



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 13 November 2019 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Johnson (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Ahmed (substitute for Councillor Mahmood), S Butt, Chappell, Hylton, Maurice and Sangani.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Mary Daly.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Denselow and Mahmood.

1. **Declarations of interests**

None.

Approaches.

Keelers Service Centre, Harrow Road, Wembley HA0 2LL

All members received correspondence from the applicant's agent.

Most members had been customers of Keelers garage in the past.

290B Ealing Road, Wembley HA0 4LL

All members received correspondence from the objector's agent.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting - 16 October 2019**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 October 2019 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to the addition of Councillor Ahmed as being present (substitute for Councillor Johnson).

3. **Keelers Service Centre, Harrow Road, Wembley, HA0 2LL (Ref. 18/3069)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing M.O.T testing centre and erection of a part 5 and part 6 storey mixed use building comprising office (Use class B1) at ground floor and 22 residential units on the 1st to 5th floors (6 x 3 bed; 8 x 2 bed and 8 x 1 bed); plant room in basement; PV panels at roof level, cycle parking and waste storage (revised description).

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee reports.

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

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's 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.

That, if by the "expiry date" of the planning application the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

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.

Ms Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Team Leader) introduced the report and answered Members' questions. In reference to the supplementary report, she informed the Committee that officers had addressed the additional objection raised that the proposal would be of detriment to local parking stress and the character of the area in the main report.

Ms Kamil Kaul spoke in objection on behalf of Sudbury Town Residents Association (STRA) and added that STRA had sent a request late this afternoon, to the Secretary of State for the Environment to call in the application for the following reasons:

The proposed development is in conflict with the policies of the 2015 Sudbury Town Neighbourhood Plan; the development raises significant architectural and urban design issues which, if granted, would set a significant precedent for further high-rise development in the area; inadequate period within which residents could respond appropriately to the officer's report. She therefore requested the Committee to defer consideration of the application pending the Secretary of State's decision on the request.

David Glover (Development Management Manager) recommended that the application be considered by the Committee and that if a resolution is passed, that resolution is subject to the consideration of the call-in request by the Secretary of State.

The Chair invited Saira Tamboo (legal representative) to advise on the legality to consider the application within the context of the call in. She advised that members could proceed to determine the application pending the outcome of the call in request.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Daly (ward member) declared that she had been approached by residents. Councillor Daly objected to the application on grounds of unacceptable noise from articulated lorries on

servicing activities, failure to meet servicing standards and lack of transparency and information about alternative uses of the site. Councillor Daly requested deferral of the application until officers had resolved the above concerns.

Mr Lloyd Gold (agent) spoke in support of the application highlighting the car free scheme, provision of affordable housing, contribution towards CPZ for the proposed development located within an area of good PTAL rating. In response to members' questions, Mr Gold submitted that the use of the ground floor of the proposed development for light industrial use would have been inappropriate in this location. He added that the proposed retail use would generate more employment than the current use as an MOT service centre. He then outlined the consultation carried out by the applicant.

During question time, members sought clarification on a number of issues including: parking, design appearance and outlook, daylight assessment, height, public realm improvements, the loss of the existing use and provision of the office use, affordable housing and amenity space to which officers provided responses. Members noted that a parking permit restricted development had been proposed with contributions towards the introduction of CPZ, but that this would be subject to consultation. The potential impacts on daylight and sunlight received by surrounding properties was discussed together with the pre-application consultation that was undertaken. Officers considered the height appropriate within the context of the designated Sudbury Town Centre with buildings of a similar height nearby, and highlighted that the emerging local plan suggests 5-6 storey buildings may be appropriate within the Town Centre. Members were advised that although the affordable housing was below 50%, the provision of 3 shared ownership units was the maximum achievable within the viability assessment which would be subject to a late stage viability review to capture any uplift.

In the ensuing discussion, members took note of the promotion of a car club to residents including the offer of two years' initial membership but requested whether this period could be increased to 3 years through the S106 Agreement. This was agreed. Members noted that there were adequate measures within the construction management plan to preserve residential amenity. Prior to voting, Alice Lester (Operational Director of Regeneration) reiterated the legal advice pending the outcome of the request for a call in to the secretary of State.

DECISION: Minded to grant planning consent as recommended subject to the Secretary of State's decision not to call in the application, and amended Heads of Terms within the Section 106 Agreement to include:

3-year Car Club membership,

Mitigate the shortfall in external amenity space to include an off-site contribution of £10,000 towards improvements to Barham Park and may include enhanced accessibility to or within the park and other open space/play improvement.

(Voting on the amended recommendation was: For 6; Abstention 1)

4. 290B Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 4LL Ref. 19/1761)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing warehouse building (Use class B8) and erection of part-one, part-three storey residential development providing nine self-contained dwellings (8 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed) with associated cycle storage, bin stores, landscaping and amenity space.

RECOMMENDATION: To GRANT planning permission subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's 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.

That, if by the "expiry date" of the planning application the legal agreement has not been completed the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

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.

Mr Liam McFadden (Planning Officer) introduced the report and answered Members' questions.

Mrs Carla Quail objected to the proposed development because it would be overbearing, giving rise to loss of light and loss of privacy. She also raised concerns regarding changes that had been made to the scheme.

Mr Andrew Boothby (objector's agent) submitted that neighbours and surrounding occupiers had not had an opportunity to review and comment on the amendments to the scheme. He also objected to the proposal because of its height, which would result in overlooking, loss of privacy and harm to residential amenities

Mr Simon Owen (applicant's agent) highlighted key aspects of the scheme and referenced the changes to it including design and waste management, following consultation with Alperton Community School. He added that privacy and outlook were addressed within the design of the scheme and were no longer an issue.

In response to Members' questions, officers discussed and clarified issues raised by members on recycling, overlooking, traffic impact including access for

emergency vehicles and servicing arrangements. Members heard that as a permit free development, the scheme would not give rise to significant parking issues. Officers highlighted the relevance of the Inspector's appeal decision adding that the Planning Inspector had considered some of the concerns that Members were raising.

At the Chair's invitation, Members who wished to vote against the application stated their reasons as follows; obstruction to parking, access for emergency vehicles, outlook and overlooking. With a split vote, the Chair exercised his casting vote in favour of the recommendation to grant permission.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to a condition to ensure the proposed obscured glazing was maintained.
(Voting was recorded as follows: For 4, Against 3, Abstention 1)

5. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm

COUNCILLOR R. JOHNSON
Vice Chair (In the Chair)