



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Tuesday 11 June 2024 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor S Butt (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Begum, Chappell, Dixon, Johnson, J Patel and Bajwa

### 1. Apologies for Absence and Clarification of Alternative Members

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Akram. Councillor Bajwa stood in as a substitute member.

### 2. Declarations of interests

In relation to Agenda Item 4, Councillor S. Butt advised he had met with the applicant from Stonebridge Boxing Club for a Brent Health Matters event but had not engaged in discussion on the application or sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the application impartially and without any form of predetermination.

### 3. Minutes of the previous meeting

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meetings held on Wednesday 8 May 2024 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

### 4. 23/3368 - Pavilion, King Edward VII Park, Park Lane, Wembley, HA9 7RX

#### PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing pavilion and erection of building for indoor sports and fitness by Stonebridge Boxing Club (SBC) to include gym and sporting facilities, physio, ancillary office space, changing facilities and café.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- i) The conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report.
- ii) 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.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

James Mascall, Planning Officer, introduced the report and set out the proposal. Members were advised that the application proposed the demolition of the pavilion, which was a two storey building to erect a single story pavilion to be used by Stonebridge Boxing Club. The new proposals would include 8 new bicycle stands, concrete benches and landscaping. The supplementary report submitted the previous day addressed the comments made by Brent's Tree Officer originally raising concerns with regard to the location of the proposed development, and the impact this would have on existing trees within King Edward VII Park. The Committee's attention was drawn to the 'Trees, Ecology and Landscaping' section of the Committee Report, which discussed how the proposal had been amended to address these concerns. It was noted that Brent's Tree Officer raised no further concerns.

The Chair thanked James Mascall for introducing the report and subsequently invited Mr Aamir Ali to address the Committee.

The following key points were highlighted:

- Speaking as the manager of the Stonebridge Boxing Club, Mr Ali explained that the boxing club started in 2009 in Kasinga House and had moved premises on four occasions. Despite constant moves, the club had maintained its membership, which continued to grow. Mr Ali said that 350 members attended on a weekly basis, with the oldest member being 78 years old.
- Mr Ali expressed that the boxing club kept children and young people off the streets and helped them make healthy choices and have a purpose in life. The boxing club had received much support from large organisations but needed a permanent residence in order to continue to help the community.
- The boxing club was happy for a range of sports and activities to take place and for their changing rooms and gym to be used by non-club members.
- In summing up, it was felt the proposal would result in the redevelopment of an underutilised park and contribute to the improvement of anti-social behaviour in the park.

The Chair thanked Mr Ali for addressing the Committee and invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented, with the following being noted:

- In response to a query regarding what steps were in place to deliver the project, Mr Ali stated that he was looking at achievable and affordable figures and fundraising had been undertaken. There was support from various sports organisations, such as London Marathon and Sports England. The original build costs were over £2m but it was now £700,000 and Mr Ali felt he shared a good rapport with organisations that were keen to support him.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

- In response to the concerns highlighted in relation to the extra cars and bikes that the new proposal could bring and whether sustainable transport had been considered for patrons, Mr Ali said that he would encourage patrons to use public transport and there would be bike stands as well.
- In addressing how the membership was retained despite so many moves and what the boxing club fees were, Mr Ali stated that the monthly fees were £45 for under 18's who were allowed access the club three times per week. For adults, the fee was £55 and allowed access for six days per week. In regards to maintaining membership, Mr Ali said that the boxing club was well known and had seven contestants that had won silver and gold medals at competitions giving it a good reputation.
- To the query of whether the fees were too high, Mr Ali reported that the fees of the boxing club were one of the lowest in London offering a combination of classes and competing opportunities.
- In regards to a discount for local residents, Mr Ali said that he had formed an agreement with Quintain where the boxing club had reduce the fees to £50 for adults. He advised that fees had increased recently as they crossed the threshold for the payment of VAT.
- In response to the concerns highlighted in regards to the park being dark and this possibly causing a safety issue, Mr Ali stated that the next stage would be looking at gaining funding for lighting.
- In response to a query on how the applicant would deal with rough sleepers sleeping on the proposed benches, Mr Ali stated that the boxing club would likely act as a deterrent to those types of behaviours and was happy to move the benches indoors if asked to do so.
- In response to the question of how much had already been raised, Mr Ali said that funders were not willing to provide funding until planning permission had been granted. However, one funder may provide around £600,000 and the London Marathon may provide £250,000. The gym would still continue to do fundraising, such as gym shows to accrue additional funding.
- In response to the question of whether Mr Ali would consider applying for a carbon fund to gain solar panels or similar due to the Council's carbon neutral strategy, Mr Ali stated that he would be happy to look into this further.

The Chair thanked Mr Ali for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application.

The following responses were provided:

- On the issue of how accessible the site was, it was reported that the building was near the main pathway of the park. Following an infrastructure survey being undertaken, some repairs were completed and the areas with heaviest

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

footfall were repaired. The footpath was not designed for excessive vehicle access except for grounds maintenance vehicles and those vehicles going to the school located adjacent to the park.

- In clarifying the issue of noise to neighbours close by, a noise assessment was conducted which looked at two noise sources a) noise from plants during construction, which met building noise standards and b) operational output noise, which was noted by the nuisance control team to be of an acceptable level.
- In response to whether a survey had been conducted in regards to the protected species in the park, officers confirmed an ecology appraisal was undertaken and submitted with the application. It looked at how a biodiverse environment could be achieved through high quality landscaping, wildlife boxes and nesting for birds and bats. Ecology on site was low level and the site was not a designated ecological site. Grass would be mowed regularly and high value trees would be retained. The wildlife friendly option was proposed and the Ecologist was satisfied by the findings and recommendations. It had been recommended that a full ecology report be produced before the building was demolished.
- Regarding the issue of the fire safety documents not being submitted with the application, it was clarified that this was covered through building regulations. There were evacuation points, access for Fire Fighters and engines and fire hydrants in the park.
- Regarding heavy vehicles like fire engines entering the park, it was clarified that emergency vehicles like fire engines and ambulances could enter the park and any damage caused would be fixed later.
- In regards to sufficient lighting in the park, it was reported that the area around the building could be controlled but further lighting needed to be discussed between the applicant, the park service and the property team. Work was being done with the Police and design officers around this. Generally, parks were not lit, and some dark areas were needed for certain animals. There was currently no funding for additional lighting but if there were to be lighting, it would be sensitively installed so as not to disturb neighbours or any habitats. Officers added that funding for additional lighting could only be gained through capital funding.
- In regards to concern about anti-social behaviour, the building was currently derelict, however once it was constructed and had CCTV, this would reduce anti-social behaviour.
- Regarding the question of why a green roof was not included in the application, it was established that this was due to the design of the building. The roof would offset to increase more soft landscaping provisions and had to be robust due to risk of vandalism.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

- When asked to explain the community user agreement, it was noted that the applicant was in contact with a football club to see if they wanted to hire facilities and this would be opened up to wider sports clubs. This agreement would be of benefit to the community.
- Regarding the removal of four trees in the application, with the new plans trees would be moved two meters to the north and away from the protected area. One of the four trees was dead so better quality trees would be planted. The new trees would be secured by two conditions a) to be planted strategically around the park and b) for there to be no impact to the basketball courts.
- Officers confirmed that the proposal doesn't rely on car parking and that it is not within the proposals.
- Officers confirmed that there would be one to two trips a week to service the waste.
- It was asked if the boxing club ceased to exist, what would happen to the building. If the building was no longer used as a boxing club, then there would need to be an application to vary the contract to adapt the building for the new user. A notice could be served to the owner if need be and it was highlighted that the building was leasehold and not freehold. The current building did not have any architectural significance and was derelict therefore officers considered demolition and refurbishment the best option.
- The leaseholder would occupy the building and the Council would own it. The new building would be surrendered back to the Council if the lease finished.
- Fields in Trust were not a statutory consultee for the planning application but would need to be consulted at a later stage. Fields in Trust were supportive of activities that benefitted the community and for which there was access to. Community use had been considered, such as a café and toilets.
- Regarding the issue of relocating the four benches if there was antisocial behaviour, there were conditions for hard and soft landscaping.

As there were no further questions from members the Chair then moved on to the vote.

### DECISION

**RESOLVED** to grant planning permission subject to:

- (1) the conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report and supplementary report; and an additional condition to allow Neighbourhood Managers the flexibility to remove or relocate benches if they contributed to ASB. An amendment was also agreed for condition 10, to add that the Council could make nominations for community usage.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

Voting on the above decision was as follows: Unanimous in favour.

### 5. **23/3833 - Tirzah Mansion, 26 Salmon Street, London, NW9 8PN**

#### **PROPSAL**

Demolition of dwellinghouse and erection of a three and part four-storey residential building comprising 13 flats, provision for car parking, cycle and refuse storage, amenity space and associated landscaping.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- i) the conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report and supplementary report.

James Mascall, Planning Officer, introduced the report and set out the proposal. Members were advised that the application proposed the demolition of the dwellinghouse and erection of a three and part four-storey residential building comprising 13 flats, provision for car parking, cycle and refuse storage, amenity space and associated landscaping.

The Chair thanked James Mascall for introducing the report and subsequently invited Mr Junaid Iqbal (Objector) to address the Committee.

The following key points were highlighted:

- Speaking as a resident of Salmon Street, Mr Iqbal thanked the Council for the recent upgrades to the pavements and verges on Salmon Street. However, there was a strong objection to the new development comprising 13 flats and it was not considered to be an upgrade, as it was felt this would cause more traffic, noise issues and pollution and impact on the quality of life of the residents.
- Residents felt that the development was too large for the street and did not feel it was for the benefit of the street. Mr Iqbal said that residents of Salmon Street objected against the proposal but felt ignored. It was felt that the new development would affect privacy and natural light of the existing homes and cause congestion and parking issues. The new development would affect safety and property value of existing homes. It was proposed that less flats be built and the wellbeing of the residents be considered.

The Chair thanked Mr Iqbal for his comments and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask Mr Iqbal any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application.

The following responses were provided:

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

- On the issue of how Mr Iqbal concluded that the 13 new flats would mean an additional 26 cars, Mr Iqbal explained that each household on Salmon Street had 3-4 cars.
- In regards to the smells that the new development would create, Mr Iqbal explained that another development on Salmon Street called Krishna Court caused a lot of anti-social behaviour like cannabis smoking and drinking alcohol.
- Mr Iqbal said that he lived right next door to Krishna Court and asked when further developments on Salmon Street would cease, as there had been a number of new developments on the street. Whilst recognising the need for housing, Mr Iqbal stated that he was not in objection about the development but the size of it, which he felt would cause density and loss of light.

As there were no further questions from members the Chair thanked Mr Iqbal and then moved on to welcoming Mr Chandra Gidoomal (Objector) to address the Committee.

The following key points were highlighted:

- Speaking as a resident of Salmon Street, Mr Gidoomal said that the new development was not aesthetically pleasing and felt it would impact the charming character of the street. The street was built by Mr Salmon and Mr Gidoomal had been a resident for 38 years. Homeowners on the street were not granted planning permission to extend their own homes so Mr Gidoomal asked how permission could be gained for altering the current site. Mr Gidoomal stated that the development of the land would be against the deeds in Mr Salmon's name.
- Mr Gidoomal stated that Salmon Street was an exclusive street and the new development would cause the existing houses to de-value. Current development Krishna Court was struggling and being used as an AirBnB. It was felt that the new development was for monetary gain and of no benefit to the residents of Salmon Street.
- Mr Gidoomal felt that the new development would cause a negative impact to the residents of Salmon Street, such as parking issues and increased road traffic, congestion and noise.

The Chair thanked Mr Gidoomal for his comments and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask Mr Iqbal any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application.

The following responses were provided:

- Regarding Salmon Street being an exclusive street, it was noted that there was a major housing issue in the country and being what was described by objectors as an 'exclusive street' may not justify stopping development. Mr Gidoomal replied that Krishna Court was built over 4 years ago and had been

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

a major problem on the street. As it had now turned into an Airbnb and especially during football season, it was drawing a lot of congestion, anti-social behaviour and noise pollution to the street. Mr Gidoomal said that he understood that there was a shortage of housing but there was other land to develop on, such as at the end of Salmon Street and Fryant Park.

As there were no further questions from members the Chair thanked Mr Gidoomal for answering the Committee's questions. The Chair then introduced Kieran Stephen as the Architect who was joined by Ben Thomas, Planning Consultant online to assist with any questions.

The following key points were highlighted:

- A pre-application process had taken place with urban design officers where the design of the scheme had evolved through a collaborative approach resulting in a high quality design that referenced the materials and roof scape forms of the local area, having been short listed for the Housing Design Awards 2024.
- The building had been carefully designed to protect the properties adjacent on Salmon Street and Queen's Walk. The proposed building gradually stepped down to a single storey on those boundaries. Officers concluded in the committee report that "The overall impact of the development was considered acceptable in relation to neighbouring properties having regard to daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy."
- Mr Stephen expressed that not only would the scheme provide much needed new homes, including four family homes, the proposals also included a highly efficient design that incorporated a range of energy efficient measures including high standards of insulation, heat pumps for heating and hot water systems and also a roof mounted PV array providing an overall 63% reduction in carbon emissions over Part L.
- The scheme proposals would achieve a biodiversity net gain of 22.96% in hedgerow and 13.86% net gain in habitat units.
- All of the homes would have private gardens or terraces, 77% of the homes would be dual aspect, there was high compliance with Daylight and Sunlight BRE Guidance and all homes would meet the minimum size requirements, demonstrating a high quality living environment for future residents.
- With regard to affordable housing, a viability appraisal was submitted and had been independently assessed by industry experts appointed by the council. They consider the scheme to be capable of delivering a surplus of £41,000 which would be paid to the Council as a contribution as it would not be viable to deliver affordable housing on site. The proposals also included a payment towards Healthy Streets of £29,000 for highway improvements to the vicinity of the site as well as a CIL contribution of £329,000.



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

- Members noted that there would be a late-stage review mechanism to capture any potential uplift in profitability as the development progresses.
- There were no statutory objections to the scheme proposals who were all supportive of the scheme. Officers have concluded that the application is acceptable and in accordance with local and national policy and recommend for its approval.

The Chair thanked Kieran Stephen for his comments and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask Kieran Stephen any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application.

The following responses were provided:

- In regards to external amenity space, each dwelling would have 20 sqm of space with 50 sqm for ground floor dwellings as standard. These specifications met Brent's standards and in some cases exceeded them. All balconies were set in by 80% for privacy. There would be significant biodiversity net gain and 10 new trees being planted.
- In response to the question about the double mini roundabout near the development and concerns about pedestrian safety and how the new development would benefit new and existing residents, a contribution of around £29,000 had been agreed towards highway infrastructure. In regards to benefits to the residents, consultation had been done with the neighbours face to face, letters were sent to neighbouring addresses, research was conducted into the local area, its character and history and high quality materials would be used. There would be 13 new homes including 4 family homes, which was a provision of over 30% family accommodation and exceeded the Council's minimum standard of 25%. It was noted that 4 dwellings would be 2-bedroom, 4 person units, which would be suitable for newly starting families and there had been a bias in the scheme towards larger units. In regards to direct benefits to the residents, 10 new trees would be planted and there would be 2m buffer planting for ecology benefits.
- In response to whether or not the deeds of Salmon Street had been seen, officers stated that this was not a planning consideration, but rather a legal consideration for the owner of the property.
- Whether alternative proposals to the 13 units had been considered, it was stated that multiple proposals were considered to address the optimal provision for the site. There had been 2 pre-applications that addressed materiality and form and were then redesigned accordingly a few times following consultation with residents and the Council.
- To the question of whether this development was considered a landmark building on Salmon Street, the Architect responded that it was not and that there were other buildings of a similar height to this development.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

- Regarding the size and impact of the development on neighbouring properties, a daylight and sunlight assessment had been carried out and was found to be entirely consistent with BRE guidance for external and internal living spaces.
- Regarding the chosen height of the development, it was noted that the development was 60m from the boundary of the intensification corridor whereby heights of up to 5 stories high may be permitted. There were local buildings with a similar height. The ridge level would also be of the same height as many of the properties on Salmon Street. The building sloped down to 3 stories towards the neighbouring properties and the third story was an inhabited roof. Ridge heights were kept consistent, and the team took time to understand the different types of roofs in the area, which helped generate the roof shape and all windows from the first floor upwards were obscured. Landscaping echoed that of the local area and the same height ridging was used so not to impact the neighbours.
- In regards to the intensification corridor, the scheme was not within the intensification corridor but was near to it and fell under the H2 London Plan, which was designed to provide housing on a small site. Additionally, this scheme was listed for a local designs award for addressing local character.
- In regards to accessing local transport and being 3.75 short of parking spaces, it was asked whether there would be a parking overspill onto neighbouring streets. It was explained that the travel plan was designed with this consideration to mitigate any impact on local transport infrastructure. The local area was analysed using 2011 census data, which showed that 43% properties were car free and 7 spaces would be appointed. As over 50% of properties were likely to own a car, the provision in place would stop overspill onto neighbouring roads. There would be 24 cycle spaces and electric vehicles charging points on site and a travel plan had been prepared. Analysis showed that there was not likely to be much impact on the local transport infrastructure even during peak times.

The Chair thanked Mr Stephen for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application.

The following responses were provided:

- In regards to how the scheme fitted into the local area and landscape, the Site Location Plan was tabled showing the elevation of Salmon Street and the other developments nearby. It showed three storeys and the ridge heights being lower than the neighbour on Salmon Street. A lot of massing had been faced away from the neighbouring properties. Page 3 of the drawings pack showed the design of the building in terms of the materials used to ensure that it was in keeping with the local character.
- In regards to steps taken to ensure that the building was in line with the character of the street, it was acknowledged that the building did deviate from the character of the street, as it was taller than its immediate surroundings

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

but did not have a harmful impact on the character of the street. New homes would be delivered, the intensification corridor was 60m and there were good public transport links.

- In terms of over-looking of adjoining properties, slide 6 of the drawings pack demonstrated two windows would have windows within 9m of the boundary but that these windows overlooked a narrow space which was to the front of the house and this minor deviation from the guidance was acceptable.
- Members asked for clarification of what the boundary treatment was that prevented overlooking. Slide 17 was shown to show floor and ground levels in relation to the height of the boundary treatment and demonstrate that these factors would prevent significant overlooking.
- In regards to the concern about the current development site going from a 5 bedroom house to a 13 unit development, it was explained that each site was bespoke and analysed as such. This was a large site on Salmon Street and assessed for impact on neighbours, quality of amenity space and housing provision and it satisfied officers that it met the development plan. It was a bigger development than what was built there before but the plans looked to optimise the site.
- Whilst commending the commitment to carbon neutrality, members asked how waste would be managed and it was explained that waste would be collected from Queens Walk and then be placed in a secure area. There was estimated to be 60l per residual waste and 60l for recycling per bedroom. A mixture of 240l bins and Euro standard bins were to be used on the site and placed within distance of refuse lorries.
- It was highlighted that planning policy set a threshold for 35 % on-site affordable housing that should be provided and, where not possible, that developments must undergo a viability test. A viability test was conducted and it was concluded that the scheme would deliver a surplus of £41,000. Therefore, it would not be possible to provide affordable housing on-site but this would be secured as an off site contribution.
- The Late Stage Review would take place when 75% of the units were sold.
- In regards to how to avoid drainage issues and flooding, it was explained that Thames Water was consulted and reviewed all information provided with the application and advised accordingly. The Committee asked to ensure that health and safety processes were in place. It was stated that a drainage strategy was in place, provided by the local lead flood authority.
- With regard to construction impacts, it was highlighted that a Construction Logistic Plan and Construction Method Statement would be secured, and that there are also controls under the Control of Pollution Act.
- Responding to whether many applications were being received similar to this one, officers stated that this was the only development being considered of

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 June 2024

its like at the moment but each application was assessed for its own merits and against the development plan.

- Regarding questions about whether the materials will match those in the area, it advised that the proposal was a modern interpretation incorporating brickwork and similar materials to neighbouring properties.
- In regards to the quality of the amenity space, it was reported that there was an access issue on the north western corner of the site, which had since been rectified by placing a boundary treatment, which would limit noise too. The site was set lower than the street and the depth and thickness of the boundary treatment was also a noise buffer from noise from the road.

As there were no further questions from members the Chair then moved on to the vote.

### DECISION

**RESOLVED** to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report and supplementary report.

Voting on the above decision was as follows: For 5, 1 Against and 1 Abstaining. One Member was against the application due to the shortfall in parking and the lack of amenity space. Another Member abstained due to there being no affordable housing on site and the development being of no benefit to local residents.

### 6. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm  
COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair