



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday, 16 November 2011 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Sheth (Chair), Daly (Vice-Chair), Baker, Cummins, Hashmi, Kabir and RS Patel

Apologies for absence were received from McLennan, Mitchell Murray, CJ Patel and Singh

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None declared.

2. **Brent Town Hall Planning Brief**

Members considered a report that introduced the Council's proposed Planning and Development Brief and provided more detailed guidance for the future and development of the Town Hall and its site. The report also explained the need for the brief and the principles that would be required of any new proposals for alteration and development of this important listed building and its curtilage. As the site already had an adopted Site Specific Allocation (SSA W3) the Planning Brief would provide more detailed specific guidance for future owners.

Mark Smith, Head of Design, stated that as a Grade II statutory listed building, certain restrictions were placed on the way the building could be altered and the type and level of development within its site. This therefore would make its disposal more complicated than would normally be required. He added that the guide dealt with many issues but principally it outlined the restrictions and the significant opportunities that the statutory listing represented. It also outlined the Council expectations for any development scheme and having been consulted upon, the brief would be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Once formally adopted the guidance within the SPD would become the fundamental requirement of any successful planning application for future development.

In respect of the Site Specific Allocation (SSA) policy W3, he advised members that mixed use development including offices, retail (for local needs only), residential, hotel and community facilities to ensure the retention of the Listed Building would be acceptable. He added that any change of use and/or development should enhance and not detract from the character and importance of the Town Hall. It should also have regard to existing traffic problems in surrounding residential areas and seek to improve them. He emphasised the need for careful reconfiguration and conversion of the site and to ensure a sensitive and informed approach to the re-development that would achieve the highest architectural standards.

He outlined the timetable for consultation which was expected to take approximately four weeks from the end of November 2011 and dependent upon the responses, the findings would be reported back in January to the Executive with a suitable recommendation. The indicative but not exhaustive consultation list would include:

Local residents in the streets around the Town Hall
Barn Hill Residents Association
Tudor Close Residents Association
English Heritage
The 20th Century Society
Environment Agency
Transport for London
The GLA

In welcoming the report, members emphasised the need to ensure a high quality design for the frontage landscape of the site and that the open space was retained or suitably integrated with any future development for the site.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the planning brief for the Town Hall be noted;
- (ii) that a subsequent consultation with local residents, their associations, statutory bodies and other interested parties, prior to the brief being reported to the Executive for final approval and adoption be supported.

3. Community Infrastructure Levy - Consultation on Detailed Proposals

The Committee received a report that set out the council's responses to the consultation for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL was introduced by the government in 2008 as a replacement for Planning Obligations (S106) to help fund much needed infrastructure required as a consequence of new development.

Dave Carroll, Head of New Initiatives highlighted the issues relevant to Brent on the government's detailed arrangements required to bring CIL forward, including how it should be spent and recorded. He stated that as the administrative expenses from the CIL pot may be expensive, officers would support the removal of the cap, currently 5%, as this would provide a degree of flexibility in the system. He did not recommend the idea of using CIL receipts for affordable housing as it would otherwise reduce the amount available for infrastructure. Dave Carroll recommended the use of the current pooling arrangements under Section 106 (S106) for offsite affordable housing rather than the levy, irrespective of pooling arrangements. He clarified that in Brent's case, affordable housing provision would mostly be on-site and the S106 pooling arrangement would provide adequate mechanism to deal with occasional off site requirements. Members noted that issues within the consultation paper concerning the collection of CIL by the London Mayor in Mayoral Development Corporations were not relevant to Brent.

In reference to the Brent's charging schedule appended to the report, Dave Carroll stated that the fees proposed were lower than those proposed by Wandsworth Council but similar to those proposed by Barnet Council. He was confident that the figures would not deter developers and that the in-built certainty would be a much better system than at present.

RESOLVED:

that the responses to the consultation by the Director of Planning as the council's response to the consultation paper to be sent to Communities and Local Government be endorsed.

4. London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework

Members gave consideration to a report that provided an update on current planning policy issues which would affect future planning decisions and plan preparation within Brent. The report also provided a summary of the key issues arising, and implications for Brent, of the London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework.

Ken Hullock, Head of Planning and Transport Strategy informed members about two significant strategic planning documents that had been published since the last meeting: the revised London Plan and the National Policy Framework. He continued that the revised London Plan published in July would remain in force after the enactment of the Localism Bill later this year. He summarised the key changes to the London Plan and the parts that related directly to Brent, drawing members' attention to a number of Opportunity Areas identified by the London Plan for Brent where regeneration and growth were to be focussed, as set out in the report.

The new National Planning Policy Framework would replace all existing national planning policy and guidance included in planning policy guidelines (PPGs), planning policy supplements (PPSs) and Best Practice Guides. As the formal consultation period closed on 17 October a response on behalf of Brent attached as appendix 3 to the report was made by officers. Although the response welcomed a simplification of policy and guidance, it highlighted some specific concerns about the implications for local planning of an absence of firm policy in certain areas.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the adoption of a revised London Plan and the implications of this for making planning decisions in Brent be noted.
- (ii) that the officer response to the Secretary of State on the draft National Planning Policy Framework be endorsed.

5. Local Planning Issues and LDF Progress

Members considered a report that outlined progress on Brent's Local Development Framework (LDF) and the implications of this in dealing with local planning issues that had arisen. The report also proposed a revised timetable for progressing the LDF in the future.

Ken Hullock, Head of Planning and Transport Strategy informed the Committee that changes to the regulations governing the production of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) meant that it was possible for the local planning authority to review it at any time. Given that Brent's LDS was out of date and over one year old, he recommended a revised timetable as set out in the report. He clarified that although officers had made good progress, further studies were necessary before a draft Plan can be produced. He continued that given the current level of resources it was not expected that a draft plan could be made ready for consideration by Committee until March 2012. The anticipated dates for adoption would be as follows; Summer 2013 for the Action Plan DPD and May 2014 for the Development Policies DPD. In view of the constraints, he recommended adjustments to the timetabling in the LDS as set out in the report and requested Members to agree this for publication, in the form of a gantt chart, on the Council's website.

RESOLVED:

that the progress made in progressing Brent's Local Development Framework be noted and agreed the revised LDS timetable for publication on the Council's website.

6. West London Waste Plan

Members received a report which explained progress with the preparation of the Joint West London Waste Plan (WLWP) with particular regard to the latest position on the identification of sites for processing waste in Brent.

Ken Hullock, Head of Planning and Transport Strategy informed members that consultation on the draft West London Waste Plan for 24 sites (6 within Brent) ended in March 2011. Since then, consultants acting on behalf of the 6 boroughs had been modifying the Plan in light of comments received and changes to the estimates of the amount of waste to be processed as set out in the new London Plan. Following the above an assessment had been carried out on the deliverability of sites. In Brent, the sites proposed for inclusion in the submission document were: (i) Twyford Waste Transfer Station (ii) Veolia Transfer Station, Marsh Road. He added that the Hannah Close / Great Central Way site was now operational and, therefore, no longer proposed and that the remaining three sites (Asia Sky, Abbey Road; Rail sidings, Premier Park Road; Alperton Lane Industrial area, Marsh Lane) were for one reason or another, considered to be difficult to deliver. This, combined with a need to identify a significantly reduced land area for waste processing than originally set out in the draft plan, meant that there was no need to designate any proposed new sites in Brent.

In outlining the next steps Ken Hullock stated that Executive would be asked to approve a revised WLWP for publication at its meeting on 12 December. Once agreed by all six boroughs the document would be made available for a further 6 week public consultation in February 2012. Authority would then be sought from each borough, i.e. in Brent's case from Executive, to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination in Public which was anticipated to be held in late 2012 and the WLWP adopted by the 6 boroughs in early 2013.

RESOLVED:

that the Executive be recommended to agree the Plan for publication and deposit for a 6 week consultation in February 2012, on the basis that the sites identified in the report were included in the West London Waste Plan.

7. Any Other Urgent Business

None raised at this meeting.

The meeting ended at 8:35pm

K SHETH
Chair