

Supplementary Planning Committee Agenda Pack

Thursday 2 July 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.	26/0225 - Brent NHS Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre for Health & Care, 116 Chaplin Road, Wembley, HA0 4UZ	Wembley Central	1 - 4
5.	25/0810 - Kingsbury High School, Princes Avenue, London, NW9 9JR	Queensbury	5 - 6

Date of the next meeting: Wednesday 5 August 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](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2026

Case No.

26/0225

Location	Brent NHS Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre For Health & Care, 116 Chaplin Road, Wembley, HA0 4UZ
Description	Demolition of existing buildings to provide within buildings of between 3 and 6 storeys, 108 residential units (Use Class C3) and car parking spaces together with associated public realm, landscaping and highway improvements, cycle parking and stores, and all other associated and ancillary works.

Agenda Page Number: 23-90

Further representations received:

Cllr Lorber has made representations raising objection the proposal, which are summarised below:

- Imposing a car-free restriction on this development will have an impact on parking on nearby roads that are outside of any Controlled Parking Zone, as future residents will park in these areas instead which will cause nuisance to existing residents.

Officer comment: The proposed development accords with relevant transport policies, which promote non-car development in highly accessible locations to reduce car dependency and encourage sustainable travel. It is noted that there is some limited parking proposed including disabled parking as required by policy. As the site is within an all year round CPZ ("SA") and adjacent to the Wembley Stadium Event Day CPZ a parking permit restriction is to be applied to all residential units proposed (save for disabled badge holders), and this shall be secured through the s106 agreement.

Controlled Parking Zones have been proved to be an effective means of restricting on-street parking to ensure that it remains available for the use of existing residents when new residential developments come forward. The site is located in a sustainable location and the use of the CPZ together with restricted on site parking is in line with the Council's wider policies on promoting non-car access to reduce congestion and pollution.

Additionally, the proposal would be supported by sustainable transport measures, including a Travel Plan that would be secured as part of the s106 agreement. This Plan would be expected to set out a range of measures to encourage future residents to move towards non-car modes of travel and set targets to measure the effectiveness of the Plan against over time, which would include targets to increase the % of trips being undertaken by non-car modes of travel. Set targets will be monitored at the end of years 1, 3 and 5 and can be revised, as required.

- Is there any space on site for motorcycles and delivery vehicles to park

Officer comment: There are no minimum numerical requirements for motorcycle parking in the London Plan. It is not a requirement for any development, so should be determined on a case-by-case basis. No such parking is proposed, nor has any been sought by Transport officers. No dedicated loading area is proposed, though with the number of delivery vehicles per day estimated to be around 16 vans (and one lorry) this does not give rise to highway concerns. Delivery vehicles would be expected to load / unload from within the site, or from Chaplin Road.

- For the purposes of the Financial Viability Assessment, what base value is being used for land bearing in mind it was originally donated

Officer comment: In line with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and for the purposes of the FVA submitted the benchmark land value has been established based on the existing use value of the site plus a premium for the landowner. The PPG is clear that applicant specific circumstances including their acquisition of the site should be excluded from an FVA. This would also be the case where land was historically donated for development. The benchmark land value established based on the existing use value of a site plus a premium for the landowner and applied in the FVA is £2.61m.

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 26/0225 Page 1 of 3

It is also noted that, prior to the site being acquired by the applicant, the land was owned by the NHS and was subsequently disposed of through an NHS-led best value disposal process. The Local Planning Authority was not a party to that transaction and is not in a position to comment on, or attach weight to, the historical circumstances in which the land came into NHS ownership. The planning assessment must therefore be undertaken having regard to the relevant planning policy and guidance, including the approach to benchmark land value set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, rather than the site's historic ownership or provenance.

- There is a complete disregard of the site's history and heritage, including the contributions The Barham's made to the establishment of the Old Wembley Hospital

Officer comment: Heritage effects have been considered in detail within the main report (paragraphs 83-106), which recognises the contribution Titus Barham made in donating the land as the site for a new hospital. In the overall planning balance section (paragraphs 358-373) the harm that demolition would result in, to a non-designated heritage asset is weighed against (and is outweighed) by the range of identified public benefits (including housing delivery). Recommended condition 31 would ensure that the site's history and its heritage is suitably recorded and displayed on site, which is considered proportionate.

- Why is there no provision of a community facility on site as part of the development

Officer comment: This has been considered in detail within the 'Principle of development' and 'Loss of social infrastructure' sections within the report.

An additional neighbour representation of objection has been received following publication of the report, this is from an individual who has previously submitted objections to the development, as summarised in the 'Consultations' section of the report.

The additional comments received maintain objection to the scale and siting of the semi-detached townhouses and their relationship with the shared site boundary. Other key neighbour concerns that are re-iterated include, daylight and sunlight impacts, disagreement with the application of the mirrored baseline assessment (for assessing daylight impacts), harm to amenity of neighbouring kitchen, overlooking and loss of privacy and construction and environmental impacts (with conditions requested). All these considerations have been discussed within the main report.

Reference is also made to application (23/0644), which was dismissed on appeal (October 2024). Whilst the site context was materially different, the Inspector concluded that the failure to achieve the minimum 18m separation distance between facing habitable room windows, as recommended by SPD1, combined with the four-storey scale of the adjoining development, would result in unacceptable overlooking and a loss of privacy for future occupiers of the appeal scheme. The Inspector also concluded that the proposed 2m high privacy screen would not adequately mitigate those impacts.

The Inspector's findings have been carefully considered. However, each application must be determined on its own individual merits, having regard to its specific design, layout and surrounding context. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed relationship between the development and No.15 Fairview Avenue does not fully accord with the 18m separation guideline in SPD1, the circumstances of the current proposal differ from those considered under referenced application (23/0644). These differences include the fact that the townhouses proposed are over three floors, rather than four, and this proposal is not a case of backland garden development but is rather a comprehensive redevelopment of a previously developed site.

Whilst the relationship between the proposed townhouses and No.15 Fairview Avenue results in a reduced separation distance to the existing flank kitchen window when compared with the 18m separation guideline in SPD1, the impact is not considered to be unacceptable.

The kitchen window is an unusual relationship, being located within a side elevation close to the shared boundary and looking across the neighbouring site, rather than being a rear-facing window to which the SPD1 guidance is principally directed. The proposed townhouses are set over 10m from the neighbouring property, comply with the 9m garden-to-habitable room separation recommended by SPD1, and satisfy the 45-degree guideline, ensuring there would be no undue sense of enclosure. Whilst a minor reduction in privacy would occur, this would be limited in practice, particularly given that a 2m boundary treatment could lawfully be erected along the boundary under permitted development rights, materially restricting intervisibility.

Taking these site-specific circumstances together, the relationship is considered to provide an acceptable level of outlook, daylight and privacy for the occupiers of No. 15, notwithstanding the limited departure from the 18m separation guideline.

Accordingly, the Inspector's conclusions in relation to the earlier appeal do not alter the overall assessment or recommendation on the current application.

Recommendation: Remains that the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report together with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement.

That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement.

That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions (including to delete, vary, or add conditions, Informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision).

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2026

Case No.

25/0810

Location	Kingsbury High School, Princes Avenue, London, NW9 9JR
Description	Proposed construction of Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) Facility and cricket pitch and netting with fencing and lighting to the school.

Agenda Page Number: 91-124

Additional Representations

Since publication of the committee report, a number of additional representations were received including 12 new objections and 8 additional comments from previous objectors. These representations raise concerns regarding the consultation process, amended plans and supporting documentation, residential amenity (including noise and lighting), parking and traffic, the intended use of the site, drainage, ecology, the identified gas pipeline constraint and requests that the application be deferred.

These matters have been considered by officers. Where they raise material planning considerations, they have been assessed within the main committee report and, where appropriate, clarified within this supplementary report.

The additional representations do not raise any new material planning considerations that alter the officer's assessment or recommendation.

Public Consultation and Notification

The public consultation undertaken following validation of the application, including neighbour notification letters, site notices and a press notice, is set out within the main committee report.

Following amendments made during the course of the application, a further round of public consultation was undertaken. Neighbour notification letters were issued to surrounding occupiers and previous respondents, together with updated site notices and a further press notice. The principal amendments consulted upon included the repositioning of the football and hockey pitches, revised lighting controls, acoustic fencing, biodiversity enhancements and updated supporting technical information. These matters are fully set out within the main committee report.

Since that consultation, only minor amendments have been made to the submitted drawings. These comprise the repositioning of sections of the ball-stop fencing further away from the site boundary in response to safeguarded land associated with the Cadent gas pipeline, together with minor revisions to the cricket pitch markings. These changes would not materially alter the proposed development or give rise to any different impacts on neighbouring occupiers beyond those already consulted upon. Accordingly, officers consider that these amendments are non-material and that no further public consultation has been necessary.

Gas Pipeline

Additional representations raise concerns regarding the notifiable gas pipeline located within the site and whether this should delay determination of the application.

The Brent Local Plan Policies Map identifies a safeguarded corridor associated with a notifiable gas pipeline that runs north-south through the borough. Where development falls within or adjacent to this constraint, the relevant statutory undertaker must be consulted.

Accordingly, Cadent Gas were consulted on the application and subsequently attended the site to identify and mark the precise location of the pipeline and its easement.

Following this assessment, the proposed layout was amended in agreement with Cadent Gas. The only change to the scheme since the previous round of public consultation relates to the repositioning of the ball-stop fencing further away from the site boundary to ensure it sits outside the pipeline easement. At its closest point, the fencing would be approximately 4.75m from the edge of the easement (7.75m from the pipeline itself). Cadent Gas have confirmed in writing that they raise no objection to the amended layout.

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 25/0810 Page 1 of 2*

Officers are therefore satisfied that the presence of the gas pipeline has been appropriately considered, the proposal has been amended to respond to this site constraint, and the pipeline does not preclude the proposed development.

Transport

Additional representations question the methodology used within the submitted Transport Statement, including the use of Census travel data to estimate likely travel patterns associated with the proposed community use. The Transport Statement has been assessed by the Council's Transport officers, who are satisfied that it provides an appropriate and proportionate assessment of the likely transport impacts of the proposal. The assessment concludes that the anticipated parking demand can be accommodated within the existing on-site parking provision and that the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the operation or safety of the local highway network. These matters are addressed within the committee report.

Recommendation: Remains to Grant Consent subject to conditions

That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters as set out within the main committee report and supplementary report.

DocSuppF