

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 11 February, 2026

Case No. **25/0041**

Location	Little Trainers Playgroup and Hazel Road Community Centre, 26 Hazel Road and Harriet Tubman House, 28 Hazel Road, London, NW10 5PP
Description	Demolition of all existing buildings and structures and erection of 4 storey mixed-use building comprising of training centre and community hall uses (Use Classes F1/F2), with roof and rear first floor terraces, associated cycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping and all other associated and ancillary works.

Agenda Page Number: 37-74

Further objections have been received on behalf of the Willesden Local History Society, who previously commented on the application. Within this objection, concerns were raised on the number of matters as summarised below:

- That there is factually incorrect information within the further comments received from Brent's Principal Heritage Officer (November 2025);
- That it is incorrect that the building was not locally listed as it was not considered to have reached the threshold for local listing;
- That the Society do not agree with the heritage significance score that the Principal Heritage Officer has given to the building;
- That the application has not been considered fully against, and is contrary to, policies BHC1, DMP1, BD1 and BP6.

Further comments from Brent's Heritage Officer (November 2025)

The objector has stated that Brent's Principal Heritage Officer's further heritage comments dated November 2025 contains "serious errors" that have affected their assessment of the heritage significance of the former Victorian mission hall.

The heritage comments dated 6 November 2025 included the following passage referring to the origins of Harriet Tubman House:

"It was built as an Anglican mission hall in a practical late Victorian ecclesiastical style in 1899, to the designs of an unknown architect. It was opened in 1900 as the 'St Martin's Institute & Mission Hall' and continued in ecclesiastic use for around a quarter of a century. The building has had a number of other uses during the past century."

The Principal Heritage Officer has reviewed those comments and advises that comments should have referred to 1888 and 1889 respectively and specified that it opened as the 'Christ Church Mission' and continued in ecclesiastical use for around 35 years. These corrections do not affect the heritage significance attributed to the building, the local list suitability rating given by the council, or the balance of benefit and harm associated with the application proposals.

Local list and heritage significance

The objector has also specified that there is an incorrect statement within the further heritage

comments that the site building was not locally listed because it was not considered to have reached the necessary threshold for local listing. They also challenge the local list assessment scoring attributed to the building by the Council's Principal Heritage Officer, contending that it should be given a local listing assessment score of 9 (out of 12) which would mean the building would have a relatively high level of significance for a locally listed building in Brent.

Harriet Tubman House was identified in 2016 as part of a long list of local buildings that LB Brent had intended to assess for their suitability for addition to its local list. At the time that this application (25/0041) was submitted, neither Harriet Tubman House nor the other buildings on the long list had been through the full assessment process for local listing, which would include the full assessment against the local listing criteria to establish its suitability for local listing, consultation, approval, and then publication. The objector is correct that the absence of its local listing was not due to a low score being given for the building in the past. The building has been treated as a non-designated heritage asset, with the council's previous Principal Heritage Officer (who also undertook the 2016 long listing exercise) attributing the building as having a relative low-medium level of heritage significance for a non-designated heritage asset. As set out in the report, the Council's current Principal Heritage Officer has assessed the building against the Council's local listing criteria and has given the building a score of 5. The professional opinion of the Principal Heritage Officer is that the heritage significance of the building would not be sufficient to warrant the building's addition to the local list.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that locally listed buildings are also non-designated heritage assets. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF is applicable to all non-designated heritage assets, including locally listed buildings and those that are not on the local list, and the provisions within Paragraph 216 have been considered and discussed within the main committee report.

For clarity, paragraph 216 is as follows:

216. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Furthermore, Brent Local Plan policy BHC1 also relates to non-designated heritage assets irrespective of whether they are on the local list or not. It is set out within paragraph (e) of BHC1 that loss of a heritage assets should be exceptional, and that the loss of a heritage asset would require clear and convincing justification that is outweighed by material planning considerations in the form of sufficiently powerful public benefits.

The application has been considered in line with paragraph 216 of the NPPF and Brent Local Plan policy BHC1. Whichever view is taken on the heritage significance of the building, the proposal would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset. The balance of benefit and harm has been discussed within the committee report, with officers concluding that the benefits of the proposal do outweigh the harm. However, when making a decision on this application, members must apply the planning balance themselves, weigh the benefits of the proposal (summarised in paragraph 37 of the report) against this harm (the loss of this non-designated heritage asset), and determine whether they consider that permission should be granted. This exercise must be undertaken whether one is to attribute the building a local listing assessment score of 5 in line with the advice of the Council's Principal Heritage Officer or 9 in line with the views of the Willesden Local History Society, but noting that the application of the planning balance would naturally be affected by the relative level of significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

That the proposal was not fully considered against policies BHC1, DMP1, BD1 and BP6

The objector has stated that the council has failed consider the application against the full wording of policies BHC1, DMP1 and BD1, and that no reference has been made to policy BP6 in the committee report. They go on to state that the proposal fails to comply with these policies.

Officers must assess how much information should be included in the report to the planning committee, and, on a fair reading of the report as a whole, officers must have presented sufficient information for the committee to reach a decision on the application. In doing so, officers must summarise key aspects of the application submission, policies and the surrounding context.

In this case the committee report has set out that the determination of this application should be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate and reference what documents comprise the development plan. It goes onto list key policies of relevance rather than the full set of policies.

Policy BP6 “South East” sets out the overall vision for this geographical part of the Borough. It highlights the need to strengthen local identity and character by (a) conserving and enhancing heritage assets. The application has assessed the impact of the proposal upon relevant heritage assets, including those within the application site and those present in the local townscape setting.

The objector has also stated that the committee report fails to include the requirement in policy DMP1 that 'complements the locality' includes the requirement to 'conserve and where possible enhance the significance of heritage assets (part d of the policy). As set out above and in the report, the application has assessed the impact of the proposal upon heritage assets including those within the application site and the setting of those further afield, and has also considered the how the proposal sits within its context.

The proposal has also been considered in line with policy BD1 “Leading the way in good urban design”. A discussion of the design, layout and massing has been included in the committee report, and the proposal is considered to be of a good quality design which is appropriate for this location having regarding to the surrounding context.

Recommendation: That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions and Section 106 obligations as set out within the committee report.