



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 10 December 2009 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Kansagra (Chair), Powney (Vice-Chair), Anwar, Cummins, Hashmi, Jackson, R Moher, HM Patel and Thomas

ALSO PRESENT:

Apologies for absence were received from Baker and Hirani

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

None

### 2. **The London plan - Comments on the consultation draft replacement plan**

The Committee gave consideration to a report that set out comments on the consultation draft of the Replacement London Plan, a legal part of the council's development plan when planning decisions were being made and a document that would set planning policy for the whole of London and for this borough in particular.

In setting out the time table for its adoption, the Head of Policy and Projects Dave Carroll informed the Committee that the deadline for submission of comments on the Replacement London Plan which was published in October 2009 for public consultation was 12 January 2010. The next stage would be an Examination in Public in summer-autumn of 2010 and the new plan being adopted probably in early 2011. The London Plan intended to replace the 2004 London Plan would be the framework for the development of London until 2031 integrating the Mayor's transport, economic development, housing and cultural strategies as well as addressing other social and environmental issues. The Plan would also provide the policy context within which boroughs set their planning policies and the basis on which the Mayor would consider strategic applications referred to him. He then drew members' attention to the comments on the key changes to policy.

Whilst welcoming the change in emphasis in giving boroughs more say in planning their boroughs, he expressed concerns about the objective to fund strategic matters through planning obligations and community Infrastructure levy (CIL). He continued that as set out in its comments, the Council supported the London Plan housing target, the minimum flat size standards in high density development, the ability to stop back garden development and the general aim of increasing affordable family housing although it was recognised that this would not be possible on every site.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10 December 2009

It was noted that Wembley had been identified as a visitor destination in the London Plan without Mayor recognising its potential to deliver office floor space and other mixed use potential. In addition the Mayor should include other emerging areas of opportunity identified by the borough such as Alperton. He continued that the Council could not deliver its Gypsy site allocation without a clear understanding of the funding avenues needed to secure and develop such sites. He added that the Mayor needed to support development on suitable sites in order to address the shortage of school places and to lobby for appropriate funding, including the provision of local S106 funds that would take priority over strategic requirements. He also added that the Council supported the provision of decentralised energy networks but on condition that the Mayor worked with boroughs, government and energy providers to secure investment that would allow their provision earlier in the development process. Whilst the Council also supported retrofitting of existing stock it also needed a realistic assessment of resources to undertake such work to be identified.

In the discussion that followed, Councillor Hashmi, whilst supporting the stance on back garden development enquired as to why The Mayor had chosen to reduce CO2 emissions by 60% by 2025 but not now. It was also suggested by the Chair that consideration ought to be given to building multi-storey gypsy sites, taking into account the shortage of building land in London. In responding to the above, Dave Carroll stated that it was not possible at this stage to apply the reductions in CO2 emissions as the Plan could not be adopted until 2012. He added that the phased change in emission levels had been favoured in order to reduce developers' construction costs. On the suggestion for multi-storey gypsy sites, he felt that it could lead to problems of overcrowding. Councillor R Moher noted that the new arrangements for Section 106 planning gain coupled with the CIL would leave little for Brent to support strategic projects within the Borough. The Director of Planning added that the proposals in the London Plan would not derail the Council's core strategy as arrangements would be in place to ensure that appropriate infrastructure was available to support projected population growth in London.

**RESOLVED:-**

that the comments set out in paragraphs 3.34 to 3.52 of the report be agreed as the council's response to the Consultation Draft of the Replacement London Plan subject to any further amendment from the Executive.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10 December 2009

**3. Proposed pre-submission changes to the site specific allocation development plan document**

The Committee received a report that summarised limited changes to the draft Site Specific Allocations Submission stage Development Plan Document of the emerging Local Development Framework. The Head of Policy & Projects clarified that the role of the document was to give more details of development within individual sites, including within the Core Strategy's growth areas. He added that following publication of, and consultation on, Brent's Site Specific Allocations in June 2009 representations were received seeking changes to the document. Having considered the representations officers were proposing limited changes to the following 3 new sites and a series of minor changes to the document which were proposed.

*Moberly Leisure Centre, South Kilburn*

A representation was received from the London Borough of Westminster for the inclusion of an allocation on the Moberly Leisure Centre in the South Kilburn growth area that would promote the redevelopment of the site for a new or improved leisure centre and enable residential development. In principle, officers recommended the inclusion of this new site as a Site Specific Allocation as the Council would want to secure some affordable housing as part of any development to assist with the redevelopment of South Kilburn.

*Former service station garage Rucklidge Avenue*

Abermarle Trust, the owners of this site submitted a representation requesting the inclusion of this site within the document as "residential development". Although planning applications for the site had been refused in the past, as it was a brownfield land within an urban development, officers felt that in principle, this site can be included within the document as it was in line with national and regional planning policy. However, officers suggest that the allocation is worded so as to refer to the difficulties of development derived from the outlook, privacy, mass and scale in relation to the surrounding properties.

**Former Wembley Mini-Market, Lancelot Road, Wembley**

***London and Quadrant Housing Trust requested that this site be included as a site specific allocation for either solely residential or the mixed use redevelopment of this site. This brownfield site had long been vacant and officers felt that in principle, the site was suitable for redevelopment. However, officers feel that in the interests of supporting the role of Wembley town centre, the development should***

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10 December 2009

***include commercial uses at lower floors. This will supersede the proposals for the site included in the adopted UDP.***

***He added that the requests for inclusion of the following sites could not be recommended for reasons set out below;***

***Swimming Pool at Roe Green Park, Kingsbury***

Officers felt that it was not possible to include an allocation at such an advanced stage in the document, when the actual site for this proposal had still not been agreed by the Council. Additionally, officers were concerned that the progress of the document was not held up while a site was agreed.

***Asiatic Carpets and Chancel House, Church End***

These sites were already included within the document but were identified for mixed use development. Due to the level of occupation of Chancel House and the significant floor space of Asiatic carpets, it would be extremely expensive to acquire these sites and which would not be achieved without complex compulsory purchase procedures.

Councillor Mistry, ward member for Queensbury requested the Committee to agree the inclusion of Kingsbury swimming pool as a site specific allocation, a popular choice of all local residents

In reiterating the reasons for not recommending inclusion, Dave Carroll added that an allocation can be proposed at the Examination in Public if a site had been agreed before then. If this was not possible, a planning brief can be prepared that can be supplementary to the Core Strategy which itself would include a statement that the Council was seeking a pool in the north of the borough. This can deal with the more detailed site development issues and would be subject to public consultation.

RECOMMENDED:-

that the Executive agrees the proposed changes to the Site Specific Allocation Development Plan Document set out in Appendix 1, for public consultation.

**4. Any Other Urgent Business**

None