



Planning Committee Supplementary Agenda Pack

Wednesday 3 June 2026 at 6.00 pm

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

Please note this will be held as a physical meeting which all Committee members will be required to attend in person.

The meeting will be open for the press and public to attend or alternatively can be followed via the live webcast. The link to follow proceedings via the live webcast is available [HERE](#)

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

S Butt (Chair)
HB Patel (Vice-Chair)
Ibrahim
Mahmood
Thomas
Maurice
Lorber
Gallagher

Substitute Members

Councillors:

I.Ahmed, Bajwa, Dar & Donnelly-Jackson

Councillors:

A.Patel & Chowdhury

Councillors:

Brown & Georgiou

Councillors:

Ahmadi Moghaddam & Perrin

For further information contact: Rebecca Reid, Governance Officer
rebecca.reid@brent.gov.uk; 020 8937 2469

For electronic copies of minutes and agendas please visit:
[Council meetings and decision making | Brent Council](#)

Members' virtual briefing will take place at 12.00 noon.

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 or 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

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
4. 25/2875 - Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9	Preston	1 - 4
5. 25/2230 - Garages rear of 60 Olive Road, London, NW2	Cricklewood Mapesbury	& 5 - 6

Date of the next meeting: Thursday 2 July 2026



- Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public. Alternatively, it will be possible to follow proceedings via the live webcast [HERE](#)

Agenda Item 4

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 3 June, 2026

Case No. **25/2875**

Location	Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9
Description	Proposed construction of a dwellinghouse with landscaping works to the front and rear gardens, installation of boundary wall and bike and bin storage

Agenda Page Number: 39-62

Members are advised that, following publication of the committee report, two further objections have been received (one new objection and one additional objection from an individual who previously commented). The issues raised have largely been addressed within the main Officer's report; however, Members are asked to note the summary of issues and the Officer's response set out below.

Amended Design not Considered to Overcome Appeal Decision

Members are advised that an additional objection has been received which places significant weight on the previous appeal decision relating to application ref. 25/1246 (APP/T5150/W/25/3375873). Officers acknowledge that the appeal decision is a material consideration in the determination of the current application and confirm that it has been carefully considered as part of the assessment of this revised proposal.

Officers also acknowledge that the objector raises a number of valid points regarding the Inspector's findings, particularly in relation to the contribution that the verge makes to the character of the junction and the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road. However, officers remain of the view that, on balance, the revised proposal is acceptable in planning terms.

The Inspector did not conclude that residential development on the site would be unacceptable in principle, including the provision of an additional dwelling in this location. Nor did the Inspector conclude that the loss of the verge itself was unacceptable in principle. Indeed, the Inspector expressly acknowledged that a contemporary or varied architectural approach would not necessarily be inappropriate within the wider context of the area, noting the varied character of surrounding development.

The Inspector's concern related specifically to the relationship between the previous design approach and the adjoining semi-detached pair. In particular, the dismissed scheme proposed a substantially different mono-pitch roof form, contrasting detailing and materially different massing, which the Inspector concluded created a visually uncomfortable relationship with the attached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road.

The current application seeks to directly address those concerns through a significantly revised design approach. The proposal now incorporates a more traditional pitched roof form, revised fenestration resulting in a more tempered visual prominence, and a materially different palette of materials, including red clay roof tiles and brickwork that directly reflect the adjoining pair and surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the ridge height of the proposed dwelling now sits below that of No.125 Preston Road, and the introduction of a shadow gap assists the proposed dwelling in reading as a subordinate and distinct dwelling, rather than appearing as an awkward or overly dominant extension to the existing pair.

Officers do not consider these changes to be merely cosmetic amendments. Rather, they are considered to directly address the design concerns identified by the Inspector in relation to the previous scheme.

Officers also do not agree with the objector's interpretation that the Inspector found development on the verge itself to be unacceptable in principle. Whilst the Inspector identified that the verge contributes positively to a sense of openness at the junction, paragraph 9 of the appeal decision makes clear that the identified harm arose from the cumulative impact of the previous design approach, the attachment to No.125 Preston Road, and the positioning on the verge. Officers are of the view that the revised scheme has materially altered a number of those key elements, particularly the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining pair, such that the overall impact is now considered acceptable on balance.

It is acknowledged that some degree of change to the openness of the junction would inevitably arise through the development of the site. However, officers consider that the revised design approach significantly reduces the visual harm previously identified by the Inspector and that the proposal would now integrate into the streetscene in a substantially more sympathetic manner than the previously dismissed appeal scheme.

Members are also advised that the wider townscape context along this part of Preston Road is evolving, with a varied architectural character already evident within the surrounding area, including more contemporary forms of development nearby. This forms part of the changing character context against which the current proposal has been assessed.

The proposal has also been carefully assessed in relation to neighbouring residential amenity impacts. Officers remain satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of outlook, enclosure, light, or privacy, for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

The Inspector did not conclude that residential development on the site would be unacceptable in principle, including the provision of an additional dwelling in this location. Nor did the Inspector conclude that the loss of the verge itself was unacceptable in principle. Indeed, the Inspector expressly acknowledged that a contemporary or varied architectural approach would not necessarily be inappropriate within the wider context of the area, noting the varied character of surrounding development.

The Inspector's concern related specifically to the relationship between the previous design approach and the adjoining semi-detached pair. In particular, the dismissed scheme proposed a substantially different mono-pitch roof form, contrasting detailing and materially different massing, which the Inspector concluded created a visually uncomfortable relationship with the attached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road.

The current application seeks to directly address those concerns through a significantly revised design approach. The proposal now incorporates a more traditional pitched roof form, revised fenestration resulting in a more tempered visual prominence, and a materially different palette of materials, including red clay roof tiles and brickwork that directly reflect the adjoining pair and surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the ridge height of the proposed dwelling now sits below that of No.125 Preston Road, and the introduction of a shadow gap assists the proposed dwelling in reading as a subordinate and distinct dwelling, rather than appearing as an awkward or overly dominant extension to the existing pair.

Officers do not consider these changes to be merely cosmetic amendments. Rather, they are considered to directly address the design concerns identified by the Inspector in relation to the previous scheme.

Officers also do not agree with the objector's interpretation that the Inspector found development on the verge itself to be unacceptable in principle. Whilst the Inspector identified that the verge contributes positively to a sense of openness at the junction, paragraph 9 of the appeal decision makes clear that the identified harm arose from the cumulative impact of the previous design approach, the attachment to No.125 Preston Road, and the positioning on the verge. Officers are of the view that the revised scheme has materially altered a number of those key elements, particularly the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining pair, such that the overall impact is now considered acceptable on balance.

It is acknowledged that some degree of change to the openness of the junction would inevitably arise through the development of the site. However, officers consider that the revised design approach significantly reduces the visual harm previously identified by the Inspector and that the proposal would now integrate into the streetscene in a substantially more sympathetic manner than the previously dismissed appeal scheme.

Members are also advised that the wider townscape context along this part of Preston Road is evolving, with a varied architectural character already evident within the surrounding area, including more contemporary forms of development nearby. This forms part of the changing character context against which the current proposal has been assessed.

The proposal has also been carefully assessed in relation to neighbouring residential amenity impacts. Officers remain satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of outlook, enclosure, light, or privacy, for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

Accessibility

Concerns have been raised over the suitability of the proposed development for wheelchair access. In particular, concerns relate to doors opening outwards into the corridor, insufficient space to accommodate door swings, the absence of shower facilities within the ground floor toilet, and a furniture layout that may not

provide sufficient space for wheelchair movement.

Policy D7 of the London Plan requires new dwellings to meet M4(2) of the Building Regulations to ensure they are accessible and adaptable and a condition will be imposed to secure this requirement. Compliance with technical details against Approved Document M (Category M4(2)) including internal layout, circulation space, doorway width and swings will typically be addressed by the Building Control process.

In addition, paragraph 2.27 of the M4(2) Building Regulations guidance states that, whilst step-free access to a WC is required on the entrance storey (ie. the ground floor in this case), the provision of a shower at this level is only required where it is reasonable to do so. The absence of a ground floor shower therefore does not, in itself, indicate that the dwelling would fail to meet the requirements of the M4(2) standards.

Fire Safety

The objection raises concerns regarding fire safety, including whether first floor windows function adequately as fire escapes, the absence of a kitchen fire door despite being referenced in the fire strategy, and inconsistencies in the proposed fire safety measures. It also questions whether the development is intended as an HMO, given references to fire extinguishers and an assembly point, which are not typically required in a standard single dwelling.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy D12A of the London Plan (discussed in paragraph 71-74 of the Committee Report) which requires development to achieve high standards of fire safety.

Accordingly, references to fire extinguishers and an assembly point are not considered indicative of HMO use and do not raise concern in this regard. The planning application relates to a C3 dwellinghouse. The use of the property as an HMO would need planning permission.

Technical requirements regarding fire safety would be controlled under Building Regulations.

Car Parking

Concerns have been raised that the proposal provides no off-street parking, potentially increasing pressure on-street parking, particularly on Wembley Stadium event days. Concerns are also raised regarding cumulative parking and traffic impacts in combination with the approved development at Land Opposite GEC Pavilion (ref: 24/2139). This is discussed in detail in paragraph 43-45 of the committee report.

Party Wall

Concerns have been raised regarding whether a Party Wall Agreement has been secured. It is also queried that appropriate measures will be implemented to seal the vertical gap between the existing and proposed walls to prevent the accumulation of vermin and debris.

Party Wall matters is a civil matter, the provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 provides a legal framework for neighbours to address matters, such as work near a boundary.

Flood Risk

Concerns are raised over ground levels and flood risks. However, as discussed in paragraph 68-69 of the committee report, the site is not located in a flood zone and when considered in combination with the landscaping measures that would be provided in the rear garden and the installation of permeable paving site wide, they are considered sufficient to manage surface water.

Recommendation: Remains to grant consent subject to conditions as set out within the draft decision notice.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 3 June, 2026

Case No.

25/2230

Location	Garages rear of 60, Olive Road, London
Description	Demolition of existing garages and proposed erection of a two-storey building with basement level to provide 2 residential dwellings with front lightwells, associated private amenity space, boundary treatment, cycle and refuse storage.

Agenda Page Number: 63-85

Revised Drawings

Revised plans were received in response to updated information relating to the recently constructed outbuilding at No. 64 Olive Road. The submitted existing and proposed drawings have been amended to accurately reflect this development.

The assessment set out within this report has already been undertaken with regard to the presence of this outbuilding. The revisions do not give rise to any change in the assessment set out within this report.

The updated list of drawings is set out in bold below.

2315.EX.01 **Rev B** – Existing Site Plan
2315.EX.02 **Rev B** – Existing Ground Floor Plan
2315.LP.01 **Rev A** – Location Plan
2315.P.01 **Rev B** – Proposed Site Layout Plan
2315.EX.03 **Rev B** – Existing Front (East) Elevation AA
2315.P.02 **Rev D** – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
2315.P.03 **Rev D** – Proposed Basement Floor Plan
2315.P.04 **Rev D** – Proposed First Floor Plan
2315.P.05 **Rev C** – Proposed Roof Plan
2315.P.06 **Rev G** – Proposed Elevation AA – East (Front) / Elevation / Section FF – East (Front)
2315.P.07 **Rev G** – Proposed Elevation DD – North (Side) / Elevation / Section EE – North (Side)
2315.P.08 **Rev E** – Proposed Elevation BB – South (Side) / Elevation CC – West (Rear)
2315.P.09 **Rev F** – Proposed Elevation / Section HH – North (Side) / Elevation / Section GG – West (Rear)

Moreover, as part of Part A of Condition 11 (wildlife and nesting features), the wording of the condition has been updated to provide more site-specific requirements, in line with the Council's Ecology Officer's advice.

The condition is recommended to read as follows:

Prior to commencement of development (excluding site clearance, demolition works and laying of foundations) hereby approved, a scheme for wildlife and nesting features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include:

a) At least 1 of each of the following features on the proposed building/site:

- i) 1 x multi-chamber swift bricks (preferred) or boxes,**
- ii) 1 x house sparrow terraces,**
- iii) deadwood and sand piles on green roof**
- viii) wildflower seed mix to green roof**

(b) Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a Statement of Conformity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement of Conformity will include photographs of each habitat/feature installed as per the approved details.

The wildlife and nesting features shall thereafter be retained throughout the lifetime of the development unless alternative details are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 25/2230 Page 1 of 2*

Reason: To enhance the biodiversity value of the land in accordance Policy BGI1 of the Brent Local Plan

Recommendation: Continue to grant consent, subject to the conditions set out in the committee report and as updated above.

DocSuppF