-321_B

Design & Access Statement April 2017
Residential Proposed Areas - Rev. E
16.313-P-201 Tree Species
Sustainability Statement
Flood Risk Assessment
Planning Statement & Statement of Community Involvement
Transport Statement
Daylight & Sunlight Report 11 April 2017
Noise Assessment Report
Air Quality Assessment
Energy Strategy Report
Use Assessment April 2017

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

- 3 The car parking spaces, refuse storage, cycle storage, private and communal amenity spaces identified on the approved plans shall be laid out and made available prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The spaces / storage shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the Development and not used other than for purposes ancillary to the residential units within the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the highways network is appropriate and that the development is fit for purpose.

- 4 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.

- 5 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.

- 6 Site clearance shall not be undertaken other than outside of the bird breeding season (March to September inclusive) unless it takes place immediately after a nesting bird check has been undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist.

Reason: In the interest of the ecological value of the adjoining land and the preservation of protected species, in accordance with the submitted ecological assessment.

- 7 Details of materials for all external work, including samples which shall be made available for viewing on site (or in another location as agreed), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced excluding site clearance, demolition and basement/foundation works. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

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

- 8 The fenestration for the development hereby approved shall meet or exceed the levels of noise reduction set out within the Noise Assessment Report Version 1.2 dated 28/3/2017.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory environment is provided for future residents.

- 9 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 + A1:2013 and 'Model Procedures of for the Management of Land Contamination – Contaminated Land Report 11' (CLR 11). A report shall be submitted in writing to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of building works (excluding demolition), 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.

Reason: To ensure the safe development and secure occupancy of the site

- 10 Any soil contamination remediation measures required by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out in full. A verification report shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority, confirming that remediation has been carried out in accordance with the approved remediation scheme and the site is suitable for end use (unless the Planning Authority has previously confirmed that no remediation measures are required).

Reason: To ensure the safe development and secure occupancy of the site.

- 11 Prior to commencement of the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and the laying of foundations), further details of how the development will be built so that 90% of the residential units achieve Building Regulations requirement M4(2) – ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’ and that the remaining 10% of the residential units achieve Building Regulations requirement M4(3) – ‘wheelchair user dwellings’ shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves an inclusive design in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.8.

- 12 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 the erection of any external lighting. 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 nearby residents and the ecological value of the adjoining land.

- 13 Within 6 months after the commencement of development, details of the hard and soft landscaping of the areas identified within the drawings hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:

- Plant species, size, density/number and location;
- Additional planting to improve ecological value adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, and an additional 3 m wide area of ecological planting adjacent to the northern boundary of the site situated between the terrace of flat 8 and the eastern site boundary, including details showing the location of this area together with ecological planting within this area;
- Hard landscaping and any other landscape features;
- Details of childrens play areas and equipment;
- Means of enclosure / boundary treatments;

The approved landscaping proposals shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter maintained and retained.

Any trees or shrubs planting that is part of the approved scheme or proposed to be retained that within 5 years of planting (or of the completion of the work in relation to retained plants) 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 position, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve the amenities of nearby residents and to prevent privacy being

compromised.

- 14 Prior to commencement of the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and the laying of foundations), a energy implementation strategy setting out how the scheme will reduce the developments carbon emissions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall consider means of using less energy within the development, as required by the 'be lean' and 'be green' criterion set out in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. The report shall demonstrate that additional measures have been considered and if applicable, identify any additional energy saving measures that are viable for implementation together with the level of carbon reduction associated with the proposed measures and any shortfall in carbon reduction below the target of 35 % set out within the London Plan.

Following approval of the details, the additional energy saving measures identified shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter maintained and retained for the life of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development has maximised its carbon savings, in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.2.

- 15 Prior to the commencement of the development, a Construction Method Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise, and other environmental impacts of the development and potential impact on the highway including any required temporary traffic management or temporary highway closures required for loading / unloading of materials/equipment. The approved plan shall be implemented throughout the duration of construction.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the neighbours by minimising impacts of the development that would otherwise give rise to nuisance.

- 16 Prior to the commencement of the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and the laying of foundations), a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the neighbours by minimising impacts of the development that would otherwise give rise to nuisance.

- 17 Prior to the commencement of works, an updated badger survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority examining the potential for badger habitation within the application site and including any relevant mitigation measures. Any mitigation measures set out within the survey shall be implemented in full throughout the construction period and prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interest of the ecological value of the adjoining land and the preservation of protected species, in accordance with the submitted ecological assessment.

- 18 A parking management and allocation scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and the parking spaces shall be allocated to occupants of the development in accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented for the life of the development.

Reason: In the interest of highway flow and safety, having regard to the levels of parking proposed within the proposed development.

- 19 Prior to the commencement of works (excluding site clearance and demolition), details of site drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those details shall be in accordance with the targets set within the Flood Risk Assessment hereby approved (reference 6586 dated April 2017) shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter maintained and retained for the life of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

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 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.
- 3 Please note that the Council's Network Management Team should be contacted to discuss any traffic management / parking suspension required for this site, prior to the submission of a construction management plan as Honeypot Lane is a distributor route and traffic sensitive road.
- 4 Given the age of the buildings to be demolished it is possible that asbestos may be present. The applicant should be reminded of their duties under the Control of Asbestos Regulations and must ensure that a qualified asbestos contractor is employed to remove all asbestos and asbestos-containing materials and arrange for the appropriate disposal of such materials.
- 5 Environmental Health advise that the quality of imported soil must be verified by means of in-situ soil sampling and analysis. They do not accept soil quality certificates from the soil supplier as proof of soil quality.
- 6 The provisions of The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. An explanatory booklet setting out your obligations can be obtained from the Communities and Local Government website www.communities.gov.uk
- 7 The applicant must ensure, before work commences, that the treatment/finishing of flank walls can be implemented as this may involve the use of adjoining land and should also ensure that all development, including foundations and roof/guttering treatment is carried out entirely within the application property.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Mandeep Chaggar, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 020 8937 5346