



Supplementary Planning Committee

Wednesday 16 November 2016 at 7.00 pm
Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)
Agha (Vice-Chair)
Hylton
Long
Maurice
Moher
J Mitchell Murray
Pitruzzella

Substitute Members

Councillors:

A Choudry, Colacicco, Daly, Ezeajughi, Hoda-Benn, Kabir, Khan and Naheerathan

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Governance Officer
020 8937 1354; joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:
democracy.brent.gov.uk

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 6.00pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

| ITEM | | WARD | PAGE |
|-------------|---|----------------|-------------|
| 4. | 6 Bowmans Trading Estate, Westmoreland Road NW9 9RL (Ref.16/0595) | Queensbury | 1 - 2 |
| 5. | 3 The Grove, Kingsbury, London NW9 0TL (Ref. 16/4104) | Fryent | 3 - 4 |
| 6. | 15 Littleton Road, Harrow HA1 3SY (Ref. 16/0852) | Northwick Park | 5 - 6 |
| 8. | Harlesden Christian Centre, Winchelsea Road NW10 (Ref. 16/0760) | Stonebridge | 7 - 8 |

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 November, 2016

Case No.

16/0595

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Location | 6 Bowmans Trading Estate, Westmoreland Road, London, NW9 9RL |
| Description | Demolition of existing single storey temple building and erection of a new 5 storey temple with a shikhar (tower), basement level for storage and plant equipment, ancillary library and educational use, priest accommodation, and a function room (Use class Sui Generis) along with associated parking and landscaping |

Agenda Page Number: Pages 29-64

Members sought further clarification regarding the traffic and travel surveys and the section 106 contributions.

Traffic Surveys

The results of two surveys were provided in the Transport Assessment – a questionnaire and parking beat surveys. The parking beat surveys was carried out by a suitably qualified professional (an independent survey company) examining the levels of parking in the surrounding area on a Tuesday and Saturday in May and on a Thursday and Saturday in November. The surveys were undertaken using a sound methodology and covers book week day and weekend parking. The number of people attending the temple on those days has not been specified. The results of the questionnaire were presented in the Transport Assessment, setting out the modal split of visitors to the existing temple (which included 70% of attendees walking). However, limited supporting information was provided as to how this was carried out. Officers have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the survey and continue to recommend that the scheme is approved subject to a Travel Plan, to be secured through the Section 106 agreement, within which the applicant will demonstrate how they propose to continue to achieve the projected levels of modal split in the future.

It is noted that on-street parking is saturated in the immediate vicinity already, so any potential over-spill parking will therefore take place in streets within the borough of Harrow. Harrow Council consider the proposal to be acceptable subject to the conditions and Section 106 obligations that have been recommended, including an obligation relating to the approval and implementation of a Travel Plan.

S106 Contributions

The financial contribution sought through the S106 agreement is proposed to be used in part towards the establishment of a CPZ in the area and also towards measures to improve footways and crossings close to the site. With regard to the CPZ contribution, this would be in addition to the contribution from the Alpine House development and calculated in line with the Council's approach to CPZ contributions established through previous planning committee decisions.

Recommendation: Remains to Grant Consent subject to conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 November, 2016

Case No. 16/4104

Location 3 The Grove, London, NW9 0TL
Description Reduction in the overall roof height of the single storey rear outbuilding from 2.85m to 2.5m

Agenda Page Number: 65

Further discussion regarding the Enforcement Appeal Decision for the existing outbuilding

- The outbuilding as constructed is 35 cm higher than the maximum height for an outbuilding that could be constructed adjacent to the boundary under Permitted Development (i.e. 2.85 m high as built compared to 2.5m which could be built under Permitted Development);
- The Inspector for the Planning Enforcement appeal noted that "a building of a height of 2.5m would be less intrusive above the boundary screening";
- However, the Inspector also specified that he had considered whether the harmful impact of the existing outbuilding could be reduced by imposing a condition to reduce its height, also specifying that a condition could also be imposed to require all of the external elevations to be rendered or painted, or to apply a trellis to the external walls. The inspector noted that while the basic appearance could be improved, it would not mitigate the harm caused by the overall massing of the structure, and that there is insufficient space around the building to allow landscape screening.

Having considered the outbuilding as altered (proposed height reduced to 2.5 m), the site context which includes the presence of outbuildings in some of the surrounding gardens and the size of an outbuilding that can be constructed under "Permitted Development", officers consider that the outbuilding (as altered by the proposal) does not result in an unduly detrimental impact on the amenities of surrounding occupants.

Recommendation: Remains approval

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 November, 2016

Case No.

16/0852

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Location | 15 Littleton Road, Harrow, HA1 3SY |
| Description | Demolition of the existing residential house and replacement with a new build detached house with basement accommodation and ancillary matters. (Re-consultation as application was made invalid due to site location not being clearly defined.) |

Agenda Page Number: 75

Members sought re-assurance that the potential risk of flooding of neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed basement development had been fully considered. The Brent Lead Local Flood Authority confirmed that this had been considered, and that the applicant has proposed adequate measures and precautions in relation to the potential flooding of the proposed dwelling and adjoining properties.

Following this response, a detailed comment was made by Councillor Perrin who set out anecdotal information from local residents regarding flooding that had taken place and suggested that a surface water drain that runs through the garden adjoining the subject site may be working beyond its capacity during heavy rainfall, or may be subject to downstream blockage, and thus could affect local surface water flooding. The Lead Local Flood Authority has recommended that this application is deferred to a later committee so that confirmation can be sought from Thames Water regarding the condition of their drainage network.

Recommendation: That this application is deferred to a later committee to allow additional information to be sought from Thames Water.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 November, 2016

Case No. 16/0760

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Location | Harlesden Christian Centre & Land next to and rear of Harlesden Christian Centre, Winchelsea Road, London |
| Description | Redevelopment of the site and surrounding land to include the demolition of the existing centre (Use class D1) and construction of five residential blocks ranging from 1 to 6 storeys high, comprising 178 residential units (67 x 1-bed, 60 x 2-bed flats, 24 x 2-bed maisonettes, 14 x 3-bed flats, 3 x 4-bed maisonettes, 8 x 3-bed houses and 2 x 4-bed houses) with associated private and communal amenity space, parking, access, landscaping and ancillary works (as amended). |

Agenda Page Number: 123-162

Further clarity has been sought on the off site affordable housing position. It can be confirmed that the 30% off site provision that is proposed to be located on Site 27, is as well as the 20% (22 units) already secured on Site 27 through the grant of planning permission 15/0822. The effect of this off site provision is that a total of 75 units of the 109 on Site 27 would be delivered as affordable as opposed to 22 units, representing an uplift to 69%.

Paragraph 75 of the published report refers to there being two disabled parking spaces located within the central servicing area. This is not the case, it is proposed that there are two marked servicing spaces located here.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

It should be noted that the CIL details referred to in the report do not take into account the existing eligible floorspace, of 228sqm. With this eligible floorspace included the CIL liability changes from £6.16m to £6.10m.

Recommendation: Remains approval

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank