Agenda Item 04

# Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 29 March, 2021 Case No.

20/2257

Location Description Willesden Green Garage, St Pauls Avenue, London, NW2 5TG Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) to allow for

- Internal alterations to facilitate the creation of 6 additional residential units
- External alterations to include additional windows, winter gardens and roof terrace
- Reduction in size of basement and repositioned ramp

and Variation of Condition 17 (Mix) of full planning application 17/5291, allowed on appeal dated 17 December 2019 (amended under non material amendment application 20/1873) for Demolition of MOT garage and erection of a part seven-storey and part four storey building with basement level to provide residential units with ground, third and fourth floor amenity spaces and ground floor play area, provision of basement car parking, cycle and refuse storage, alterations to vehicular accesses and associated landscaping

## Agenda Page Number: 95-122

The roof of the consented development was proposed to be a zinc with a zinc canopy with the top floor proposed to be glazed brick. The proposed scheme omits the zinc roof with the top floor proposed to be of brick construction with brick parapet to the roof. However, the applicant has agreed for the top floor to also be glazed brick to be more consistent with the extant permission and to create a distinct top to the building. A framed glazed canopy has been retained around the roof. Whilst the zinc roof has been omitted, as stated in the committee report the development continues to follow the design intention of the extant scheme with the resulting scheme very similar in appearance and continues to utilise high quality materials, which are considered to be acceptable. The brick parapet would also have the benefit of better screening the proposed PV panels.

In order to control the roof materials, the following condition (condition 18) is proposed

18. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the materials to the seventh floor shall be glazed brick, samples of which are to be submitted under condition 3 of this permission.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

### Amendments to conditions

Amended plans have also been received, showing slight amendments to the plant doors at ground floor. The approved plans condition (condition 2) is therefore amended to update the ground floor plan to 2999-ACA-XX-00-DR-A\_8071 Rev 16 L00 Floor Plan

Condition 4 which relates to the basement layout incorrectly refers to 8 disabled parking spaces. As such this condition is amended to refer to the provision of 7 instead of 8 disabled parking spaces.

Furthermore conditions 16 (detailed design and construction) and 17 (piling and excavation) have now been

- 16. Unless carried out with the details already discharged under application ref. 20/3994, prior to the commencement of development further details of a detailed design and construction method (in consultation with London Underground) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which:
- · provides details on the use of tall plant
- · accommodate the location of the existing London Underground structures

The approved details shall be implemented in full and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not impact on existing London Underground transport infrastructure, in accordance with London Plan and 'Land for Industry and Transport' Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012.

- 17. Unless carried out with the details already discharged under application ref. 20/3996, prior to the commencement of development further details of piling and excavation works (in consultation with Network Rail) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which provide details of:
- · Vibro-compaction machinery/piling machinery
- · Ground treatment works
- · A method statement to include the proposed methods of piling, excavation and construction

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development

Reason: To ensure that there is no impact upon critical railway infrastructure

### Further comments received

Since the publication of the agenda 2 additional comments have been received. The issues raised have been addressed in the main committee report, however further comments are provided to clarify aspects.

### Transport

Concerns have been raised with regards to the accuracy of the data submitted in the Transport Statement and Framework Travel Plan. This information has been reviewed by Transport Officers who consider the information submitted acceptable. It should be noted that a revised Travel Plan is to be secured via legal agreement.

In the case of the Transport Statement submitted this has updated the trip generation assessment from the extant scheme, based upon surveys undertaken at four similarly sized blocks of private flats in outer London. This updated assessment estimates a total of 9 arrivals/36 departures in the morning peak hour (8-9am) and 30 arrivals/21 departures in the evening peak hour (5-6pm) by all modes of transport. These numbers are actually slightly lower than for the original assessment, despite the increase in the number of flats.

Census 2011 data was again used as the basis for assigning these trips by mode, with 18% of trips assumed to be by car drivers. On this basis, the development is now estimated to generate 2 arrivals/7 departures in the morning peak hour and 6 arrivals/4 departures in the evening peak hour by car. As before, this level of vehicle movement is not considered likely to have any significant impact on the local road network, with the existing car repair garage currently generating greater numbers of vehicle movements.

For other modes, 29 movements in the morning peak hour and 33 movements in the evening peak hour are now estimated to be made by public transport. This again amounts to less than one additional passenger per bus and tube service passing the site, so is not considered significant enough to cause any concern.

Purely pedestrian and cyclist trips also remain low enough not to be of concern.

Servicing trips have also been examined in more detail, with 1-2 HGV deliveries to the site estimated per day. This is again lower than for the existing garage, with service vehicles able to load safely from the double yellow lines on St. Paul's Avenue fronting the site.

Finally, the accident analysis for the area has been updated to cover the extended five-year period from January 2014-February 2019. This identified one further accident in the immediate vicinity of the site over the additional two years of the study, which is not considered to result in the proposed development being a highway safety concern.

### External appearance/landscaping

The objection raised concern with regards to the lack of soft landscaping to the St Pauls Avenue, however there would be no loss of soft landscaping to St Pauls Avenue itself. Whilst the loss of the green roof is acknowledged, this particular element of soft landscaping was located on a flat roof and set back from the frontage due to the position of the ramp. Therefore whilst a visible addition from the side facing windows at 75/75A St Pauls Avenue, its amenity benefits from public viewpoints would be more limited.

An objection has also been received on the basis of the boundary treatment to visible street frontages. As with the consented scheme this is brick with railing but now shown to be of a consistent height of 1.8m. Whilst a consistent and greater height is shown on the drawings (whereas previously the height of the boundary treatment was reduced along St Pauls Avenue) full details of boundary treatments are required to be submitted by condition. It should however be noted that any boundary treatment to the front would need to be of a suitable height to balance future residents privacy and ensure an acceptable impact on the street scene.

Whilst the objection also makes reference to the materiality of the development no longer being consistent with the extant scheme, this is not considered to be the case particularly given the agreed change to the top floor. In addition there is often a range of different materials that would all result in an acceptable appearance.

#### Neighbouring amenity

The objection also raises issue with the side facing doors serving the plant room. Due to the nature of the room they serve, in is unlikely that the doors would frequently be in use or their installation would exacerbate create noise issues. The application has been accompanied by a noise assessment who shows any noise generated would be within reasonable limits and a further conditions are attached to this permission to control noise.

Recommendation: Remains Approval Subject to conditions, including an additional condition and revisions to the conditions as specified above.

DocSuppF