



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 20 April 2022 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Johnson (Vice-Chair) and Councillors S Butt, Chappell, Dixon, Kennelly, Donnelly-Jackson and Maurice

Also present: Councillor Kansagra (in person as local ward councillor) for Agenda Item 5

### 1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

### 2. Declarations of interests

No declarations of interests were made at the meeting.

### 3. Minutes of the previous meeting

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

### 4. Order of Business

At this stage in proceedings the Chair advised that he had agreed to vary the order of business on the agenda. This was to enable the consideration of Agenda Item 5 (Application 21/3248 – Lidding Road Garages, Lidding Road, Harrow) followed by Agenda Item 7 (Application 21/3713 – Land Opposite, 33-47 Brookfield Court, Gooseacre Lane, Harrow) as the applications were in close proximity and had the same public speaker registered to address the committee on both applications. Items 4 and 6 would then follow. The minutes reflect the order in which the items were therefore considered at the meeting.

### 5. 21/3248 - Lidding Road Garages, Lidding Road, Harrow

#### PROPOSAL

The demolition of the existing garages and redevelopment to provide 3 self-contained flats and 5 dwelling houses; with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping.

#### RECOMMENDATION~:

- (1) That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

impose the conditions and informatives as set out within the report and supplementary agenda.

- (2) That the Head of Planning is 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.
- (3) 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.

Liam McFadden, Planning Officer, North Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the council led scheme had initially come to the Planning Committee on 15 December 2021 where the committee had agreed to defer a decision on the application in order to:

- (1) seek further details and assurances from Thames Water in relation to the impact of the proposed development on drainage and the maintenance of the sewerage infrastructure and how these would be mitigated;
- (2) seek further details on the location of the flooding incidents identified within the Floor Risk Assessment; and
- (3) seek further details on the proposals to alleviate concerns regarding the access of construction traffic to the site via Gooseacre Lane as part of the Construction Method Statement and Logistics Plan to be secured via condition.

Committee members were informed that since initial consideration of the application the Council had adopted a new Local Plan, however this did not alter any assessment or recommendations made for the proposed scheme. In addressing the points of clarification, officers shared tracking diagrams to illustrate how construction vehicles would be able to access the site safely and with minimum disruption for existing local residents via Gooseacre Lane or Hillview

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

Avenue and without the need for parking suspensions. The committee was also advised a full Construction Logistic Plan would be required by condition.

Officers advised that the concerns regarding the sewerage infrastructure and flood risk had been further explored by officers who had met with Thames Water to discuss the concerns raised in relation to the impact of the development. As a result, Thames Water had confirmed they considered there to be sufficient capacity in terms of drainage and infrastructure with the flow from the development expected to be small. They had also advised they had no concerns over the risk of foul water flooding as part of the development which they advised would not result in an increase in pollution of Wealdstone Brook. Whilst acknowledging the current issues in relation to the performance of the foul sewers in the area Thames Water advised that the capacity of the sewage system was sufficient to serve the proposed development with the main pollution issues having been caused by blockages created by inappropriate materials such as fats, oils and grease being put into the system. With regard to surface water flooding Thames Water had felt the increased flow rates identified in the drainage strategy would reduce the overall flood risk. Confirmation was also provided that in terms of access to the sewers a build over agreement had been proposed with further details having also been provided relating to an ongoing programme seeking to address the issues with water quality in the Wealdstone Brook working in conjunction with Harrow Council. In light of the comments received from Thames Water and the clarity provided from officers with regard to construction traffic, the officer's recommendation remained that the planning permission be granted.

Members noted the details of the additional objection received as detailed within the supplementary agenda and as no questions were raised, the Chair then invited Mr John Poole (as an objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application.

Mr Poole began by drawing Committee member's attention to the map of misconnecting pipework that had been produced by Thames Water and circulated to members ahead of the meeting. The map showed the misconnections in pipework that Mr Poole believed had significantly contributed to the foul surface water and sewage issues in the local area. Mr Poole then drew members attention to the map produced by the Environment Agency that illustrated that Brent Council were believed to be the riparian owners of large sections of the Wealdstone Brook, he then went on to share the following concerns with regard to the application:

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 April 2022

- The Wealdstone Brook was highly polluted and posed a health risk to the local community, human excrement had been seen in the brook and in recent weeks the foul odour that emanated from the brook had been particularly strong and affected the quality of life of local residents. Mr Poole went on to note that he had been a resident for 50 years and had never seen the quality of the brook as poor as it had been recently.
- Referencing Brent Council's Climate Emergency Strategy Mr Poole drew members attention to the Bio Diversity and Climate Emergency Documents produced by Brent Council, adding that local residents were keen to support the council in meeting the targets specified to achieve carbon neutrality, however he believed that if planning permission was granted for the proposed scheme in Lidding Road it would be in conflict with these objectives.
- In summarising his concerns Mr Poole urged the Committee to defer the application until a report had been received from Brent Council's Sustainability Officer, the report of the London Flood Review had been published and Thames Water had rectified the faulty sewer connections and infrastructure.

The Chair thanked Mr Poole for his contribution and reminded Committee members that it had been established there were issues with sewage pollution in the area and that the Committee would therefore need to consider the impact of the proposed development in terms of the potential to exacerbate the ongoing issues and whether enough had been done to mitigate the concerns.

In response to questions from members in relation to his comments, Mr Poole responded with the following points:

- Mr Poole shared that he was not confident Thames Water would be forthcoming in completing the work necessary to rectify the issues of the misconnecting pipework given they had been aware of the problems for a long time and were yet to action repairs. Concerns were also expressed regarding ongoing drainage issues and the localised impact in terms of flooding in the local area
- In response to a question regarding Thames Water's position that the sewerage issues being experienced were due to blockages caused by use of inappropriate materials being flushed in to the system, Mr Poole responded that he believed the predominant factor affecting the sewer infrastructure remained the misconnecting pipework.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

As members had no further questions the Chair invited Kerry Csuka as the applicant's agent to address the Committee (in person). Kerry Csuka introduced the application, drawing the Committee's attention to the following key points:

- Since the scheme had been deferred at the Planning Committee in December 2021 the project team had explored the issues raised and responded to them accordingly.
- The team had consulted with Thames Water, who considered that the existing sewer had sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from the new scheme.
- Thames Water had issued a letter stating that drainage problems in the area had not been caused by the capacity of the sewers but by sewer blockages due to misuse.
- In terms of sewer access, a build-over agreement was proposed to ensure that access would be maintained with the development in place, this approach had been accepted by Thames Water.
- Thames Water had responded to the Sewer Flooding History request made in the proposed site area with confirmation that no flooding events had been recorded in this area as a result of discharging public sewers.
- With regards to surface water flooding there would be an overall reduction in flood risk due to the reduced surface water flow rates identified in the Drainage Strategy.
- In response to the concerns previously raised regarding construction traffic, tracking diagrams had been provided that demonstrated that illustrated how construction vehicles were able to access the site from Gooseacre Lane, without the need for parking suspensions. This was also the case for Hillview Avenue. A planning condition was also proposed which required a full Construction Logistics Plan to be provided.
- The existing drainage and sewer situation would not be worsened by the proposed development, as a result of improved landscaping and modern material the development would actually see a reduced surface water discharge rate compared to the current situation.
- There would be many benefits to the scheme including 8 new homes provided at London Affordable Rent, 63% would be 3-bedroom family-sized homes, this significantly exceeded Brent's 25% target.
- The Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) would be enhanced and opportunities for biodiversity were maximised, with 33 new trees being planted.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 April 2022

- The scheme provided both parking spaces for the new homes in line with policy plus additional spaces for existing residents.
- The proposed high-quality design had been commended by Brent's Urban Design Officer who considered the scheme an exemplar infill scheme.

Committee members raised queries regarding the increased pressure on the sewage system, flooding and construction traffic. In response to the questions from members Kerry Csuka supported by the applicant's additional representatives, Rhys Williams, Flood Risk Consultant and Marcus Nelson, Architect (attending online) clarified the following points:

- In response to concerns regarding the increased demand on the already compromised sewage system on Lidding Road, Rhys Williams, Flood Risk Consultant acknowledged the ongoing issues with misconnections in the pipework and advised that the proposed scheme would be built to best practice in line with building regulations ensuring that surface water and foul water pipes would be correctly connected to the sewer and drainage system, therefore the risk of cross contamination would be minimised.
- The Committee were advised that in order to mitigate flood risks the ground floor level would be built above the required calculated height to accommodate for any flood level (including an additional factor to reflect any climate change impact). An element of flood storage compensation had also been included in the design to ensure that residents who lived further up or down stream would not be adversely affected by flood waters.
- Surface water issues would see an improved discharge rate through the use of sustainable drainage systems (rather than the existing hardstanding materials) including the use of rain gardens and permeable surfaces that would act as a sponge to collect rainfall and slowly discharge the water at a steady rate. The incorporation of the sustainable drainage system design would also see an improvement in the bio diversity of the site.
- Kerry Csuka confirmed that as illustrated in the tracking diagrams, construction traffic would be able to access the site via Gooseacre Lane and Hillview Avenue with no identified need to apply parking restrictions at present.

As no further questions were raised, Councillor Kansagra, in his capacity as local ward councillor, was then invited to address the Committee (in person). In addressing the Committee Councillor Kansagra highlighted the following key points for consideration:

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 April 2022

- The historical issues regarding the sewage pipes remained problematic despite Thames Water being aware of the concerns.
- The impact on residents of the misconnecting pipes was far reaching and in his opinion would only be exacerbated by building additional properties on the site.
- If the proposed scheme were approved, it would create an access issue if Thames Water needed to remedy the misconnecting pipework.
- In summarising his concern Councillor Kansagra suggested that the application should be deferred or rejected until the sewage problems had been remedied.

As a follow up question by the committee, Councillor Kansagra was asked whether he would have supported the application had it not been for the issues identified in relation to the sewer infrastructure, foul water pollution of the Wealdstone Brook and flooding.

Councillor Kansagra confirmed that if the issues highlighted were rectified he would be prepared to reconsider the merits of the application on planning grounds.

As members had no further questions for Councillor Kansagra, the Chair invited members to ask officers any questions or points of clarification they may have in relation to the application. In response to questions raised by the Committee the following responses were provided:

- Officers confirmed that access to the site for construction vehicles had been fully assessed and were considered to be acceptable with no need identified to introduce parking suspensions.
- Responding to further comments regarding access by construction traffic, clarification was provided that a full Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) would also be required by condition which would include access and egress arrangements.
- Clarification was provided that should any damage be caused to pavements as a result of construction activity it would be possible to reclaim the cost of any works required to rectify from the contractor based on a condition survey completed prior to works commencing.
- In response to a query regarding planting and the replacement of trees, officers confirmed that a number of low quality trees would be lost as part of the development but would be replaced (as conditioned) with species

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

considered to be more acceptable by the Council's Tree Officer which would also be of a type able to offer a higher level of water absorption to support natural drainage in the area. The committee was advised that further consideration would be given to the most effective types of water absorbing tree species that could be replanted to replace the trees lost through the new development.

- In relation to the concerns highlighted in terms of flooding and impact on the sewer infrastructure officers again highlighted the outcome of discussions with Thames Water regarding the ongoing programme they were developing seeking to address the water quality issues within Wealdstone Brook, working in conjunction with Harrow Council, although it was noted the specific schedule of works and timescales were still to be confirmed.
- In terms of assurance relating to the Flood Risk Assessment, the committee were advised of the mitigations provided through the Flood Resistant Measures proposed. These included flood resistant damp proofing and an assessment of the surface water flood routing into Wealdstone Brook which ensured that flood risk was not increased across the site or outside of the site boundary.
- In clarifying the position regarding the proposed use of "hit and miss brick work" in the voids under the houses, officers advised that this included the provision of void space under the development to allow surface water to flow off with a drainage maintenance plan to be included
- Overall officers considered that the development would result in an improvement in terms of surface water drainage when compared to the existing circumstances and that the scheme was acceptable in terms of flood risk and potential impact on the local sewage system.
- Responding to concerns that no written assurances had been obtained from Thames Water regarding the schedule or timescale for their proposed programme of works the committee were reminded that whilst not possible to secure this by way of legal agreement as part of the application process (given Thames Water were not the applicant) Thames Water retained a legal obligation in relation to maintenance of the sewer infrastructure system.
- Officers clarified that the main sewer manhole covers would remain accessible on the site, therefore access would still be possible in the event of work needing to be completed on the system.
- In response to a question regarding the potential use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding as a further potential measure to support mitigating actions relating to flooding and water quality in the Wealdstone

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

Brook members were advised this would not be possible as the committee had no remit over the allocation of these funds.

Gerry Ansell, as Head of Planning & Development Services, concluded the discussions by advising the Committee that, as detailed within the report, the Council's Drainage Engineer had also assessed the capacity of the network and confirmed that capacity was sufficient to cope with the proposed development both in terms of surface water and foul water. Whilst recognising the concerns raised in relation to the sewer network and pollution in Wealdstone Brook the committee were advised these reflected wider issues with the development having been assessed as resulting in an improvement in terms of surface water drainage when compared to existing circumstances and being acceptable in terms of flood risk and potential impact on the local sewerage system. It would therefore be for the committee to reach a decision based on these assessments and the wider planning related considerations relating to the application.

As there were no further issues were raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

**DECISION:** Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out within the report and updates within the supplementary agenda.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 4, Against 1 and Abstain 3.)

In concluding consideration of the application the Chair advised that whilst recognising the concerns highlighted in relation to Thames Water and wider drainage, water pollution and sewerage infrastructure maintenance works, the committee had needed to consider the application, in fulfilling their strategic planning role, on the basis of the relevant planning considerations outlined.

**6. 21/3713 - Land Opposite, 33 - 47 Brookfield Court, Gooseacre Lane, Harrow****PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks planning permission to re-develop the site by introducing four x four bedroom terraced dwelling houses. The new dwellings would be two storeys in height with the roof levels also supporting habitable space. Dormer additions would be included to both the front and rear roof elevations of each dwelling. The southern parts of the site would be sub divided to provide rear gardens to each

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

dwelling. Each unit would have one car parking space, cycle storage and refuse storage. New tree planting was proposed along the southern boundary onto Gooseacre Lane/Hillview Avenue and access to the new development would be from the existing road supporting Brookfield Court which would be widened to 5.5m with a 1.35m wide footpath as part of the proposed scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION~:**

- (1) That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose the conditions and informatives as set out within the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is 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.
- (3) 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.

Denis Toomey, Principle Planning Officer, North Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that a previous application for the site had been refused due to the character of the proposed dwellings, inappropriate levels of hardstanding and insufficient provision replacement planting, which the committee felt failed to mitigate the impact associated with the loss of the existing green cover to the south of the application site. The revised application sought to overcome the previous reasons for refusal by responding to the concerns raised and as a result the proposal had now been re-orientated with the main front elevation directed to the north with the rear elevation and associated garden spaces positioned towards the south of the site. Additional replacement planting had also been included next to the southern boundary. Members also noted the update provided within the supplementary agenda relating to provision for refuse collection and subsequent amendment proposed to Condition 16 in relation to cover the temporary holding area for bins on collection day.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

As no questions were raised by members, the Chair then invited Mr John Poole (as an objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Mr Poole shared his concerns as follows:

- The development would result in loss of green space and have an adverse impact on available local amenity space for children and families in Brookfield Court.
- Mr Poole believed it was unreasonable to suggest that local children and families affected by the loss of green space could access Woodcock Park as an alternative as the reason that many children used the current green space was because they were easily seen by their parents from Brookfield Court, this would not be possible if they were travelling to Woodcock Park.
- Due to the extremely close proximity to the previous application considered (Lidding Road) the same concern regarding drainage issues existed for the Brookfield Court application, particularly as Hillview Road regularly flooded when it rained.
- In light of the concerns raised Mr Poole urged the Planning Committee to reject the application.

As Committee members had no questions for Mr Poole the Chair invited the next speaker Mr John Cutler (agent) to address the Committee (in person) who highlighted the following points:

- The proposed scheme was an infill development on residential land, which was supported by Local Plan Policy BH4, and London Plan Policy D3.
- The Brent Local Plan recognised that 54% of the new homes needed in the borough were 3 bed plus properties, yet policy BH6 required only 25% of new homes to be 3 bed or more. In the context provided, the proposed four new homes would all be 4 bedroom properties.
- The site currently provided limited value as vacant grassland, it was felt that the loss of the green space to support the development was mitigated by the fact that there were other private and public areas of amenity space within close proximity to Brookfield Court, namely Woodcock Park which was positioned only 200m to the west of the site and could be used by the local community as an alternative to the green space in Brookfield Court.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

- The revised design, with the housing facing to the north would provide a positive contribution to Brookfield Court whilst protecting neighbouring amenity.
- Established building lines had been respected, and the height mirrored that of the built form directly north and north west. The architectural approach had been to provide a modern interpretation of traditional design features.
- The scheme included significant tree planting, particularly along the southern and western boundaries, plus provision of wildflower planting. Bird and bat boxes were also included. It was pointed out the Council's Tree Officer had not raised any objections.
- The scheme would achieve a 0.47 Urban Greening Factor score, against a target of 0.40.
- The proposal would also enhance the usability of Brookfield Court, widening the access road carriageway to 5.5 metres. A new footpath would enhance safety.
- Existing parking arrangements within Brookfield Court would not be adversely affected with the Council's Highway Officer also not having raised any objections.
- All units were accessible and adaptable.
- The scheme would reach the Passivhaus standard, reducing carbon emissions by up to 90%.
- The Council had already indicated the proposal was acceptable in principle. It would provide four new family homes, for which there was a significant need in the borough.

Committee members raised queries regarding the scheme's Urban Greening Factor and carbon emissions. In response to the questions Mr Cutler supported by the applicants other representatives (online) provided the following responses:

- As further clarification on the schemes Urban Greening Factor (UGF) score John Cutler advised that the UGF was a London Plan test which sought to ensure that new developments maximised bio diversity and green landscaping measures. Members were advised that the UGF could be increased by the addition of permeable paving, additional tree planting and green space with the score for the proposed application exceeding the required target.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

- It was confirmed that the 90% reduction in carbon emissions was with regard to the current building regulations.

As there were no further questions for the agent, the Chair invited members to ask officers any questions they may have regarding the scheme. In response to the questions raised by the Committee the following responses were provided:

- Officers advised that flood risk concerns had been assessed with the Flood Risk Assessment having been reviewed by the Council's Principal Flood and Drainage Engineer who had been satisfied with the contents of the report.
- The proposal would result in management of surface water by incorporating suitable mitigation measures which included the provision of rainwater harvesting butts, soft landscaping to the north of the site to support the management of surface water run-off. The mitigations would ensure a betterment to the current position regarding surface water in the area.
- Officers acknowledged the importance of retaining green space in line with policy DMP1 and recognised that the development would see a loss of green space, however balanced against the provision of offering 4 family sized homes it was felt that the loss of green space was outweighed by the benefits of the scheme as a whole.
- In response to concerns highlighted in relation to flooding and Thames Waters record of these being logged, officers advised that during their consultation with Thames Water no concerns regarding flooding or foul water discharge had been identified given the scale of the development which officers had been required to use as the basis for their assessment of the application and recommendations.
- It was confirmed that the applicant owned the proposed application site and although the site was on a private road the applicant had right of the way to access the site, deeds had been provided and confirmed by the Council's Legal Services Team.
- Officers advised that current local residents would not be disadvantaged in terms of parking during the construction of the development or once completed. Residents were able to park on the pathway to the north of the site with the widening of the road also likely to improve parking provision. The tracking diagrams provided in the report identified how residents could access the site.
- Officers confirmed that a condition had been included to ensure appropriate external street lighting was installed.
- Officers confirmed that due to the status of the proposed area of land being

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

identified as contaminated, conditions were included that recommended an investigation of land contamination to be carried out prior to the commencement of any building works together with details of remediation and verification of the works carried out.

- Officers advised that in considering the ecological impact of the scheme the design team had maintained green space on the southern portion of the site. Whilst 16 trees would be removed the proposal included the planting of 25 new trees and higher levels of soft landscaping. Officers confirmed that as part of the landscaping conditions the tree planting schedule would specify the species and maturity of the trees, that would be included as part of the planting scheme.
- In line with Policy G5 of the London Plan and Policy BGI1 of the Draft Local Plan developments were required to contribute to Urban Greening with the Urban Greening Factor score for the proposed development exceeding the required target.
- Whilst recognising the concerns raised in relation to the loss of existing green space as a play area officers advised it was not possible to designate an area as part of this application for this specific purpose given the boundary of the application site.

As there were no further questions from members and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out within the report and updates detailed within the supplementary agenda.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 6, Against 1, Abstain 1)

**7. 21/4155 - 6 St Johns Road, Wembley****PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing building and the proposed erection of a part 5 and part 18 storey mixed use building containing commercial floor space (Use Class E) on the ground floor and comprising 79 residential units on the upper floors.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

- (1) That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to
  - (a) Any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order
  - (b) Any direction by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Consultation Direction
  - (c) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as set out in the report
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose the conditions and informatives as set out within the report.
- (3) That the Head of Planning is 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.
- (4) 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.

Toby Huntingford, Principle Planning Officer, North Team, introduced the report, set out key issues and answered member questions. In introducing the report members were advised that the application related to the demolition of the existing job centre building and the proposal to construct a new building that would be part 5 and part 18 storeys in height, accommodating a flexible commercial unit at ground floor level and 79 homes and communal rooftop amenity spaces across its upper floors. The scheme would provide 100% affordable housing with 31 units for social rent and 48 for shared ownership. Of these a quarter of the homes would be family sized. The residential led re-development would benefit from high public transport accessibility with the site designated within the Wembley Growth Area, Housing Zone, Town Centre and Tall Building Zone. Committee members were

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

shown CGI images to illustrate the context of the development within the wider local area. Member's attention was then drawn to the supplementary report that set out the strategy to reduce carbon emissions.

As no questions were raised by members at this stage, the Chair then invited Tim Gaskell as the applicant's agent to address the committee (in person) in relation to the application:

- Mr Gaskell began by highlighting the benefits of the scheme that included the development being 100% affordable for tenants, within an area identified by Brent Council as suitable for tall buildings with excellent access to public transport networks.
- All homes would be built to a high standard with nearly all units being dual aspect.
- The slender design of the building would complement the area, it was acknowledged that the proposed building would be tall at 18 storeys, however members were advised that it would not be as tall as other buildings in the area.

Members raised queries regarding the consideration given to the height of the building, accessibility and resident parking.

- Tim Gaskell confirmed that following suggestions from the pre application stage the design team had looked at the possibility of lowering the height of the building, however upon further exploration it would have resulted in a less attractive building with decreased natural daylight and more overshadowing for residents.
- Confirmation was provided that 10% of the units would be fully accessible with 2 designated disabled parking bays to be provided.

As no further questions were raised for the agent, the Chair invited Committee members to ask officers any outstanding questions they may have. The responses provided were as follows:

- In response to concerns regarding the disabled parking provision officers confirmed that the provision would be based on the conversion of existing parking bays along Elm Road with future dedicated spaces to be provided on request. Existing blue badge holding residents would also still be eligible to use the on-street parking provision already available.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

- Responding to further concerns raised by members regarding the removal of general car parking bays, officers advised that some parking spaces would be retained at the Elm Road junction on St Johns road however some would need to be removed to allow room for refuse vehicles to turn in the road. On balance it was felt this was acceptable as there was good parking and public transport capacity in area with the scheme designated as “car free” in order to encourage sustainable travel patterns.
- Officers confirmed that there would be a loading bay for delivery vehicles.
- In addressing concerns raised regarding overlooking and loss of light, officers confirmed that in line with policy SPD1 standards the development would not breach privacy guidance in terms of overlooking. Two flats would see a minimal enclosure breach, however this would only affect their rear windows. In addition to this the assessments for daylight/sunlight impact demonstrated only a minor adverse impact.
- Officers confirmed that all units would be compliant with London Plan Standards for amenity space, members were informed that all flats would have balconies that exceeded the amenity space policy, tenants would also have access to rooftop gardens.
- In response to member questions regarding the height of the building additional CGI and aerial views of the proposed development were displayed in order to provide further context of the development within the surrounding area. Members were advised that the building had a positive urban design, with a slender profile and vertical emphasis. Whilst at 18 storeys it would be designated a tall building in its immediate context the massing would enable it to be defined as a landmark building within the wider context of other existing and emerging tall buildings in the surrounding area, whilst being a subservient building in the context of its wider tall buildings cluster. Officers confirmed the height was in accordance with Policy BD2 and consistent with the Tall Building Zone designation of the site and aspirations of a local site allocation that anticipated re-development of considerable density to the north of the town centre. Whilst recognising concerns identified it was felt that on balance the benefits of the scheme outweighed any potential impact in terms of height.

At this point in the meeting the Committee agreed (under Standing Order 62) to extend the time of the meeting by an additional 30 minutes in order to complete consideration of the current and remaining item on the agenda.

The discussion then resumed as follows:

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

- In addressing a member query regarding refuse storage, officers recognised that the information in the report required clarification with regard to the number of bins needed for the scheme and as such a condition would be added to secure the necessary refuse storage capacity within the development.
- In response to potential issues highlighted regarding interference of TV signals for surrounding properties as a result of the development officers advised that the developer would be required to undertake a test of surrounding properties prior to and following construction of the building. Should any issues be identified, which it was recognised may be the case to the north west of the site, the developer would be required to rectify any issues which would be secured via the accompanying legal agreement.

As there were no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to:

- (1) The Section 106 obligations, conditions and informatives set out in the report and supplementary agenda;
- (2) Referral of the application for Stage 2 review by the Mayor of London; and
- (3) The inclusion of an additional condition to secure the necessary refuse storage capacity within the development.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 4 and 4 Against.)

The decision was **CARRIED** as a result of the Chair exercising his casting vote, having initially voted in favour of granting planning permission.

**8. 21/1634 - Wembley Hotel, 40 London Road, Wembley, HA9 7EX****PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing hotel and the erection of a new building comprising of the hotel at basement level and residential apartments,

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

ground floor café, provisions for cycle parking spaces, bin stores and associated landscaping.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (1) That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement as detailed within the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement and issue the planning permission and impose the conditions and informatives as set out within the report.
- (3) That the Head of Planning is 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.
- (4) 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.

Liam McFadden, Planning Officer, North Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the application sought the demolition of the existing hotel building and the erection of a new building to include hotel amenities and residential units. Members were advised that the application had come to the Committee due to the volume of floor space in the proposed development. The site was a two storey detached building with accommodation in the roof space in use as a hotel. It was located on the west side of London Road and located in both the Wembley Growth Area and Opportunity Area and Tall Building Zone and also lay within an Air Quality Management Area. The site plan showing the existing and proposed floor plans and a CGI of the development were then shared with the Committee.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

As Committee members had no questions for officers, the Chair invited Stephen O'Connell (in person) as the applicant to address the Committee in relation to the application:

- Stephen O'Connell advised the Committee that the applicants were a privately owned family business who had been operating a variety of businesses in London Road, Wembley for a number of years.
- In line with the growth and regeneration currently being undertaken in the Wembley area, the business sought to expand to meet the rise in consumer demand by constructing a 53 room hotel and 9 residential units.
- The scheme would be constructed to a high quality, offering the community first class facilities.

In answering the sole Committee question, Stephen O'Connell confirmed that the increased capacity that would be provided through the hotel should the application be granted would also enhance employment opportunities available to the local community.

As there were no additional member questions the Chair clarified to the Committee that the application had come to the Planning Committee because of the volume of floor space of the development, he then invited members to ask officers any questions or points of clarification they required.

Members had no specific questions, however commented that the character and design of the proposed building appeared to be in keeping and a good match for the surrounding area.

As no further question or comments were raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

**DECISION:** Granted planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement, conditions and informatives set out in the report.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 8; 0 Against and 0 Abstain)

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

20 April 2022

**9. Any Other Urgent Business**

As this was the final meeting of the Planning Committee in advance of the local borough elections in May 2022, the Chair thanked all members and officers for their hard work, commitment and support in operation of the committee with members keen to see the re-introduction of site visits moving forward as part of the arrangements for the new committee post election.

The meeting closed at 21:04pm.

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair