



## Supplementary Planning Committee

**Wednesday 16 October 2013 at 7.00 pm**

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

### Membership:

#### Members

##### Councillors:

Ketan Sheth (Chair)  
John (Vice-Chair)  
Aden  
Baker  
Cummins  
Hashmi  
Kabir  
Kataria  
CJ Patel  
Powney  
Singh

#### first alternates

##### Councillors:

R Moher  
Van Kalwala  
J Moher  
Kansagra  
Sneddon  
Cheese  
Oladapo  
Long  
Brown  
Gladbaum  
Hossain

#### second alternates

##### Councillors:

Adeyeye  
Ogunro  
Moloney  
HB Patel  
Hopkins  
Beck  
Al-Ebadi  
Naheerathan  
Lorber  
Harrison  
Mashari

**For further information contact:** Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1354, [joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)**

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

**Members' briefing will take place at 5.30pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
13. Supplementary		1 - 8

# Agenda Item 13

## Agenda Item 03

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

Case No.

13/1219

---

Location	Sea Cadet Corps Building Welsh Harp & Sea Rangers Caprice Welsh Harp, Birchen Grove, London, NW9 8SA
Description	Refurbishment of existing boat station to include new gravelled work area at the rear and installation of new spiral staircase to the front, removal of 3 portacabins and erection of a 2 storey extension with a monopitch roof

**Agenda Page Number: 19**

#### Site Visit

Following the Committee site visit, further clarification is provided below regarding the relationship of the proposal to the neighbouring buildings:

- Relationship with the building to the north - The northernmost building of this cluster of five buildings (34m north of the application site), projects approximately 3.4m rearwards of the adjacent building. It should however be noted that this reward projection is as a result of the building being set further back from the accessway; the depth of the building is similar to the existing Sea Cadets Corp building.
- Height of proposal compared to BTYC building to south - The BTYC building situated approximately 40m to the south of the application site has a maximum height of 7.2m, the application proposal would have a maximum height of 7.5m. Whilst the two storey element of the building is a similar design to the proposal, the bulk of the BTYC building overall is significantly less with it being predominantly single storey.

#### Additional letters of support

Since the Committee Report was drafted, an additional 16 representations have been submitted in support of these proposals on the same basis as outlined in the 'Consultations' section of the committee report.

#### Visual Assessment

The applicants have submitted a 'Visual Assessment' in support of their proposal. The assessment concludes that the proposal cannot be considered 'inappropriate development' on the basis that the extension would not be harmful to the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The submission has not changed the conclusions drawn in the *Remarks Section* of the Committee Report and points set out above.

**Recommendation: Remains refusal**

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 05

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

Case No.

13/2269

---

Location	179 Anson Road, London, NW2 4AS
Description	Erection of a detached ground and subterranean storey single bedroom dwelling house with fully accessible accommodation and associated hard and soft landscaping

**Agenda Page Number: 37**

#### Site Visit

Following the Committee site visit, the following clarification is provided:

- The previously refused scheme was for a single storey dwellinghouse with basement level (pg 39 of Committee

Report). The siting and design of proposal has now changed and further details of details of wheelchair turning space has been provided. In addition, works have been carried out at the property with new off-street parking spaces completed to the front of 179 Anson Road and the proposed off-street parking space to serve the proposed dwelling re-orientated to comply with highway requirements. The main amenity space is now provided to the front of the site, whereas previously this was previously split over two areas.

- The existing plans show that the garage has a height of 3.2m and this corresponds with what is shown on the proposed drawings.

- The width of the frontage of the application proposal is 11.3m, which is comparable to other properties in the area (179 Anson Road and 1 Tracey Ave have widths of 13 & 10.3m respectively). However, the depth of the plot at 13m is significantly smaller than others in the area, including 179 Anson Road at 39m and 1 Tracey Avenue at 35m.

- The proposed basement would be served by a lightwell to the front of the property providing approximately 4 sqm of usable patio space. In terms of outlook, the lightwell would be 2m deep when viewed from the physio room and 3m deep from bedroom (not taking into account of steps); this is not considered to provide a good quality of accommodation.

- The proposed house would be 1.9m higher than the proposed boundary treatment, thus while the dwelling is single storey in nature the proposal would be readily visible from the street scene.

### **Existing House**

Many similar house types have been adapted to meet disabled access needs and the planning process seeks to help to explore the options to achieve this. In this case, there is a problem with providing ramped access from Tracey Avenue to the side main entrance door. However, appropriate access could be provided from the property frontage (to Anson Road) by way of a 1:12 gradient ramp and platform. Furthermore, there is significant scope to extend the property which, in other examples, has been carried out to meet individual requirements.

### **Additional Report**

The applicant has prepared a report for distribution at the Planning Committee which draws attention to two residential 'infill' developments which are set out below. Notwithstanding that each planning application is assessed on its own merits, it is not considered that either of these approved development share similar characteristics to these proposals:

- 54 Wrotesley Rd/Furness Rd, NW10

The appeal was allowed in May 2010 the Inspector commented "*Indeed, at a time when Government policy through Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing is directed towards making the best use of land for housing, the rear parts of corner plots such as here can make a modest, but welcome contribution to housing supply.*" PPS3 has now been superseded by the NPPF which gives greater protection to rear gardens (seeing 'Remarks' section). Furthermore, the Council has adopted Policy CP17 in the Core Strategy since this appeal decision which gives greater weight to the protection of the suburban character of the Borough.

- 40-42 Okehampton Rd/Dundonald Rd, NW10

This is a larger plot (it makes use of two rear gardens) therefore the dwelling is not as cramped within its and plot and the dwelling does not breach either building line. Whilst the distances between the windows and boundary treatments are similar to these proposals, the dwelling has four different aspects which improves the outlook for the occupiers.

### **Recommendation: Remains Refusal**

DocSuppF

## **Agenda Item 06**

### **Supplementary Information**

**Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

**Case No.**

13/2103

Location Land next to Harrod Court, Stag Lane, London, NW9

Description A hybrid planning application for full planning permission for the erection of a three storey building with a pitched roof to accommodate 11 affordable residential units for shared

ownership (5 x 1-bed, 5 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed) with associated car parking, cycle storage, landscaping and amenity space; and outline planning permission for the erection of a medical centre of approximately 1,256sqm, including a pharmacy of approximately 90sqm, together with associated car parking.

#### **Agenda Page Number: 45**

##### Clarification

Officers can advise that this application is not required to be referred to the Mayor as stated on page 46(a) of the committee report.

In relation to CIL, officers can confirm that the applicant can apply for affordable housing relief subject to meeting the eligibility requirements (see page 56).

##### Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan

The Council's Tree Officer has reviewed the revised Tree Report dated 22 July 2013, and has confirmed that this document contains a suitable Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan. As such, this information does not need to be re-submitted as part of condition 25. It is recommended that the condition is reworded to read as follows:

*The proposed tree-protection details as outlined in the Tree Survey prepared by S J Stephens Associates dated 22 July 2013 shall be adhered to throughout all stages of the construction period for both Phases One and Two. Works shall not commence on site until the Local Planning Authority has been on site and inspected the required tree protection measures in relation to the relevant phase.*

*Reason: To ensure retention and protection of trees and other landscape features on the site in the interests of amenity.*

To correspond with the above it is recommended that the Tree Report within the list of the approved documents as set out in condition is reworded to "Tree Survey prepared by S J Stephens Associates dated 22 July 2013"

**Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement**

DocSuppF

## **Agenda Item 07**

### **Supplementary Information**

#### **Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

**Case No.**

13/2196

---

Location	152 Olive Road, London, NW2 6UY
Description	Demolition of former Cricklewood Library building and erection of a five storey building including basement comprising 10 No. residential units (2 x 1-bed, 6 x 2-bed, 2 x 3-bed) and 157m2 of D1 (multi-functional community) floorspace

#### **Agenda Page Number: 65**

##### Consultation Responses

Concerns have been raised by local residents that a statement of support for the planning application has been falsified. Officers can now advise the Planning Committee that the owner/occupier of the subject property has confirmed that they did not make any representation in support of the proposal. It is also noted that no individual postal address was given for one of the representations submitted. As such, the details set out on pg. 70 of the Planning Committee report need to be revised to state that 2 responses have been submitted in support of the application (revised from 4)

Following publication of the Committee Report, the following representations have been received:

### **Page 3**

- An objection from community group "Friends of Cricklewood Library";

- A further 13 objections received from local residents; and
- A petition with 304 signatures, requesting that the application is refused by Brent's Planning Committee.

Some additional points have been raised by the further objections, and these are included below with an Officer response:

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Objector</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Lack of storage space/ access for wheelchairs/ pushchairs/ D1 floor space wasted by circulation floorspace/ lack of daylight and ventilation to D1 basement	Resident objection and Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
Building regulations Part B1 requires special provision for basement staircases, needing lobbied and protected routes, with direct access to the outside. The staircase to the basement does not meet this requirement and furthermore would not allow for use by disabled persons	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The density of the proposal is too high and fails to comply with the London Plan Density Matrix	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 12 to 19 of main report
Employment loss	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The storage area for waste is inadequate in terms of volume/ location for both residential and community use	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The applicant has failed to adequately consult with Friends of Cricklewood Library and other local community groups	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
Adequate cycle parking has not been provided	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 36 to 43 of main report
Parking should be provided for the D1 use of the premises	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 36 to 43 of main report
The proposed bin store will attract fouling and presents security issues for passers by	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 36 to 43 of main report
The quality of the building has been further diminished since it has been vacant and should not be a reason for its demolition	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The owner of the site has agreed with the developer that 1000sqm of re-provided community floorspace would be acceptable without consulting with local residents	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The proposal fails to comply with the London Plan, local policy and the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to design, sustainable development, promoting health communities, protection of community facilities, impact on existing/ proposed residential amenity and ensuring equal life chances for all	Friends of Cricklewood Library	These points are covered in the main report
The proposed combined library and community space on the ground floor and basement will be insufficient, unsuitable and impractical for community needs (Arts Council recommends between 25-30sq ft of library space per 1000 population, June 2010)	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The proposed development will adversely affect the employment prospects of local people by denying them a space which could be used by social enterprises and give them access and guidance to extend their skills and education.	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The proposal is unclear about the future	Friends of	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main

ownership of the 'community hub'; it might be sold or given to parties outside the community by the developer	Cricklewood Library	report
The development will increase the number of delivery and visitor vehicles at a point in the road with limited visibility, high pedestrian usage, with oversubscribed parking bays.	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 36 to 43 of main report
Allowing the loss of the only community space in the area contravenes Brent's Core Strategy, CP23. The proposal also contravenes numerous national, London and local planning guidelines and policies.	Friends of Cricklewood Library	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
Brent has not made an adequate case for the borough-wide loss of library services	Resident objection	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
Whilst a D1 use is proposed, there is no guarantee this would be used as a library and it is unlikely to be viable in the long term.	Resident objection	See Paragraphs 4 to 11 of main report
The community space would be shared with the D1 floorspace on the ground floor with four residential units below resulting in noise and disturbance compromising both uses particularly at weekends	Resident objection	The proposal for a mixed use development including D1 space and residential is not unacceptable in principle and potential issues of noise and disturbance can be managed by noise conditions, separate accesses, a management plan etc.
In accordance with non statutory guidance published by the Communities and Local Government Department it is for the Local Planning Authority to decide whether listing as an asset of community value is a material consideration if an application for change of use is submitted. As the new residential units mean that most of the site will be subject to a change of use, and it is clear that the library building is of great local importance, the listing of the building as an asset of community value should be considered a material consideration for this proposal.	Resident objection	No application has yet been received for a Community Asset Listing for the site and therefore cannot be considered to have material weight.
Proximity to adjoining residential properties which could result in structural damage during construction	Resident objection	The provision of a basement is not unacceptable in principle, and no additional issue have been found to warrant the refusal based on the provision of a basement.
Lack of family and affordable housing provision	Resident objection	See Paragraphs 17 to 19 of main report

For information, the Friends of Cricklewood Library have advised as part of their representations that they have previously make a submission to All Soul's College to use the former library building as a "Cultural Centre".

#### **Recommendation: Remains refusal**

DocSuppF

## **Agenda Item 09**

### **Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

**Case No.**

13/1888

**Description** Renewal of planning permission reference 08/0593, dated 27/05/2008, for change of use from offices (Use Class B1) to 49-bedroom (116-bed) hostel for the homeless, including the erection of an entrance canopy, installation of front boundary railings, access door for disabled and construction of a bicycle store and subject to a Deed of Agreement dated 27th May 2008 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended

#### **Agenda Page Number: 95**

The Rucklidge Avenue Residents Association (RARA) have made a further submission. They have confirmed that they do not object to the proposed 2 year extension of the use and also welcome the inclusion of condition 2, requiring signage to be erected at the pedestrian access gate informing people that the main entrance is off the High Street.

RARA continue to query whether Section 106 contributions should be sought here. The main body of the report concludes that since the adoption of Brent CIL it is not currently possible for the Council to seek financial contributions to public realm improvements through s106. In any case, it is noted that s106 contributions have already been secured under previous applications for a temporary use in the building and these have been used towards additional tree planting within the locality of the site. For Members information temporary permissions are exempt from CIL.

#### **Recommendation: Remains approval.**

DocSuppF

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 October, 2013**

**Case No.** 13/1978

---

**Location** BRITISH LEGION HALL, 1 Albert Road & 5 Albert Road, London, NW6 5DT

**Description** Approval of reserved matters relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of outline planning permission reference 12/1516.

Application 12/1516, dated 30/08/2012 for demolition of existing structures on site and erection of new mixed use development comprising of 144 residential units and 480m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floorspace (Use Class A1/A3/A4) and subject to a Deed of Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended or equivalent

#### **Agenda Page Number: 101**

#### **Consultation Response**

A formal response to the consultation was received from HS2 on 04/10/2013.

They have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposed development, but have requested that certain conditions are attached to the decision to ensure that there is no impact on the safeguarded route of HS2 which will be in a bored tunnel at this location.

The conditions are as follows:

*1. Construction of the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced on those parts of the site shown as falling within the 'Limits of Land Subject to the Safeguarding Direction' until detailed design and construction method statements for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements and for any structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which:*

- (a) Accommodate the proposed location of the HS2 structures and tunnels.*
- (b) Accommodate ground movement and associated effects arising from the construction thereof, and*

- (c) *Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of the HS2 railway within the tunnels, ventilation shaft and associated below & above ground structures.*

*Reason: To ensure the foundations of the buildings are built to ensure the structural integrity of the buildings taking into account the potential presence of HS2 beneath the site.*

*2. The design and construction method statements to be submitted under Condition 4 shall include arrangements to secure that, during any period when concurrent construction is taking place of both the development hereby permitted and of the HS2 structures and tunnels in or adjacent to the site of that development, the construction of the HS2 structures and tunnels is not impeded. The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statement, and all structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (c) of condition 4 shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the buildings hereby permitted are occupied.*

*Reason: To ensure the foundations of the buildings are built to ensure the structural integrity of the buildings taking into account the potential presence of HS2 beneath the site.*

*3. No works below ground level comprised within the development hereby permitted shall be carried out at any time when a tunnel boring machine used for the purposes of boring tunnels for the HS2 Ltd railway is within 100metres of the land on which the development hereby permitted is situated.*

*Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not cause a construction conflict with the proposed alignment of HS2.*

**Recommendation: Remains Approval, subject to additional conditions.**

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank