



# **LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT**

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 12 March 2025 at 6.30 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor S Butt (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Akram, Begum, Chappell, Dixon, Johnson and Kansagra.

Also present: Councillors Clinton and Lorber for item 4 and Councillor Nerva (online) for item 6.

### **1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternative members**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Patel with Cllr Kansagra substituting on his behalf.

### **2. Declarations of interests**

The Chair advised that all members of the Committee had received an approach (which had had been logged) from the applicants agent in relation to Application 24/0410 – Atlip Centre & 2 Atlip Road, Wembley, HA0 4LU (Agenda Item4) along with various approaches from objectors to the scheme.

It was confirmed that members of the Committee had not sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the application impartially and without any form of pretermination.

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

### **3. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13 November 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

### **4. 24/0410 - Atlip Centre and 2 Atlip Road, Wembley, HA0 4LU**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Demolish all existing buildings (Atlip Centre, 2 Atlip Road and existing substation), remove the existing car park and redevelop the sites on both sides of Atlip Road for a mix of uses, including C3 residential, co-living homes, commercial uses (Class E) and community uses (Class F), including provision of a new standalone community centre.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to:

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

- (1) The applications referral to the Mayor of London (Stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed in the main and supplementary committee reports.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and within the supplementary committee reports.

Gary Murphy (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the planning application committee report detailing a mixed used residential led development. The site was opposite Alperton Station and within the Alperton Growth Area and the Tall Building Zone. The proposal was for a mixed use development comprising 7 buildings ranging in height with the tallest being 29 storeys. This was to accommodate 464 C3 dwellings, 421 co-living homes, commercial floor space including a new standalone community centre, new open public space. The C3 homes would deliver a range of market sale, low cost rent and shared ownership homes. Wheelchair accessible and family sized homes would also be provided across all tenures along with improved pedestrian access and increased site permeability as well as provisions for Blue Badges.

Attention was drawn to the supplementary report, circulated in advance of the meeting, which provided details of further representations in objection to the scheme. There had been a minor correction to a sentence in the main report and there was also an additional planning condition to attach.

The Chair thanked Gary Murphy for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Tahira Choudhry (who had registered to speak in support of the application) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

- Having lived in Alperton since 1965 Tahira Choudhry started by highlighting the many changes seen in the area over the years and development of housing to meet the needs of a growing population.
- For years, she advised Alperton had felt neglected. It often seemed like priority stopped at the Ealing Road Temple, leaving Alperton residents to fend for themselves and with the previous development of The Atlip Centre, built with hopes of housing shops and businesses, felt to have failed creating an eyesore at Alperton Station.
- Although every development faced objections, once built she felt it important to recognise that those same developments become communities where people forged memories. The need to support new housing was also highlighted, especially given the current demand for housing amongst families with development only regarded as “bad” until people moved in and called them home.
- Whilst recognising the challenges within the Alperton area, particularly in the vicinity of Atlip Road, where drug activity and rough sleeping remained concerns, it was felt the applicant had been diligent, consulting the community and even including spaces for local creatives linked into the

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

Creative Enterprise Zone (CEZ) and ensuring that Alpertons rich history of small businesses and skilled trades was not lost but reinforced.

- It was felt the new development would also help clean up the area, improving safety through natural surveillance from new residents as well as providing high-quality public spaces, giving the local community something to take pride in.
- In summing up Tahira Choudhry highlighted the positive aspects of progress without which she felt Alpertons would not exist as currently known and support expressed for Alpertons future to be shaped by the needs of its people and development that helped strengthen the community welcomed.

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

- Further details were sought on whether it was envisaged the proposed improvements to open space and community centre were likely to provide benefit to existing residents. In response, Tahira Choudhry felt these enhancements would be beneficial to new and existing residents supporting efforts being made to tackle antisocial behaviour as well as use by creatives in the area.

The Chair thanked Tahira Choudhry for her response and then invited Eddy Utubor (who had registered to speak in objection to the application) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

- Whilst recognising the current pressures in relation to the housing shortage and growing population requiring the development of new homes, Mr Utubor highlighted concerns relating to the potential impact the potential development would have on levels of crime in the area surrounding the development. Referring to statistics relating to current levels of crime, he highlighted that most of this was focussed around densely populated areas. As a result, he felt permission to build an extra 885 flats in high tower buildings adjacent to Atlip Road would act as a catalyst for more crime including drugs, vehicle crime, criminal damage and robbery, which were common in overcrowded areas.
- In regards to regeneration and strategic development, residents understood that Brent actively promoted regeneration. However, it was felt Atlip Road was not suitable for this purpose given the current density of buildings on the road with the proposed development therefore likely to lead to overcrowding with a range of associated health and socio-economic concerns also highlighted as a result, including reference to the findings of the Brent Poverty Commission.
- Given the concerns outlined he concluded (prior to his time for addressing the Committee expiring) by outlining his strong opposition to the proposed

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

development on the basis of overcrowding and the associated impact on the health and wellbeing of residents in the area.

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

- As an initial query, Members asked what type of development would be supported in the area, recognising the current pressures on housing supply in the borough. In response, Eddy Utubor advised that given the concerns regarding overcrowding, anti-social behaviour and the impact on daylight/sunlight for properties adjacent to the site the preference would be for any development to match the same level as adjacent dwellings along Atlip Road, with the gym and car park to also be retained.
- Given the current underutilisation of the site, members enquired whether it was felt the new development provided any benefit in terms of addressing crime and anti-social behaviour given the proposed design and increase in number of residents making criminal activity and anti-social behaviour more difficult given the increased level of natural surveillance. In response, Mr Utubor advised that he did not recognise these as potential benefits given the overall density of the proposed scheme and associated impacts highlighted from overcrowding.

As no further Committee questions were raised, the Chair then moved on to invite Councillor Clinton (who had registered to speak in objection to the scheme as a local ward councillor) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Concern was expressed at the limited extent of the consultation undertaken with local residents and period for response, prior to the application being presented to Committee. As a result, it was felt the Committee should consider (as a minimum) deferring consideration of the application to enable a site visit at which local ward councillors also had the opportunity to attend.
- Further concerns were expressed regarding the loss of sunlight as a result of the impact of the proposed development on adjacent properties and on neighbouring residents.
- The opposition expressed by local residents at the potential loss of gym facilities on the site was also highlighted, given the associated detrimental impact on residents health and wellbeing and with the need identified for a replacement facility to be provided.
- Concerns were also identified in relation to the loss of Atlip Centre car park given the impact not only on users of the centre but also the wider community use by users of the adjacent church and neighbouring residents, which it was not felt had been adequately considered.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

- Further objections were highlighted in relation to transport and parking given the potential impact the car free element of the development would have in the displacement of parking and impact on the adjacent area (requiring consideration of a CPZ). Concerns regarding the capacity of existing public transport provision serving the local area were also highlighted given the proposed scale and density of the development. Whilst supportive of the efforts being made to encourage a reduction in car use the ability to achieve this entirely in such a large scale development were challenged with a need identified to provide sufficient incentives to support such a change in behaviour, which it was felt the current proposals did not include.
- Objections were also highlighted in relation to the detrimental impact of the development on surrounding infrastructure such as GP and school provision, which whilst recognising the position in terms of planning policy remained key issues for local residents given the need to expand local provision, recognising the proposed scale of development.
- Attention was also drawn to the development not having met the 35% target for Affordable Housing provision as a result of viability assessment, which it was felt also supported the objections raised.
- As a final issue, the concerns previously raised in relation to overcrowding were also supported given the scale and density of the proposed development and also across Alperton as a whole. Whilst supportive of the need for more housing and wider regeneration it was felt this also needed to be accompanied by higher build standards and the expansion of supporting infrastructure.

The Chair thanked Councillor Clinton for addressing the Committee and with no specific questions raised advised that the issues highlighted would be picked up as part of the questions to officers with it highlighted that the proposals had been subject to a robust viability assessment.

As a final contribution, the Chair then invited Prashant Patel (applicant) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- The applicants long-term interest in Alperton, with his family having built the Atlip Centre around 35 years ago and which over the years had supported many local businesses and, in partnership with Mount Anvil and L&Q, had successfully delivered 186 homes on land to the south of the site. The current proposals now aimed to complete redevelopment of the remaining estate in accordance with Brent's Local Plan and site allocation.
- Key aspects highlighted in terms of design of the development proposals included over 15 pre-application meetings with officers, 2 QRPs and 2 public consultations with residents and businesses. Whilst aware of the recent e-petition opposing the development, the planning application itself had only received 18 formal objections. Whilst all concerns were taken seriously it was felt that the low number of formal objections reflected the quality of engagement and the proposals.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

- Whilst the development brief had started as a 100% C3 housing scheme, viability had identified the scheme could not support this level of affordable housing. To address this, one co-living building had been introduced, which had been designed to meet the Mayor's standards. This had increased the affordable housing offer to 20% with a policy-compliant mix of 70% low-cost rent and 30% intermediate housing.
- All affordable housing would be delivered on-site within a C3 tenure. 20% of the new homes had been designed for families and were located within the lower-rise buildings clustered around the landscaped courtyard. 82% London Affordable Rent tenure homes were family sized.
- The proposals would also provide 638 sqm of flexible space for community and creative uses. This included creative workspace units in the site's north-eastern corner.
- The proposals also included a new two-story community centre curated with local input including a local resident and other local businesses and stakeholders active within the Ealing Road Creative Enterprise Zone.
- A total of 160 new trees would be planted, contributing to an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 and Biodiversity New Gain of 778%. Streetscape improvements to Atlip and Ealing Road had also been designed to enhance safety and greenery for pedestrians and cyclists.
- In terms of build quality, the high-quality architecture had been designed to set a new standard of design for Alperton and was supported by Brent officers and the QRP. Beyond these public benefits, the development would also provide significant financial contributions, including approximately £14m in Brent CIL to fund local infrastructure improvements and a s106 package of £2m including £600,000 for step-free access to Alperton Station with the aim (subject to approval of planning permission) to deliver the first homes by 2028.

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

- Further details were sought on the plans to address the loss of gym provision. In response the applicant advised that the current gym provision on the site was undertaken as a commercial enterprise. Whilst consideration had been given to options for retaining provision, the current design policy requirements had meant this was not possible with it pointed out a range of alternative provision was already available within a 1.5km radius of the site. It was not, therefore, felt that the loss of the gym would directly impact on residents given the alternative provision already available to serve local need. Given the concerns highlighted members advised they would be keen to ensure (subject to approval being granted) that any financial contribution

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

generated through the development towards improvement of local open space included the option to provide an outdoor gym facility.

- Further clarification was sought regarding the community centre provision. In response the applicant advised this was recognised as a key asset with the proposals having evolved through a process of consultation and engagement with the local community resident and stakeholders within the Ealing Road Creative Enterprise Zone. The proposals would also include space for commercial and creative uses with the obligation to provide the facilities secured via the s106 Agreement and delivery of the associated Community Use Plan.
- Details were sought as to whether any consideration had been given to the potential conversion of the proposed co-living homes into affordable housing. In response the applicant reiterated that whilst proposals had originally been designed to deliver a 100% C3 housing scheme the economic challenges and constraints had impacted on viability meaning that had not been possible to achieve. The co-living building had therefore been included to address the position. Based on the current viability assessment this had increased the affordable housing offer to 20% with a policy-compliant mix of 70% low-cost rent and 30% intermediate housing. Whilst keen to have been able to meet the 35% target members were reminded that the affordable housing element which had been assessed as viable would be delivered on-site within a C3 tenure. This would include 20% of the new homes being family sized dwellings with 82% of the London Affordable Rent tenure homes also being family sized.
- In response to further details being sought on the potential affordability of the co-living units, the applicant advised this had been subject to a detailed needs assessment with the units included within the development purpose built (as opposed to more traditional HMO type provision). A variety of rental costs were outlined which it was felt compared favourably to alternative provision (e.g. including all bills) and offered a more diverse and high quality option.

In terms of the comparison to alternative co-living provision within HMOs the difference in range of shared and communal facilities available were highlighted. Whilst members recognised the type of tenure offered within the development represented a new product it was felt that rental costs within HMO facilities remained cheaper.

- Further details were sought on the justification provided for the proposed loss of the banqueting facility in terms of the Equalities Statement provided and subsequent discussions with the existing operator (Clay Oven) as well as other providers. In response the applicant's representative detailed the discussion held with the current operator who had confirmed their intention to vacate the site as a result of the limited parking and other operational restrictions. Whilst able to compromise to an extent on venue capacity and reduced operating hours, they had confirmed it would be difficult for them to mitigate against other concerns such as noise and access in terms of their

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

operational requirements in such close proximity to the residential development and given the loss of parking. For these reasons the existing operator had confirmed that even if the proposed development included a replacement banqueting facility of appropriate size, without current or increased levels of car parking being re-provided it would not include what they required as a minimum to operate and compete commercially with other similar operators. In recognising the detrimental impact these issues would have on the long-term sustainability of any banqueting business, if one was to remain on site, the current operators had confirmed their intention to seek alternative premises. Confirmation was provided that the applicant had instructed commercial agents for the existing Atlip Centre to undertake market research into the existing supply of banqueting facilities within Brent (each within 5.2 miles of the application site) looking at factors such as their use, capacity and access to parking. This had included an assessment of 16 other similar facilities with all (apart from one) having access to car parking provision on site, operating with less restricted hours and not having proximity issues to sensitive residential neighbours. For these reasons it was felt the feasibility of accommodating a new banqueting facility as part of the site redevelopment, without access to a sizeable level of parking spaces, and with limits put in place on operating hours remained commercially prohibitive. Having also reviewed existing provision within the area it was not felt that the proposed loss of the banqueting facility would result in a shortfall in provision.

Given the wider objectives of the proposed site allocation, it was also pointed out that notwithstanding the commercial and operational issues identified in terms of the location within a high density mixed use redevelopment, any redesign of the scheme to incorporate an appropriately sized banqueting facility would also impact on the space available for residential use and subsequently limit the number of new homes, including affordable homes being delivered. Whilst acknowledging that engagement with potential operators had been undertaken by agents through the market testing process it was highlighted that no alternative expressions of interest had been received with the alternative and more flexible floorspace provision in the proposed Community Centre also having the potential, given its design as a multi-purpose space, to play a positive role locally in accommodating a range of functions, cultural events community gatherings, religious festivals and creative industry events (albeit in a smaller space and with more limited car parking and necessary residential amenity controls). As a result, the applicant felt the provision of the new standalone facility would benefit new and existing residents, mitigating in part the loss of the existing banqueting suite and operator, in a way that supported new social infrastructure provided in a flexible and adaptable building.

- In noting the range of commercial non-residential units proposed within the development, disappointment was expressed at the lack of replacement gym provision with concerns also highlighted at the loss of parking provision on site. In response to the concerns raised relating to parking provision, the applicant advised that the existing provision was operated as a private facility. Given the sites sustainable location with a PTAL Rating 5 – 3 it had been designed (in accordance with London Plan standards) as car free with a



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

commitment to encouraging more sustainable transport solutions and the inclusion of car club spaces and funds available through s106 contributions towards the introduction of a CPZ, if supported by residents. Additional financial contributions had also been secured towards the enhancement of pedestrian and bus network capacity as well as towards provision of step free access at Alperton Station. Recognising the concerns raised regarding wider infrastructure enhancements including GP and school provision, members were also reminded of the additional CIL contribution secured which could (dependant on allocation by the Council) be used to support wider investment in social infrastructure.

As no further questions were raised the Chair once again thanked Prashant Patel (as the applicant) and his team for responding to the issues raised and then moved on to invite Members to raise any further questions direct with officers, with the following issues highlighted:

- In response to details being sought on disabled parking provision within the scheme, members were advised that the proposal included 20 spaces (17 accessible spaces (14 for the C3 residential units and 3 for the co-living units), 1 accessible space associated with the community centre and two Car Club spaces. The overall level of accessible parking, including for the co-living units, had been deemed acceptable by Transport officers with its layout also felt to be well located for each of the residential blocks. Members were advised that a Car Park Management Plan (CPMP) had been submitted setting out how eligibility for parking spaces would be checked and how use of the spaces would be enforced with all spaces including electric vehicle charging.
- In response to further clarification being sought regarding the loss of gym provision, members were advised that whilst the site allocation policy had identified gym re-provision as one of the allocated uses, it had not specified the size required to be provided. The existing gym was provided on a commercial basis with it confirmed that the applicant had engaged with the operator ('The Gym Group') to establish whether there could be an opportunity to retain their operation within the redeveloped site. Unfortunately, however, the operators minimum floorspace requirements had been identified as incompatible with the proposed design as a whole given the size of any replacement gym required to meet the operators requirement either resulting in the loss of the community centre (building D1) or proposed residential floorspace (including associated internal amenity space). Whilst a continued gym presence on site was therefore supported, in principle, the potential detriment of its inclusion on the developments overall viability, level of proposed housing (including the affordable housing offer) and delivery of the community centre had required an assessment to be made weighed against the overall planning balance. To justify the lack of re-provision of a gym within the proposals the applicant had been required to provide detailed justification to support their position that a commercial gym offer would be incompatible with the proposed design, especially given the future increase in residential accommodation, and the potential increase in gym demand that would be expected to follow as a result of the site's redevelopment. Having

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

noted the potential impact on delivery of the community centre or reduction in number of homes, including affordable units, a further analysis had been carried out by the applicant to establish the concentration and geographical spread of existing surrounding commercial gym uses that would be accessible from the application site. This had identified six commercial gyms operating with similar facilities within 2km of the application site all accessible from the site either by walking, cycling or public transport with a further three specialist health and fitness studios and specialist gyms located within 1.5km distance from site. In noting the overall policy context for gym use re-provision and the efforts made to explore re-provision of the existing use members were advised that given the potential impact in seeking to accommodate a large enough space for a commercial gym operator within the current design proposals and alternative gym coverage in the area it had been felt that on balance maximising housing delivery, including securing the maximum viable level of affordable housing, should therefore be prioritised over other competing land uses.

- In seeking further clarification on the basis of the affordable housing mix, members were advised that on a cumulative site wide basis, the application was proposing to provide 20% affordable housing (by habitable room) equating to 88 affordable dwellings, with the provision weighted towards London Affordable Rent and a policy compliant 70:30 tenure split for the affordable dwellings. Rather than provide an off-site payment in lieu for the co-living homes in line with London Plan policy, to be utilised for off-site affordable housing provision, the applicant had sought to increase the on-site affordable offer overall for the C3 dwellings. The proposed amount of affordable housing had been the subject of rigorous viability testing, which had identified that the development would result in a significant viability deficit, and it therefore agreed that cumulatively the proposed offer of 20% affordable housing across the C3 and co-living floorspace had represented the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing the scheme could viably deliver at the current time. The proposal included 93 (20%) homes with at least three bedrooms, which officers had acknowledged was below the Local Plan BH6 policy target. Given it had, however, been demonstrated that any increased level would negatively impact the already challenging scheme viability and the proposals were already weighted to deliver family provision within the low cost rented tenure (for which there was significant demand across the Borough) officers had felt the benefits outweighed the shortfall identified on a site-wide basis.

In terms of affordability, and the needs assessment undertaken in relation to the co-living units, members welcomed the detail provided within section 52 – 56 of the report including the outline of affordability benefits with co-living rents (although not set by the Council) typically being less than studio flat rents.

- In noting the s106 contribution being provided in relation to Healthy Streets and Active Travel Improvements clarification was sought as to whether this could be used, should the need for a CPZ be identified, to support the offer of subsidised permits for local residents. In response, members were advised

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

this would not legally be permissible with the contribution available to support consultation and further implementation of healthy street improvements in the vicinity of the site.

In recognising the role of CPZ's in supporting the availability of on-street parking for the use of existing residents when new developments came forward, members were advised that a car free agreement would also be sought to remove the right of future residents within the new development to on-street parking permits in any existing, or future CPZ's operating in the area in line with the Council's wider policies on promoting non-car access to reduce congestion and pollution. In recognising that several adjacent streets surrounding the application site did not currently fall within any CPZ it was highlighted that sufficient s106 contributions were available to support the implementation of new and extended CPZ's in the wider area to address parking problems as they arise should residents wish to pursue that option.

- In response to further details regarding the permitted level of parking provision, members were advised that London Plan policy T6 strongly supported the move towards more sustainable travel choices, with the expectation that car free development (in which only designated Blue Badge parking was provided) would be the starting point in accessible locations such as the proposed development. Brent Local Plan policies also supported car free development in places that were well connected by public transport, such as the application site. Confirmation was provided that the existing (private) surface car park which primarily served the Atlip Centre had c.135 spaces with this site not due to be re-provided to accommodate the wider redevelopment. As a result, the proposed development would therefore involve an overall net reduction of 115 car parking spaces on site. Given the good access to public transport services (PTAL 4) it was noted that the maximum parking standards available would allow up to 0.5 spaces per C3 dwelling and up to one space per 10 bedrooms for the co-living units. The commercial space would be allowed up to one space per 100sqm (assuming office use), and any parking for the community space (aside from disabled or operational parking) would need to be justified through the relevant legal agreement. In accordance with the car parking allowances in Brent's Local Plan and the standards within the London Plan, the overall parking allowance had therefore been calculated as 277 spaces, with the proposed provision of 20 spaces (including 17 accessible spaces), 1 accessible space associated with the community centre and two Car Club spaces well within the maximum numbers permitted based on the objective for the development to remain car free given the sites highly sustainable location and PTAL rating.
- In response to further clarification sought on the potential use of the financial contribution which had been secured to support the provision of step free access at Alperton Station for wider social infrastructure investment members were advised of the application of Local Plan Policy BSWGA1 in terms of supporting the delivery of wider social infrastructure within the Alperton Growth Area as demand continued to increase as a result of further development and housing growth within area. It was noted this process would also be supported on a borough wide basis through the development

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

of Brent's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Details on the collection and allocation of CIL were also provided as part of Brent's Infrastructure Funding Statement, which included details on the specific allocation of funding across the Alperton Growth Area. In terms of specific contributions secured through the proposed development, members were advised these included not only £190k for improvements to public transport bus services & £600k to support the provision of step free access at Alperton Station but also a contribution of £143k to offset the shortfall in on site play space and £89,200 for Neighbourhood Play space with the contribution to be spent on improvements to nearby open spaces. In addition, £100, 000 had been secured to support Healthy Streets improvements in the vicinity of the site which would be in addition to the proposed CIL contribution.

- Further details were also sought in relation to the assessed impact of the development on surrounding residential properties and its relationship with wider site allocation. In response, members were advised that the impacts on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to nearby residential developments had been subject to robust assessment with it recognised, as a result, that some existing nearby residential development would experience noticeable impacts and there would be some shortfalls against BRE guidelines. It was, however, noted that BRE guidelines retained some flexibility, recognising that in order to achieve the level of affordable housing, meet site allocation requirements and deliver other benefits a certain quantum of development on site would be necessary in viability terms. Whilst acknowledging the shortfalls identified these were considered inevitable when seeking to develop at high density in a way that made efficient use of the land, within a growth area where there was a dense pattern of development already established and still emerging in the locality involving an existing site (part of which was undeveloped) that comprised buildings notably lower in scale than other nearby sites and which was subject to a site allocation policy that sought to encourage further growth. In assessing the impacts identified as a result, these were felt to be outweighed when balanced against the overall planning benefits with the building design, envelope and relationship to sensitive boundaries and internal layouts balanced against the site constraints and helping to mitigate any harmful effects owing to proximity of buildings to site boundaries.

In terms of the height, scale massing and appearance of the development members were reminded that the site was located within a Tall Building Zone in the centre of Alperton Growth Area, where a number of tall buildings either currently exist, were under construction or had recently been approved. The proposed buildings would be up to 29 storeys in height which would be comparable to the tallest buildings currently being constructed on the former Alperton Bus Depot site opposite. Officers also advised that the proposed layout and arrangement of height and massing around the site was considered to be well designed reflecting the outcome of a lengthy pre-application process (including design review) that had tested various alternatives. The tallest buildings proposed had been located closest to the railway edge, stepping down in height significantly towards the eastern edge to respond to the more sensitive Sunleigh Road relationship, given its more

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

suburban low-rise context. In addition, a comprehensive townscape and visual impact assessment had been submitted in support of the application, which demonstrated that the buildings would strengthen the emerging tall building cluster in the location, would be a positive addition to the emerging context and that they would relate well to the varied and undulating skyline that was established and emerging in the area. No harm had been identified in relation to any heritage assets or protected views, and the siting, separation, massing, articulation and materiality of the buildings would enable these to be seen as distinct blocks. Active frontages had also been maximised at ground floor across the site supported by new landscaping, open space and public realm with the detailed design of the buildings considered to be well designed, of high quality and responsive to the site constraints.

- In relation to waste management arrangements confirmation was provided that an Operational Waste Management Strategy (OWMS) had been submitted in support of the application. Sufficient refuse storage capacity had been provided for the residential blocks with the various commercial uses all provided with commercial waste stores. Members were advised that the co-living units (building A) would be expected to arrange their own private refuse collection although it was expected that a commercial waste contractor would be appointed to service the development once operational on an agreed schedule. In respect of the co-living units, this was considered necessary due to the reduced storage capacity provided internally with the applicant committed to funding additional refuse / recycling and food waste collections for the co-living units to avoid any overspill and this on-going commitment (which would also apply to any future site owner) being secured through the s106 legal agreement in the form of a Waste Management Plan.
- In response to assurances sought relating to design standards and the quality of residential accommodation, members were advised that the residential accommodation has been assessed as a high quality design, including adequate provision of accessible homes good outlook and light, with only a low proportion of single aspect homes included. The buildings also achieved good levels of separation distances between them (in places well in excess of the minimum 18m typically sought in new development). Whilst the overall amount and type of external private and communal amenity space did not fully meet Brent's target requirements as set out within policy BH13, it was felt the provision of amenity space on site had been maximised for location and density of the development and was of sufficient high quality to provide a good variety of different types of external communal spaces (including new publicly accessible open space) as well as on site play for public access and future residents. Given the shortfall identified, members were also reminded that a financial contribution had been secured for the enhancement of existing open space / play provision in the locality, which members were keen to ensure included consideration regarding the provision of an outdoor gym.
- In relation to the Site Allocation Policy, further details were sought regarding connectivity and site accessibility. Member noted that London Plan policy T1

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

set a strategic aim for all development to make the most effective use of land reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes. This was supported by Local Plan Policy BT1 which sought to promote sustainable patterns of development in the borough, minimising the need to travel and reducing the dependence on cars. In terms of the application site, members were advised that Atlip Road would continue to be the primary means of access for the proposed development, for both vehicle and non-vehicle access. Pedestrian entrances would be from Atlip Road, with suitable footway connections along either side. A new pedestrian connection was also proposed in the form of a new route opened up alongside the existing railway viaduct, to the west of block A. This had been designed to improve pedestrian connectivity and site permeability with new pedestrian crossing points to be provided along Atlip Road in order to facilitate access between the sites either side of the road. Members were advised that where any new routes were established as Permissive rather than Adopted Pathways these would be subject to the necessary legal agreement to ensure they could be maintained as publicly accessible routes.

- In response to a query relating to flood risk and drainage members were advised that a detailed Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (including detailed SuDS strategy) had been submitted. The site fell within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding) although some parts of the site had been categorised as 3a for surface water flooding, with this risk addressed through the drainage / SuDS strategies and mitigation measures proposed. The proposed strategy, including SuDS features had demonstrated that post development there would be a 96% betterment in surface water runoff rates which was an improvement from a flood risk perspective. No objections had been raised by the Local Lead Flood Authority, Environment Agency, or Thames Water to the proposed strategies or capacity in relation to the new development, with conditions to be secured requiring further details, including for the drainage and SuDS measures and their long-term maintenance.

As there were no further questions from members the Chair thanked everyone for their contributions and then moved on to the vote.

### DECISION

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

- (1) The applications referral to the Mayor of London (Stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed in the main and supplementary committee reports. This to include the recommended use as part of the parks, amenity and play space contribution for an outdoor gym facility and for this to be focussed within the vicinity of the development
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and within the supplementary committee reports.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous: For 8, Against 0, Abstentions 0).

### **5. 24/2624 - 7 Randall Avenue, London, NW2 7RL**

Following an update provided by the Head of Planning & Development Services at the meeting, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application. This was as a result of officers having undertaken a further review of the consistency of the plans against the outline consent and the site location plan for the current application, which members were advised had identified concerns about the consistency of the submitted drawings.

### **6. 24/3532 - 75 Chamberlayne Road, London, NW10 3ND**

#### **PROPOSAL**

Proposed erection of single-storey rear extension and associated landscaping works to lower ground floor, installation of mechanical plant and extraction flue/ducting to rear of building and installation of rear side infill canopy to lower ground floor that forms a covered passage.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The conditions and informatives as specified within the main committee report.

Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing that the proposal involved the erection of single-storey rear extension and associated landscaping works to lower ground floor along with installation of mechanical plant and an extraction flue/ducting to the rear of the building and installation of a rear side infill canopy to lower ground floor that formed a covered passage. The application site was a four-storey terraced building with a basement, commercial unit (restaurant) on the ground floor and residential flats above on the eastern side of Chamberlayne Road with an outdoor seating area at the front entrance. The site lay within the Kensal Rise Conservation Area and to its rear the site adjoined Queen's Park Conservation Area and formed the primary shopping frontage of Kensal Rise Town Centre.

Members noted the application had been referred to the Committee for consideration as a result of a request having been received from three local councillors with members also advised of the previous planning site history and enforcement activity relating to the unauthorised erection of a single storey rear and side infill extension, that had resulted in submission of the current application.

The Chair thanked Damian Manhertz for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Councillor Neil Nerva (who had registered to speak as a local ward councillors in objection to the application) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

- As a local ward councillor, Councillor Nerva advised he was representing local residents as well as Queens Park Residents Association and the Kensal Rise Residents Association in seeking to highlight a number of concerns relating to the application. These included the adverse impact to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area due to the extraction flue, as well as on neighbouring amenity in terms of noise and odour. Whilst noting the late submission of requests to speak by local residents at the meeting, concern was also expressed that it had not been possible for them to address the meeting in person.
- Referring to the previous planning history and enforcement activity relating to the site concerns were also raised in relation to operation of the current facility on the site, which had included the installation of a Gazebo/tent within the rear courtyard following enforcement action to remove the previous unauthorised extension and associated noise, smell, disturbance and fire risk. Concerns were also highlighted in relation to the impact which the small window proposed within the application for the new rear extension would have in terms of noise and odour.
- As a result of the concerns outlined, Councillor Nerva urged the Committee to either reject the application or ensure that specific conditions were imposed regulating the hours of operation, use of window and waste collection arrangements to minimise the detrimental impact on residents and the neighbouring amenity.

The Chair thanked Councillor Nerva for addressing the Committee. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair 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, with the following being noted:

- As an initial query, further assurance was sought in relation to the concerns raised around fire safety at the site. In response, members were advised that the previous site had an unauthorised extension, which was poorly built and had been removed following enforcement action. The current application was seeking approval of the construction of a new brick built rear extension, which had been designed to meet building regulations and was assessed to have met the requirements in relation to fire safety within Policy D12a of the London Plan.
- In response to further details being sought on refuse and waste management, members were advised that use of the building as a restaurant represented a lawful use of the site. From a planning perspective any concerns relating to nuisance arising from operational use of the premises would therefore be matters for consideration by Environmental Health with the current application only relating to the erection of the rear extension and flue.
- In seeking further assurance regarding the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring residential amenities along with character and



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

appearance of the designated Conservative Areas members were advised that the proposed extension, given its matching brickwork, modest bulk and scale and subservient relationship with the host and neighbouring buildings was not considered to introduce harm to the character and appearance of the Queens Park Conservation Area (QPRA). In view of the limited visibility of the proposed extension from street vantages, this element of the proposal was also not considered to prejudice the setting and character of the Kensal Rise Conservation Area. Whilst noting that the external flue would be visible from neighbouring properties within the QPRA the harm caused as a result was felt to be less than-substantial as it would only have an impact on a localised part of the QPCA. When considering the operation of the site and the benefits of the unit being occupied by a use that would contribute towards the viability and vitality of the Town Centre this was considered to provide a public benefit that would outweigh the limited harm to the Conservation Area. The rear extension and side canopy were also considered to sufficiently comply with design policies without compromising neighbouring amenity or the setting of the conservation area.

- In terms of concerns relating to noise and odour members were advised that whilst Environmental Health officers had advised that there had been previous noise complaints made in relation to the premises regarding the use of the rear courtyard these were not be regarded as material planning considerations relating to the current application as they were not relevant to the operation of the mechanical plant or the extraction system. The applicant had also submitted an odour assessment and advised that the installation would include carbon filtration with an odour extraction system to be installed in line with guidance on odour from commercial kitchens. Additional mitigation measures had also been recommended in the form of a pre-filter/panel filter, or an electrostatic precipitator installed before the carbon filtration system supported by conditions in relation to noise and vibration which it was felt would also help to mitigate against any concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring amenities.
- Additional clarification was provided in relation to the design of the proposed extension with it noted that the window would be side rather than rear facing. Member also noted that as the gazebo which had been referred to was not classified as a permanent development structure the concerns raised in relation to its use would not be a matter falling within the remit of the Planning Committee. It was, however, felt that the erection of a permanent extension may help to address some of the concerns identified regarding that use. Similarly, confirmation was provided that concerns raised around the operating hours of the premises were not matters which could reasonably be addressed by conditions given the current application was not seeking to establish any new use.

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

**DECISION**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

12 March 2025

The Committee **RESOLVED** to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives detailed within the report.

(Voting on the above decision was as unanimous: For 8, Against 0 Abstentions 0).

### **7. Any Other Urgent Business**

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair