



## Supplementary Planning Committee

**Wednesday 19 June 2019 at 6.00 pm**

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Denselow (Chair)  
Johnson (Vice-Chair)  
S Butt  
Chappell  
Hylton  
Mahmood  
Maurice  
Sangani

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

Ahmed, Dar, Ethapemi, Kabir, Kennelly, Lo,  
W Mitchell Murray and Patterson

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

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

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](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)**

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

**Members' briefing will take place at 5.00pm in Boardroom 5**

Please note this meeting will be filmed for live broadcast on the Council's website. By entering the meeting room you will be deemed to have consented to the possibility of being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting.

## **Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:**

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest\*\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also significant enough to affect your judgement of a public interest and either it affects a financial position or relates to a regulatory matter then after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

### **\*Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences**- Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

### **\*\*Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

(a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:

- To which you are appointed by the council;
- which exercises functions of a public nature;
- which is directed is to charitable purposes;
- whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party of trade union).

(b) The interests a of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who is the subject of a registrable personal interest.

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
3. Wembley Youth Centre and Land next to Ex Dennis Jackson Centre, London Road, Wembley, HA9 (Ref 18/4273)	Wembley Central	1 - 2
4. 2A, Preston Waye and 283, 285 & 287 Preston Road, Harrow, HA3 (Ref. 18/4902)	Barnhill	3 - 4
5. 110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS (Ref. 18/4675)	Mapesbury	5 - 6
6. 110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS Ref. 18/4701)	Mapesbury	7 - 8

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## Agenda Item 03

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 19 June, 2019**

Case No.

18/4273

---

Location	Wembley Youth Centre and Land next to Ex Dennis Jackson Centre, London Road, Wembley, HA9
Description	Demolition of community centre and erection of three residential blocks ranging from three to seven storeys in height comprising a total of 170 residential units (67 x 1 bed, 82 x 2 Bed, 13 x 3 Bed and 8 houses) with community centre, new vehicular and pedestrian access, provision for car parking, cycle and refuse storage, amenity spaces and gardens and associated landscaping.

The proposed development does not accord with the provisions of the development plan in force in the area as it seeks to develop land designated as open space within Brent's Core Strategy policy CP18.

#### **Agenda Page Number: 11-54**

#### Corrections in recommendation section

The list of conditions as set out within the recommendation to committee on pages 12 and 13 of the committee report are to be amended slightly to correct inconsistencies with the wider report and draft decision notice. These amendments are as follows:

- Condition 39 (Highway surface material details/samples to be submitted) is to be removed from the list of conditions, as such requirements have been incorporated into condition 36 (Landscaping and playspace detailed plans to be submitted), where details of both soft landscaping and hard landscaping are sought.
- Condition 39 is to be replaced by a condition which was incorrectly omitted from this list of conditions, which will require the applicant to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the LPA to compensate for the development's impact on local bus service capacity.
- Condition 41 (Arboricultural Method Statement to be xxx) is to be corrected to read as follows 'Arboricultural Method Statement to be secured'.

For clarity, the above changes do not result in any changes to the actual conditions contained within the draft decision notice.

#### Correction in Consultations section

Where it is stated in the report that a S106 obligation is to be imposed to secure a planning obligation (most notably in the consultations section), it is to be clarified that this is incorrect. Whilst all planning obligations referred to are to be upheld, they will all be secured through condition. A S106 agreement cannot be entered into in this instance since the Council cannot enter into a bi-lateral S106 agreement with itself.

#### Correction in main body of report

At paragraph 120 of the committee report, it is stated that the applicant and TfL are still in discussions regarding the payment of a bus capacity contribution. It should be clarified that this matter has been settled and the applicant has agreed to pay the requested bus capacity contribution.

**Recommendation: Grant consent, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the committee report.**

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 19 June, 2019

Case No.

18/4902

---

Location	2A, Preston Way and 283, 285 & 287 Preston Road, Harrow, HA3
Description	Demolition of buildings and erection of a 2 to 4 storey residential building comprising 35 self-contained flats (6 x studios, 12 x 1 bed, 10 x two bed and 7 x 3 bed) with basement level, provision for car and cycle parking and associated landscaping

**Agenda Page Number:** 55-80

Within paragraph 15 of the report (agenda page 65), reference is made to a link to the sports ground from the north-western corner of the site. This reference was included in error. A gate in this location was evaluated, but was not considered to be necessary so was not included in the final proposal.

**Recommendation:** Remains approval subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement as set out within the main report.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

## Agenda Item 05

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 19 June, 2019**

Case No.

18/4675

---

Location	110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS
Description	Replacement of existing building (containing public house and former members club) with a mixed use development within a part 4 and 5 storey building comprising public house and function room on ground floor (Use Class A4), 48 self-contained flats (14 x 1 bed, 22 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed & 1 x 4 bed), green roof and photovoltaics panels, bicycle and refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping (SCHEME A)(Amended Plans - Key changes to public house facade and internal layout)

**Agenda Page Number:81-116**

**Please note that this supplementary report is identical to that for application 18/4701 with the exception of the agenda page number and recommendation.**

Following the publication of the Report a further two letters of objection have been received, raising some or all of the following points:

- Loss of the public house will be severely detrimental – it is a community facility
- Policy CP23 protects community facilities
- The PH hosts Busy Rascals and National Childbirth Trust courses
- Loss of a beautiful building
- Policy BE27 confirms that buildings within a conservation area cannot be demolished unless they positively detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The replacement building clashes with the surrounding aesthetics, doesn't fit into the conservation area
- Proposed block too tall and wide
- No space for a kitchen in the public house
- Residential tower block will have a negative impact on other listed buildings
- Willesden Green Station is listed and will be overshadowed by this structure. It is out of character.
- The playgroup is essential for my child
- Willesden Green is not here to be gentrified
- We are here to support each other, to support local businesses, and to make sure that the area is kept affordable so no one is left wanting
- No one wants this landmark to be demolished

Policy BE27 was one of the heritage policies within the now superseded Unitary Development Plan. The application has been assessed against current policy and guidance.

The remainder of the above points have been previously raised and addressed within the relevant sections of the Report.

Members are also asked to note the following:

The CIL Indexation figure for Scheme B (ref: 18/4701) noted on p11 of the Report should be 224 **not** 323. That is, it should read the same as that reported for Scheme A (ref: 18/4675). The level of CIL received would therefore be similar to that for Scheme A.

An objector commented that the committee report incorrectly sets out that the pub owns the space currently and would own the space in the proposed development (paragraph 28 of the report). However, it is set out within this paragraph that the owner of the building or public house will own the space to be used for community purposes, not that the current pub operator owns the existing space or will own the new space. It is also set out within the report that this is a legal matter rather than a planning matter, but that the community use of the space would be secured through the legal agreement.

Whilst not all objections are repeated verbatim they are paraphrased in the interest of brevity particularly as many of the objectors raise similar points. However, all are given consideration in the determination of the application.

*Document Imaged*

*DocSuppF  
Ref: 18/4675 Page 1 of 2*

Within the response to the points of objections listed on p3 of both Reports, reference is made to the Carlton Tavern as being listed. The building was in fact not listed but was about to be listed by Historic England.

It has also been suggested by an objector that more of the Inspectors' Decision Letter should have been included within the Report, in particular paras.32-34. These paragraphs consider: the existing space around the building and how the height and design respond to the shops and station opposite (para.32); the upper parts of the existing building can be seen from the station platform and on existing the station one is reminded of the origins of the development of Outer London (para.33); and the existing building makes a positive contribution to the setting of the station, which it would be desirable to preserve (para.34). The Report does not attempt to repeat verbatim, the Inspector's comments but does paraphrase some of his views at para.12. With regard to being able to view the site from the station platform, that is his observation. The proposal has been assessed against the significance of this heritage asset as set out in paras.19 and 20 of the Report.

An additional comment has also been made that the scheme is contrary to DMP21 and that insufficient assurances are provided to secure space for Busy Rascals, not to start demolition until that is agreed and to stop future changes of use, and the lack of oversight if future changes are delegated to officers. Scheme B has been recommended for approval on the basis of the Recommendations at the end of the Report, which are considered sufficiently appropriate to secure these matters. This includes specific obligations regarding community use. The objector also refers to the "Statement of Community Involvement" submitted by the applicant and references a lack of support by local residents for "Scheme B" (application reference 18/4701). Members should note that the comments received in relation to this planning application have been summarised, and that objections to the design and appearance of the proposed building has been discussed for both schemes. Officers have considered the revised proposals and consider the design to be acceptable for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

The objector also cites other developments where a replacement public house has been proposed and approved but that the pub has not opened, namely to Good Ship (Kilburn), Falcon Public House (Queens Park / South Kilburn) and Brent Tavern (Cricklewood). The objector also refers to the Corrib Rest (Queens Park). Replacement public houses were secured within the Good Ship, Falcon and Brent Tavern schemes, but those developments have not been built yet. The Council, as Local Planning Authority, can grant planning permission for the development of a site. However, it cannot specify the precise timeframes for the delivery of that development (other than setting dates for the commencement of works). As set out in the main report, the submission demonstrates that the proposed public house is laid out in a way that would be viable, including a potential location for a kitchen (should the pub operator choose to include one). Controls are recommended over the use of the pub (if consented and delivered) through condition. Should a planning application be submitted for a change of use of use of the pub (either within the existing building, or in the future, the pub within the proposed development if consented and delivered), such an application would need to be considered on its merits. That is not proposed within this application.

**Recommendation:**

Remains refusal for the reasons set out in the committee report.

DocSuppF

# Agenda Item 6

## Agenda Item 06

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 19 June, 2019**

Case No.

18/4701

---

Location	110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS
Description	Replacement of existing building (containing public house and former members club) with a mixed use development within a part 4 and 5 storey building comprising public house and function room on ground floor (Use Class A4), 48 self-contained flats (14 x 1 bed, 22 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed & 1 x 4 bed), green roof and photovoltaics panels, bicycle and refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping (SCHEME B)(Amended Plans - Key changes to roof form, public house facade and internal layout).

#### Agenda Page Number: 117-160

**Please note that this supplementary report is identical to that for application 18/4675 with the exception of the agenda page number and recommendation.**

Following the publication of the Report a further two letters of objection have been received, raising some or all of the following points:

- Loss of the public house will be severely detrimental – it is a community facility
- Policy CP23 protects community facilities
- The PH hosts Busy Rascals and National Childbirth Trust courses
- Loss of a beautiful building
- Policy BE27 confirms that buildings within a conservation area cannot be demolished unless they positively detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The replacement building clashes with the surrounding aesthetics, doesn't fit into the conservation area
- Proposed block too tall and wide
- No space for a kitchen in the public house
- Residential tower block will have a negative impact on other listed buildings
- Willesden Green Station is listed and will be overshadowed by this structure. It is out of character.
- The playgroup is essential for my child
- Willesden Green is not here to be gentrified
- We are here to support each other, to support local businesses, and to make sure that the area is kept affordable so no one is left wanting
- No one wants this landmark to be demolished

Policy BE27 was one of the heritage policies within the now superseded Unitary Development Plan. The application has been assessed against current policy and guidance.

The remainder of the above points have been previously raised and addressed within the relevant sections of the Report.

Members are also asked to note the following:

The CIL Indexation figure for Scheme B (ref: 18/4701) noted on p11 of the Report should be 224 **not** 323. That is, it should read the same as that reported for Scheme A (ref: 18/4675). The level of CIL received would therefore be similar to that for Scheme A.

An objector commented that the committee report incorrectly sets out that the pub owns the space currently and would own the space in the proposed development (paragraph 28 of the report). However, it is set out within this paragraph that the owner of the building or public house will own the space to be used for community purposes, not that the current pub operator owns the existing space or will own the new space. It is also set out within the report that this is a legal matter rather than a planning matter, but that the community use of the space would be secured through the legal agreement.

Whilst not all objections are repeated verbatim they are paraphrased in the interest of brevity particularly as many of the objectors raise similar points. However, all are given consideration in the determination of the application.

*Document Imaged*

*DocSuppF  
Ref: 18/4701 Page 1 of 2*

Within the response to the points of objections listed on p3 of both Reports, reference is made to the Carlton Tavern as being listed. The building was in fact not listed but was about to be listed by Historic England.

It has also been suggested by an objector that more of the Inspectors' Decision Letter should have been included within the Report, in particular paras.32-34. These paragraphs consider: the existing space around the building and how the height and design respond to the shops and station opposite (para.32); the upper parts of the existing building can be seen from the station platform and on existing the station one is reminded of the origins of the development of Outer London (para.33); and the existing building makes a positive contribution to the setting of the station, which it would be desirable to preserve (para.34). The Report does not attempt to repeat verbatim, the Inspector's comments but does paraphrase some of his views at para.12. With regard to being able to view the site from the station platform, that is his observation. The proposal has been assessed against the significance of this heritage asset as set out in paras.19 and 20 of the Report.

An additional comment has also been made that the scheme is contrary to DMP21 and that insufficient assurances are provided to secure space for Busy Rascals, not to start demolition until that is agreed and to stop future changes of use, and the lack of oversight if future changes are delegated to officers. Scheme B has been recommended for approval on the basis of the Recommendations at the end of the Report, which are considered sufficiently appropriate to secure these matters. This includes specific obligations regarding community use. The objector also refers to the "Statement of Community Involvement" submitted by the applicant and references a lack of support by local residents for "Scheme B" (application reference 18/4701). Members should note that the comments received in relation to this planning application have been summarised, and that objections to the design and appearance of the proposed building has been discussed for both schemes. Officers have considered the revised proposals and consider the design to be acceptable for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

The objector also cites other developments where a replacement public house has been proposed and approved but that the pub has not opened, namely to Good Ship (Kilburn), Falcon Public House (Queens Park / South Kilburn) and Brent Tavern (Cricklewood). The objector also refers to the Corrib Rest (Queens Park). Replacement public houses were secured within the Good Ship, Falcon and Brent Tavern schemes, but those developments have not been built yet. The Council, as Local Planning Authority, can grant planning permission for the development of a site. However, it cannot specify the precise timeframes for the delivery of that development (other than setting dates for the commencement of works). As set out in the main report, the submission demonstrates that the proposed public house is laid out in a way that would be viable, including a potential location for a kitchen (should the pub operator choose to include one). Controls are recommended over the use of the pub (if consented and delivered) through condition. Should a planning application be submitted for a change of use of use of the pub (either within the existing building, or in the future, the pub within the proposed development if consented and delivered), such an application would need to be considered on its merits. That is not proposed within this application.

**Recommendation:**

Remains approval subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 agreement

DocSuppF