



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 10 February 2021 at 4.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Kelcher (Chair), Johnson (Vice-Chair), S Butt, Chappell, Dixon, Kennelly, Maurice and J Mitchell Murray.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Anton Georgiou.

1. **Declarations of interests**

None.

Approaches.

Councillor Kelcher informed the Committee he received a telephone call from the agent regarding the Grand Union application.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13th January 2021 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **20/2784 Northfields, Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1NW (Known as "Grand Union")**

PROPOSAL:

Hybrid planning application comprising:-

Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and structures on the site, all site preparation works and redevelopment to provide new buildings to accommodate new homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial uses, new basement level, associated cycle and vehicle parking, new vehicular accesses, associated highway works to Beresford Avenue, landscaping and creation of new public and private open space, ancillary facilitating works, various temporary meanwhile uses, interim works and infrastructure with all matters reserved - appearance, access, landscaping, layout and scale.

Detailed planning permission for Phase 3 (Buildings G, H and J) for the demolition of existing buildings and structures, all site preparation and infrastructure works and the development of new homes (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial floorspace; together with new basement level, associated storage, cycle and vehicle parking, new vehicular accesses, associated highway works to Beresford Avenue, landscaping and creation of new public and private open space, ancillary facilitating works.

RECOMMENDATION:

To resolve to grant planning permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London and subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement to secure the matters set out within the reports, the conditions and informatives recommended in this report, and to delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Chief Legal Officer.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions to secure the matters set out within the reports.

Messrs Colin Leadbeatter, Neil Quinn and Liam McFadden (Principal Planning Officers) introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered Members' questions. In reference to the supplementary report, Mr Leadbeatter drew the following salient matters of clarification to Members' attention:

- The number of dual aspect homes would be increased to 61% within Phase 3 of the development, rather than across the outline consent.
- The financial contribution secured under the original s106 agreement for improvements to Stonebridge Park station would be £2m not £4.6m stated.
- To clarify, £4.6m was secured towards bus service enhancements under the original s106 agreement.
- All trees and hedgerows have already removed under the extant Masterplan consent.

He then outlined the various phases of the revised Masterplan that now included additional 330 homes with commensurate increase in affordable homes (35%), compliant with the emerging housing policy. Members heard about additional communal space provisions, improvements to public open space, provision of community centre and a nursery, significantly higher landscaping and CIL contributions of £73million.

Ms Claire Hammond (Land Director of the applicant St George) addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions on several matters including mix of tenure, affordable homes, traffic and parking. She provided the following updates on the delivery of the proposed development:

- Phase 1 of the scheme, well advanced, would provide 400 homes of which 114 would be affordable and ready for residents to move into later this year.
- Phase 1 would also deliver 5,000 sqft community centre that will open in 2022 with the Grand Union Development Trust established to provide strategic management for the community centre. There would be a new commercial and leisure space including a nursery and food shop.
- The applicant had delivered highways improvements to the Old North Circular road more than 2 years ahead of the S106 deadline.

- In addition to over £8.5million paid in CIL and S106 contributions, the construction works had employed 81 local people.
- The revised masterplan would deliver high quality amenity space, additional homes of which 35% would be affordable and a mix of 3-bed or more family homes and a quarter of those at affordable rent.
- The number of dual aspect homes has also improved. For Phase 3, this has increased from 53% to 61% and for the remaining phases, the design allows for maximisation of dual aspect homes.

During question time, Members raised several issues to which officers submitted the following responses:

- The proposed development would provide high quality industrial space with no loss of employment space.
- As the CCG initially did not take up the offer of the health care facility within the timeframes in the original legal agreement, officers had rebuilt the relevant clauses into the S106 legal agreement to require the applicant to re-offer the 800sqm facility to the CCG.
- The updated transport assessment showed that there would be no material impact. In addition, there would be contributions for highway study, and improvements to Stonebridge Park station and that any capacity increase can be addressed without changes to those secured under the extant planning permission.
- The applicant would submit parking management plan as part of the car parking controls in the detail submission under reserved matters application.
- There would be small decreases in compliance levels regarding daylight, but these would be comparable to other similar schemes in the borough and the benefits are considered to outweigh the harm.
- TfL capital spend was outside of the Committee or the Council's controls, although the Bakerloo line upgrade to improve capacity was ongoing.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by unanimous decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission, subject to the legal agreement and conditions and informatives as set out in the original committee report, and referral of the application to the Mayor of London for his Stage 2 response.
(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 8; Against 0)

4. 20/3156 1-26A, Coachworks & Storage areas, Abbey Manufacturing Estate, all units Edwards Yard, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HA0

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a mixed use development of buildings ranging between 3 and 16 storeys in height, comprising residential units, flexible commercial floorspace, affordable workspaces and community use

floorspace, associated car parking, landscaping and ancillary facilities (phased development)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the application's referral to the Mayor of London (stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the reports.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the reports.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

That, if by the "expiry date" of this application (subject to any amendments /extensions to the expiry date agreed by both parties) the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Mr Toby Huntingford (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He referenced the Committee's decision for refusal of the previous application, a material consideration in the assessment of the current application and, set out the headline similarities and differences between the refused and proposed applications. In reference to the supplementary report, Mr Huntingford drew Members' attention to two additional objections that officers had addressed within the main report, the applicant's revised proposal to address the shortfall in play space and additional planning condition for obscure glazed and non-opening window to the first floor of Block G.

Ms Balvant Mistry (objector) raised several issues of concern including the following and answered Members' questions:

- Overdevelopment of the area with several buildings with excessive height.
- The cumulative impact of the overdevelopment would result in additional noise, disturbance, loss privacy, and loss of light to existing and future residents.

- The development would worsen the traffic and parking situation in the area that would give rise to increased pollution particularly to the local Alperton Community School.
- Lack of adequate infrastructure to support and address the impact of the proposed development.

Ms Anita Patel (objector) echoed similar issues of concern and answered Members' questions. Ms Patel highlighted the transport impact of the proposals that she felt could not be sufficiently addressed by the proposed CPZ.

Councillor Anton Georgiou (ward member) addressed the Committee and raised several issues including the following:

- Inadequate infrastructure including health services, leisure facilities and road network to support and address the intensity of development in the Alperton area.
- Additional parking and traffic that would give rise to parking displacement in neighbouring streets.
- The affordable housing would be outside of the financial range of local residents.

Ms Rebekah Jubb (agent) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions. She referenced the applicant's briefing document that summarised the key changes from the previous application and the benefits of the scheme that included the following; affordable housing with family size units, increased amenity space, employment and affordable workspace, new community floor space and dedicated outside space. Ms Jubb also drew Members' attention to the provision towards a CPZ of £150,000, improvements to Alperton Tube Station of £166,000, local buses network of £177,250, CIL payments of £10.83m and a provision of on-site car club. In conclusion, Ms Jubb reiterated that the scheme fully satisfied all of the Council's requirements and would deliver important and much needed development.

In response to Members' questions, Ms Jubb stated the following:

- The design aspects of the proposal was consistent with the site and was tenure blind for ease by the RSL.
- In addition to the contributions towards CPZ, priority would be given to residents only and that the Parking management Plan would be put in place.
- The number of 1-bed flats was the result of viability and demand issues.
- In addition to conditions imposed by Canals and Rivers Trust, adequate biodiversity and ecological measures including soft landscaping and urban greening would be put in place.

In the ensuing discussions, members raised several issues including infrastructure, privacy, affordable housing and unit mix. Officers clarified the Infrastructure Development Plan for the site, highlighting the provision of new multi-use community and health centres, 1 hectare of public open space, canal upgrade, to mention a few. Members heard that with substantial separation distances in excess of requirement there would be no material privacy impact.

Members noted that PNB Paribas had carried out a robust viability and sensitivity testing and advised that the scheme delivered the maximum affordable housing and in addition to late stage reviews on uplifts.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted consent subject to the referral of the application to the Mayor of London for his Stage 2 response, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 obligation, the change to the relevant Section 106 Heads of Terms, the imposition of the planning conditions set out within the committee report as well as the additional planning condition for obscure glazed and non-opening window to the first floor of Block G as discussed in the supplementary report.

(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 7; Against 1)

5. 20/0115 Matalan Discount Club, Cricklewood Broadway, London, NW2 6PH

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing building; erection of 3 buildings ranging from 3 to 7 storeys with basement, comprising 238 self-contained residential units with commercial space at ground floor level (Use Class B1, Block A only); creation of new street, associated landscaping, car and cycle parking, private and communal amenity space.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to grant planning permission subject to:

- (i) Referral to the Mayor of London (stage II).
- (ii) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

That, if within 12-weeks of the date of the stage II response from the Mayor of London (assuming no objections raised/not calling the application in and subject to any amendments/extensions to the expiry date agreed by both parties) the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

Mr Sean Newton (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, set out the key issues highlighting the car free development, increase in affordable housing and answered Members' questions. In reference to the supplementary he advised that the number of dwellings proposed in the description of development should read 239 dwellings units (not 238) dwellings or units and the number of dwellings within Block A should read 141 (not 138). He then drew Members' attention to the additional objections received and officers' responses as set out within the supplementary report.

Mr Ben Tansley (objector) raised several concerns about the proposed development including the following:

- By the tallest part being on the edge of the site the proposal would constitute a breach of Brent's Policy BD2 and Tall Building Strategy adding that heights should step down from the centre, not rise to the edge.
- The proposal would be overbearing and result in overlooking and intrusion to surrounding properties, to the detriment of residential amenity.
- The development would result in similar undesirable precedents in the area
- The proposed private external amenity space falls short of policies without compensatory provision as the local park was about half a mile away.
- In the interest of residential amenity, Members should condition that construction traffic should not simply avoid but must not use Temple Road due to existing traffic problems.

Mr Chris Miller (objector) although not against the principle of development of the site in order to build residential flats expressed the following concerns:

- The height of the proposed 7-storey building would be excessive with detrimental impact on the amenities and the character of the area. Mr Miller considered that a 5-storey building would have less impact and more in keeping with the local environment whilst at the same time providing a substantial boost to housing availability in the area.
- The proximity of the building to the Broadway and, consequently, the likely infringement of privacy for both the residents of Gratton Terrace and the new development.
- The applicant has not included adequate analysis as to how the skyline for Midland Terrace (which lies immediately behind Gratton Terrace) would be affected by this development
- The applicant has not set out the lines of sight from the development to Midland Terrace which would be altered by the proposed development.
- The top floor windows of the development would be able to look directly into the first floor windows of both Midland and Gratton Terrace, compromising their privacy.

- If possible, the development should also be set back from the Broadway to reduce the imposing impact on the Broadway and also allow trees to be planted to break up to the appearance of the frontage.

Councillor Colacicco (ward member) echoed similar sentiments in objection to the proposed development. She suggested the following conditions, if members were minded to approve the application:

No glass balconies to minimise impact

A ban on construction traffic and Saturday working on site.

Requirement for a car club and adequate disabled parking spaces

Measures to improve air quality.

Mr Mark Pender (agent) and other experts representing the applicant addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions. He drew Members' attention to the following supporting facts:

- The scheme incorporated significant input from key stakeholders including Brent Council, the GLA, CABE/Design Council and the local community through public consultations.
- The design of the scheme would facilitate the adjoining site coming forward for development as identified in the emerging Local Plan.
- The scheme responded to concerns raised by your officers and residents of Gratton Terrace by lowering the height from 9-storeys to 7 at the junction of Temple Road and Cricklewood Broadway.
- As the proposal is for build to rent, in accordance with the now adopted London Plan and the emerging Local Plan, the preference is for the affordable units to be for London living rent.
- The viability assessment submitted in support of the application has been rigorously tested by the GLA and BNP on behalf of Brent Council the result of which would be 50 London living rent flats.
- All flats have their own private balcony or terrace as well as access to communal spaces at ground level including the pedestrian street, new park, courtyards and roof terraces and would meet or exceed the national space standards.
- The applicant would sign up to the Considerate Construction Scheme, Car Club and would implement servicing and delivery strategy

In the ensuing question time, Members raised several issues to which officers submitted the following responses:

- The request for glass balconies was an issue for the applicant and that Considerate Contractors Scheme was normally secured for major developments.
- Delivery and servicing plan was already within the conditions.
- That officers considered that the proposal would not harm the Railway Cottages Conservation Area would result but if Members considered that there was any harm in line with the GLA comments, it would be 'less than substantial' harm with public benefits identified to outweigh that harm.

- Whilst the proposal would be 2 storey higher than the adjacent building, excessive separation distance meant that there would no loss of privacy or outlook.
- If any dwelling were to change from build to rent to sales then the viability assessments would be revisited.
- Barnet Council were consulted about the application but did not provide any response.
- Adequate amenity space provided in addition to the nearby Gladstone Park.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning approval subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 agreement, and the Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.

(Voting on the decision was as follows: For 5; Against 3)

6. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 8.42 pm

COUNCILLOR M. KELCHER
Chair