



Planning Committee

Wednesday 9 April 2025 at 6.00 pm

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

Please note this will be held as a physical meeting which all Committee members will be required to attend in person.

The meeting will be open for the press and public to attend or alternatively can be followed via the live webcast. The link to follow proceedings via the live webcast is available [HERE](#)

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Kelcher (Chair)
S Butt (Vice-Chair)
Akram
Begum
Chappell
Dixon
Johnson
J. Patel

Substitute Members

Councillors:

Agha, Bajwa, Crabb, Gbajumo, Mahmood,
Mitchell and Rajan-Seelan

Councillors

Hirani and Kansagra

For further information contact: Rebecca Reid, Governance Officer
rebecca.reid@brent.gov.uk; 020 8937 2469

For electronic copies of minutes and agendas please visit:
[Council meetings and decision making | Brent Council](#)

Members' virtual briefing will take place at 12.00 noon.

Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest** in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also significant enough to affect your judgement of a public interest and either it affects a financial position or relates to a regulatory matter then after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

***Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences** - Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

****Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

- (a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:

- To which you are appointed by the council;
- which exercises functions of a public nature;
- which is directed is to charitable purposes;
- whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party or trade union).

- (b) The interests of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who is the subject of a registrable personal interest.

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members		
2. Declarations of interests Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, the nature and existence of any relevant disclosable pecuniary or personal interests in the items on this agenda and to specify the item(s) to which they relate.		
3. Minutes of the previous meeting		
(a) Wednesday 11 December 2025		1 - 40
(b) Wednesday 15 January 2025		41 - 52
APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION		
4. 24/2052 - 21 Copland Avenue, Wembley, HA0 2EN	Wembley Central	57 - 82
5. Any Other Urgent Business Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Deputy Director Democratic Services or their representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 60.		

Date of the next meeting: Wednesday 7 May 2025



- Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public. Alternatively, it will be possible to follow proceedings via the live webcast [HERE](#)

This page is intentionally left blank



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 11 December 2024 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor S. Butt (Vice-Chair in the Chair) and Councillors Agha, Akram, Begum, Chappell, Dixon, Johnson, and J Patel.

Also Present: Duncan Moors (External Planning Lawyer, Ashfords LLP)

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kelcher, with Councillor Saqib Butt (as Vice-Chair) chairing the meeting and Councillor Agha attending as a substitute.

2. **Declarations of interests**

There were no declarations of interest made during the meeting.

3. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 16 October 2024 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. **24/1804 College North West London, Dudden Hill Lane, London, NW10 2XD**

PROPOSAL

Hybrid planning application comprising: Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and structures within 'Phase 1' and all site preparation works, and redevelopment with mixed-use buildings providing residential homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, retail and leisure space (Class E), workspace (Use Class E(g)), associated cycle and vehicle parking, new and altered vehicular accesses and other associated highways works, hard and soft landscaping including creation of new and upgrades to existing public open space, and all associated ancillary and engineering works; and

Outline planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and structures within the rest of the Site, and redevelopment with a series of new mixed-use buildings accommodating residential homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, retail, workspace and leisure space (Class E), community space (Use Class F), and flexible nursery/community/medical

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

floorspace (Use Classes F/E(e)/E(f)), associated cycle and vehicle parking, new and altered vehicular accesses and other associated highways works, hard and soft landscaping including creation of new and upgrades to existing public open space, and all associated ancillary and engineering works, with all matters reserved except for means of access.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The conditions and informatives as set out in the main Committee report; and
- (2) Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London along with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the report.

Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the hybrid planning application comprising:

- Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and structures within 'Phase 1' and all site preparation works, and redevelopment with mixed-use buildings providing residential homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, retail and leisure space (Class E), workspace (Use Class E(g)), associated cycle and vehicle parking, new and altered vehicular accesses and other associated highways works, hard and soft landscaping including creation of new and upgrades to existing public open space, and all associated ancillary and engineering works; and
- Outline planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and structures within the rest of the Site, and redevelopment with a series of new mixed-use buildings accommodating residential homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, retail, workspace and leisure space (Class E), community space (Use Class F), and flexible nursery/community/medical floorspace (Use Classes F/E(e)/E(f)), associated cycle and vehicle parking, new and altered vehicular accesses and other associated

The proposed development was formed of two phases: Phase 1 was applied for in detail and included the construction of 11 new blocks (Blocks C-H, J, K, V, W and Y) to provide 1,076 residential dwellings (Use Class

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

C3), comprising heights of between 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 28 storeys (up to 98.5 AODm). The development also proposed 3,354 sqm of flexible retail, commercial and leisure floorspace (Use Class E) (which includes 1,173 sqm of gym floorspace) at lower levels of these blocks.

Phase 2 was applied for in outline, and included the provision of up to 3,500 sqm (GIA) of new land use floorspace within 11 new blocks (Blocks A, B, L-N, and P-U) comprising heights of between 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 16 and 17 storeys (up to 100.2 AODm), with the maximum quantum as follows:

- flexible retail, commercial and leisure floorspace (Use Class E): up to a maximum of 1,500sqm;
- community floorspace (Use Class F): up to a maximum of 1,000sqm;
- nursery or local community/ medical floorspace (Use Class F/E(e)/E(f): up to a maximum of 1,000sqm;
- C3 Residential: up to 57,500 sqm (approximately 551 homes).

Attention was drawn to the supplementary report, detailing two further representations received after the publication of the committee report, amendments to the main report, additional conditions, amended conditions, and additional Heads of Terms to the published report. The recommendation remained to grant consent subject to the additional and amended conditions and Heads of Terms, and in the main committee report.

The Chair thanked Neil Quinn for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Terry Gamble (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- In representing the applicant (The Hill Group), Mr Gamble began by highlighting they were the second largest privately owned house builder in the UK and had maintained a 5-star Home Builder Federation rating for the past seven years, reflecting the quality of their homes.
- Contracts had been exchanged with United Colleges Group in August 2022 to advance proposals for two key Site Allocations in the Brent Local Plan: the College North West London site and Crescent House in Wembley. The acquisition facilitated the delivery of the College's new

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

campus on Olympic Way, ensuring the College's permanent presence in the Borough with state-of-the-art facilities, providing specialist training and apprenticeship opportunities for young people.

- The commitment to delivering meaningful social value, already collaborating across 14 London boroughs with community partners and anchor organisations to understand local needs and develop bespoke social value delivery plans. This approach intended to continue in partnership with Brent and United Colleges Group on the development.
- That the development would generate significant Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions to Brent, estimated at approximately £46 million. It was noted that the scheme's design complied with the Neasden Station Growth Area masterplan, aiming to connect with the local community and provide a range of local facilities, including a nursery, gym, workspaces, local shops, and a purpose-built community centre.
- The development included the creation of a grand public green space, resulting in one of the greenest schemes in Brent with nearly 1.5 hectares of enhanced green space, over 370 new trees, and an Urban Green Factor of 0.57. Enhancements to Dudden Hill Park and Selbie Avenue pocket park were also noted, with these spaces remaining under Brent's ownership but maintained by Hill Group.
- The proposed application would deliver over 1,600 high-quality new homes, equating to approximately 68% of Brent's annual housing requirement, at a time when many housebuilders were pausing new developments. Despite being a unique 'enabling development' funding £105 million towards a new College facility, Terry Gamble expressed that the Hill Group had sought to maximise the level of affordable homes when compared to the viability assessment undertaken.
- Described as an established developer and contractor with an unparalleled track record in delivery, The Hill Group had built out every site where planning permission was secured. If granted approval, construction was intended to commence in Summer 2025 and was felt by the applicant representative to represent substantial investment in the Borough, delivering significant economic, social, and environmental benefits.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- In concluding his representations, Terry Gamble advised that the applicant looked forward to growing their relationship with Brent and urged the Committee to approve the scheme in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

The Chair thanked Terry Gamble 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 inquired about the management of the social rented homes, specifically questioning whether a housing partner had been secured to manage the scheme. In response, Terry Gamble reported that discussions had been conducted with several Registered Providers, including Brent, regarding the management of the homes. It was noted that whilst no final agreement had been reached, significant dialogue was ongoing. This raised related questions on the management approach that would be taken, should no Registered Housing Partners be secured to which Terry Gamble assured that there were currently interested parties and offers under consideration.
- Members addressed the provision for an indoor gym and queried whether the developers would consider contributing to an outdoor gym, noting that outdoor gyms were extensively utilised by residents in Brent to mitigate health inequalities. Members also discussed the provision for community use within the development, highlighting the significance of youth hubs and diversionary activities for young people, and inquired whether these considerations would be incorporated in the development plans. In response to the former question, Terry Gamble responded affirmatively, indicating a willingness to consider the provision of an outdoor gym. The supporting consultant (Don Messenger) added that, as the planning consent was an outline consent, the details could be addressed at the reserved matters stage. In response to the initial question and while elaborating on the plans and vision for the community centre, including potential users and discounts, Don Messenger advised that the community centre was designed to be highly flexible for various uses. Consultations had already taken place with local groups and residents, who had expressed a desire for leisure-related activities, such as table tennis. The supporting consultant noted that, as the community centre was part of the outline element of the hybrid consent, there was additional time to refine the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

plans. The importance of ongoing community engagement to ensure the best fit for the community centre, aiming to attract the wider community to the scheme and utilise the green space was also emphasised. The supporting consultant welcomed continued discussions on the community space as the project progressed, should planning permission be granted.

- Members raised concerns regarding the provision of social and affordable housing. Disappointment was expressed at the low contribution of 18% towards affordable homes, noting that the target was 50%, with members querying the discrepancy between the developers' calculations, which indicated a deficit of approximately £147 million, and the independent assessment by external consultants, BNPP, instructed directly by the Council, which identified a less substantial deficit. Clarification was sought on the reasons for the discrepancy and whether it implied the possibility of increasing the offer for affordable housing, which was a significant need for Brent residents. In response, the supporting consultant explained that the developers' viability assessment encompassed numerous inputs and outputs, and that the developers had also engaged closely with the independent adviser. Despite iterative discussions, both parties had concurred that the enabling development was in deficit, and the maximum reasonable amount was being provided. It was further mentioned that an agreed review mechanism would be taking place later in the construction process, which would ensure complete transparency. Should a surplus be identified at a later date, there would be an opportunity to either increase affordable housing or alter the tenure, subject to discussions with the planning officers.
- Following on from the previous question, members reiterated the concern regarding the significant discrepancy between the financial viability assessments of the developers and the independent consultants, with further reasoning being sought for the substantial difference. Jack Taylor, an additional consultant, provided further clarification, noting that the appraisal involved numerous inputs, and the large scale of the scheme compounded the issue. Several areas of challenge were cited, including residential values, which, although not significantly different, resulted in larger discrepancies when applied to a large scheme. Further issues included rental levels for two blocks envisaged as built-to-rent, and the yield used to capitalise rental income for those buildings. Minor challenges also existed in areas, such as build costs, agents' fees, and finance rates. It was

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

emphasised that where these small changes were applied collectively, they resulted in a substantial change in the deficit figure.

- Members sought further clarification, including how the proposed development would contribute towards the preservation of the environment or the enhancement of green areas. Members additionally questioned whether there was a possibility for local residents to receive concessions or incentives to join the gyms, rather than being subjected to commercial rates. Questions were also raised around whether a percentage of housing could be allocated to provide priority for key workers in Brent and to purchase houses or accommodation in the area. In response, Don Messenger responded to the initial inquiry regarding the environmental landscape, emphasising that the preservation and enhancement of green areas were of paramount importance from the outset. Reference was made to Neasden SPG, which outlined a vision closely adhered to in the development plans. The primary change was the retention of Dudden Hill as part of the open space within the scheme, whereas the original proposal in the SPG had suggested constructing buildings in that area. It was also noted that the development included 11,500 square metres of open green space and two football pitches, exceeding the SPD's minimum target by 24%. The urban greening factor, as per the London Plan, had a policy target of 0.4, whereas the development achieved a factor of 0.57, nearly 50% above the policy requirement, which highlighted the commitment to creating meaningful green spaces accessible to all. Don Messenger reiterated the intention to ensure the green spaces and routes were open and inviting to the wider community, not only the residents of the development. Terry Gamble addressed the question regarding concessions for gym memberships, stating that the developers were in dialogue with several operators and would consider this suggestion. Regarding housing for key workers, it was noted that the rented homes in Phase 1 were all designated as social rent. The final arrangements, whether with Brent or an individual registered provider, would need to be reviewed to determine potential inclusion within the Section 106 agreement.
- Members raised queries regarding the proportion of affordable housing within the proposed development, noting that typically there was a 70/30 split between affordable and intermediate housing whereas within the proposed scheme the split appeared to be reversed, with approximately 64% intermediate housing and 36% affordable housing. Members sought to understand the rationale behind this distribution and whether there was

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

potential to increase the proportion of social rent housing. Don Messenger responded by explaining that the tenure split aimed to achieve a balance. The importance of delivering the project, which included enabling the college to have a permanent home in the borough, was emphasised. The first phase of the development focused on social rent housing, with an emphasis on front-loading social rent units. These units were situated in the lower blocks, which were more suited to family homes and had direct access to green spaces. It was noted that 62% of the social rent units were family homes, ensuring this met community needs. It was further mentioned that viability reviews would be conducted at later stages, and if a surplus was identified, there could be an opportunity to adjust the tenure mix in the future.

- Following up, members inquired about the potential of incorporating intermediate housing products within the scope of the development to address housing concerns and assist individuals in temporary accommodation through registered providers, as an alternative to shared ownership. In response, Don Messenger responded by noting that London living rent was typically associated with build-to-rent schemes. The Hill Group predominantly focused on for-sale housing, although there were some build-to-rent units within the scheme. It was indicated that the second phase of the development included build-to-rent units, and the developers were open to considering different types of intermediate housing products.

The Chair thanked the applicants representatives 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, with the following being noted:

- Further details were sought regarding the tenure split for the affordable housing element of the proposed development. Members sought to understand the rationale behind why the development had not achieved the standard 70/30 tenure split, noting that the current proposal included approximately 64% intermediate housing and 36% affordable housing, and questioned whether there was potential to increase the proportion of social rent housing. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) offered comprehensive general information on affordable housing and the conclusions related to tenure split and explained the strategic targets of the London Plan and Brent's Local Plan, aiming for 50% affordable housing in new developments. Members heard that the fast-track

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

approach enabled certain schemes to bypass viability assessments provided they met specific affordable housing thresholds. The current planning application proposed 19.4% affordable housing, requiring viability testing. Phase 1 included 9.3% affordable housing (69 social rent homes), and Phase 2 included 36.9% (15 social rent units and 160 shared ownership homes). The scheme was tested using the Existing Use Value (EUV) plus approach, with BNPP concluding a potential surplus. It was additionally noted that redevelopment of two College of North West London sites - Dudden Hill Lane and Crescent Housing, Wembley - was contingent on a new college facility at Fulton Road. The redevelopment aimed to support growth, provide new homes, and enhance infrastructure. The Committee also heard that an agreement on a benchmark land value and capital contribution had been reached, but a funding shortfall remained. The proposed scheme's benefits were also highlighted, including the provision of 1,900 new homes towards the Council's annual target of 2,350 homes, open spaces, social infrastructure, and job opportunities.

- Clarification was sought regarding the potential outcomes of a late stage review. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that the College Green scheme, being a large development with over 1900 homes, would undergo early, mid, and late-stage reviews. The early and mid-stage reviews would aim to capture additional affordable housing on-site if there was a surplus. It was further elaborated that the tenure split would also be considered. The exact mechanisms would be discussed with the applicant and the Greater London Authority (GLA). It was also highlighted that there were opportunities for adjustments at the early, mid, and late stages of the development.
- Members sought further details around the type and nature of the convenience store proposed for the scheme. In response, Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) noted that the proposed convenience store would be a retail convenience store located on the Dudden Hill site, with a floor area of less than 500m². The impact of the store, referenced within the committee report which included the sequential test and the impacts on neighbouring town centres, was also cited. Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) further noted the flexibility in the variety of uses within the development, highlighting that there was approximately 4000m² of Class E workspace, which included retail and leisure uses. It was emphasised that while the store was primarily envisaged as a convenience store, the Council lacked the authority to dictate the end operator, leaving the decision to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

market forces to determine the occupant of the unit. As a subsequent question, members inquired about the provision of medical centres in the vicinity, given the expected increase in the local population. In response, Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) addressed this concern by indicating that consultations had been conducted with the NHS and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) during the planning application process. It was conveyed that, based on these consultations, it has been assessed that there were sufficient facilities or other sites being developed to meet the healthcare needs of the incoming residents. Members were assured that the NHS and CCG had confirmed the adequacy of existing capacity to accommodate the anticipated demand.

- Members sought clarification on whether a conclusion had been reached around the arrangements for water drainage in relation to Thames Water, and questioned if conditions had been set on the property. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) responded affirmatively, stating that a number of conditions had been recommended concerning surface water capacity, as advised by Thames Water, along with a pilot method statement. It was further explained that these conditions would necessitate consulting Thames Water upon submission of the details, allowing them to provide comments and confirm that the capacity requirements had been met.
- In response to further questioning around the funding for the new campus on Fulton Road, members were informed that the new college facility at Fulton Road had secured funding from the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Department for Education. However, there remained a significant shortfall of approximately £107 million. It was elaborated that, following the viability assessment, this shortfall would be addressed by the applicant through the purchase of both Crescent House and College Green sites, which would finance the construction of the college. It was clarified that the breakdown for the viability assessment included £50 million as the benchmark land value for the two sites, and an additional amount termed as the capital contribution. This combined figure effectively covered the shortfall in the delivery of the college.
- Members sought reassurance regarding the efforts made to secure affordable housing funding and whether collaboration with the Mayor's office had been pursued to access affordable funding and if all possible avenues, such as grants, had been explored. In response, David Glover

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

(Head of Planning and Development Services) affirmed that extensive efforts had been undertaken, stating that planning teams as well as housing teams had been actively working with the Hill Group and the Greater London Authority (GLA) to examine grant levels and to ascertain whether the GLA could increase these levels. It was noted that there had been some progress in this regard. It was also explained that the Council had been engaging with various stakeholders, including registered providers, to maximise affordable housing within the scheme. It was emphasised that where the financial viability of the two schemes was not achieved, the schemes would not be delivered. However, the Council remained committed to securing as much affordable housing, particularly low-cost rented housing, as possible. It was further mentioned that Phase 2 would not commence immediately, and other funding sources or financial changes might improve the prospects for Phase 2. In concluding the response, it was reiterated that significant efforts were being made across the board to optimise the outcomes.

- Highlighting concerns relating to the family housing targets further questions were raised around whether the targets had been met and if the maximum possible effort had been made to achieve the family housing targets. In addressing the concern, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that the viability of the scheme was influenced by the cost per square metre for family units, which was lower than that for one- and two-bedroom units. This had an impact on the overall viability. However, it was noted that Phase 1 encompassed a high number of family-sized units, particularly in the social rent category, which were prioritised based on the highest need.
- As a further issue highlighted, members sought details about the feasibility of the scheme in the absence of grant funding. Additionally, members raised concerns regarding the impact of overshadowing, particularly in relation to daylight and sunlight factors, noting that many of the taller blocks were situated towards the railway line and requested information on the impact on properties located on the opposite side of the railway. In response, Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) conveyed that properties on the opposite side of the railway had been assessed and indicated that these properties were situated at a sufficient distance, approximately 25 to 30 metres away, to ensure that the impacts would not be significant. While it was acknowledged that there would be impacts on Selby Avenue and Denzil Road, in particular, it was explained that the approach to building

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

heights and massing adhered to the guidelines set out in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Efforts had been made to minimise these impacts as far as possible. It was further noted that while there would be significant changes in height and massing, the lower-rise blocks of 5 to 6 storeys were strategically located to mitigate the impacts on daylight and sunlight.

- Members further inquired about potential disturbances to wildlife in relation to archaeological considerations. In addressing the concern, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) stated that the scheme would be subject to a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which had undergone an ecology assessment. It was further mentioned that the scheme also considered biodiversity net gain, which involved on-site enhancements. To achieve the full 10% biodiversity net gain, some offsite credits would be required, however, there would be enhancements within the site itself, including new open spaces.
- Member raised queries regarding the shortfall in biodiversity net gain (BNG) as cited in the committee report, noting that there was no Section 106 contribution for this particular development to offset the BNG shortfall. It was questioned whether a Section 106 contribution could be considered to address the compliance with BNG. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) responded by explaining that in previous schemes, Section 106 contributions were secured under the Brent Local Plan for general biodiversity net gain, though not specifically 10%. It was noted that under the current mandatory legislation, which came into effect in February 2024, where there was an offsite shortfall, contributions would be made through credits. It was further mentioned that the Council would work with ecologists to determine suitable sites for these contributions, although there were no specific Brent habitat sites identified at present. Contributions could also be directed to a national bank. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) added that the legislation established a hierarchy for BNG under the Environment Act. It was explained that if the on-site provision was below 10%, it could be supplemented by offsite provisions at registered locations or through the purchase of credits administered nationally. It was highlighted that the Council did not have registered onsite habitats for BNG due to legal requirements for maintenance and monitoring. David Glover assured members that the Council was exploring opportunities for offsite provision within the Borough,

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

particularly in parks, although these had not yet been established. It was clarified that any shortfall below the 10% requirement would be mitigated.

- Members then sought further clarification about the internal daylight and sunlight analysis, specifically the Greater London Authority's (GLA) concerns regarding the high proportion of single-aspect north-facing units. Further details on the implications of this concern was sought. In response, Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) highlighted that efforts were made to encourage as many dual-aspect units as possible. It was acknowledged that schemes of this scale would inevitably include some single-aspect units. It was clarified that there were no single-aspect north-facing units, which was the primary concern of the GLA. Neil Quinn assured the Committee that in Phase 2, efforts would be made to improve the number of dual-aspect units. It was additionally noted that the design of the buildings would include significant systems for heating and cooling to ensure comfort for residents in single-aspect units.
- Members also sought additional detail about the viability of the scheme, noting that there was a surplus until the £107 million shortfall for delivery of the new college site was considered. Clarification was sought on the composition of the £107 million shortfall in funding. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) clarified that the shortfall was comprised of various elements, including strategic CIL payments from the Council, funding from the GLA, and funding from the DfE. It was explained that the majority of the funding was generated by releasing the two sites for development. Whilst the shortfall was acknowledged, it was emphasised that the release of the existing sites for alternative development was a key mechanism identified by the college to afford the delivery of the scheme. Neil Quinn (Principal Planning Officer) added that the mechanisms and legal agreements surrounding the funding were still evolving. It was highlighted that the development could not proceed until the college was delivered. It was stressed that the proposals collectively aimed to unlock the delivery of a new college for Brent's young people, which was a prerequisite for the developments. David Glover further noted that the viability consultants had evaluated the college cost figures to determine the reasonableness of the contribution towards the college funding. The consultants found only a minimal difference between their cost estimates and those provided by the college which it was confirmed was a higher education institution offering specialised vocational

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

courses, apprenticeships, and training. The engagement work undertaken by Brent Works with the college was also highlighted.

- Following up, members further queried whether the late-stage review mechanism would apply solely to the proposed site or if it would also capture any potential cost efficiencies that might reduce the £107 million figure. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) responded that the review mechanism would only apply to the proposed site. It was explained that the amount the college received would remain the same, even where the college's costs were lower. However, it was noted that it was unlikely the college costs would decrease, as costs typically increased over time. The review mechanism would focus solely on the College Green and Crescent House schemes, without re-evaluating the college costs. Members also heard that College Green would undergo early, mid, and late-stage reviews, while Crescent House, being a smaller scheme, would have only early and late-stage reviews. It was explained that the profit levels and benchmark land values were fixed and would be considered during the viability reviews. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) further added that the college had contractual arrangements for selling their land. Once the transaction was completed, the college would have the funds to proceed with their delivery phase, allowing the applicants and their agents to move forward with their sites.
- In response to further clarification being sought about the Dudden Hill Lane zebra crossing, details were provided on the access and highway works at Dudden Lane, particularly in relation to the connection between the site and Dollis Hill tube station. John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) conveyed that the developer had agreed to provide a zebra crossing at a specific point to facilitate access from the development to Cooper Road, which lead to Dollis Hill station. It was noted that there was an existing crossing further south, but observations indicated that only a third of people crossing at the end of Denzil Road were using it. Consequently, concerns were raised regarding the effectiveness of the existing crossing. It was further stated that contributions had been requested to fund a transport study, which would involve conducting detailed surveys, drawing up a detailed design, and analysing the data. Based on the findings, a decision would be made on whether to relocate the crossing. An overview of the wider highway works was also provided.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- Further information regarding the measures in place to ensure that local residents benefited from job opportunities arising from the proposed scheme were sought by members. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised the committee that an Employment and Training Plan had been secured, which required the developers to engage with the employment and training team to identify opportunities for construction jobs, apprenticeship positions, and end-use employment. It was highlighted that the Plan also included a social value component, where active efforts would be made to implement these methods. It was confirmed that these provisions would be secured in the heads of terms. Furthermore, it was estimated that the scheme would generate approximately 176 construction jobs and around 300 end-use jobs for the local community.
- Members raised concerns regarding traffic and transport assessment issues, noting that the development would introduce nearly 3000 additional people to the area. Assurances were sought around the mitigations planned to accommodate the increased population in terms of parking and transport. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) confirmed that the development would include 50 parking spaces designated for disabled individuals, meeting the minimum requirements. It was highlighted that this represented a significant reduction from the approximately 300 parking spaces currently available on the site. It was anticipated that this reduction would result in a net decrease in traffic in the area, which would be beneficial for the operation of the highway. It was further mentioned that improvements were planned for pedestrian and cyclist facilities, as well as contributions to public transport.
- The Chair addressed earlier committee queries and the subsequent agreement by the applicant representatives to consider the inclusion of an outdoor gym as part of the SPD, as well as the possibility of securing concessions within the gym for the 69 dwellings designated for social rent within the development, with officers requested to respond on these elements further. Regarding the provisions for the outdoor gym, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) suggested that the consideration of gym facilities would be included as one of the conditions. It was confirmed that the community use plan would be secured through the conditions, ensuring all related provisions were addressed. The possibility of opening intermediate homes to other tenures, in accordance with policies, and the inclusion of flexibility within the Section 106 agreement to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

accommodate this, was also conveyed. Regarding concessions within the gym, David Glover stated that it would not be possible to secure this within the planning agreement. While he acknowledged the willingness of the Hill Group to work with future operators to secure such concessions, it was noted that it could not be legally included as a requirement to mitigate the development's impact. However, he affirmed that other provisions could be secured.

- The Chair also sought details as to whether discounts on the community use element for social rent applicants could be arranged to which Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) responded that hours for community access would be considered, which would include discounted rates for the local community.

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

DECISION

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

- (1) The application's referral to the Mayor of London (Stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee reports, together with:
 - Provision to include the requirement for an outdoor gym facility to be added within condition in the Community Use Agreement to be secured as part of the legal agreement.
 - Definition of intermediate housing within the legal agreement to capture a range of intermediate products;
 - The review mechanisms to be secured as part of the legal agreement to include the requirement to change intermediate housing to social housing where viability allows.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and amended within the supplementary committee reports.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous in favour).

- (1) The application's referral to the Mayor of London (Stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee reports, together with:
 - Provision to include the requirement for an outdoor gym facility to be added within condition in the Community Use Agreement to be secured as part of the legal agreement;
 - Definition of intermediate housing within the legal agreement to capture a range of intermediate products;
 - The review mechanisms to be secured as part of the legal agreement to include the requirement to change intermediate housing to social housing where viability allows.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and amended within the supplementary committee reports.

5. **24/1841 Crescent House, 130-140 Wembley Park Drive, Wembley, HA9 8HP**

PROPOSAL

Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site with a residential-led (Use Class C3) building with flexible commercial/community floorspace (Use Class E/F) at ground level; new basement excavation; cycle stores and blue badge parking; refuse stores and plant rooms/equipment; hard and soft landscaping including part-naturalisation of the Wealdstone Brook; new play space; and all associated engineering and ancillary works.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London along with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the report; and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

(2) The conditions and informatives as set out in the main Committee report.

Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the proposal to demolish the existing College of North West London building and the erection of two mixed-use linked blocks, A and B, which would be respectively 31 and 18 stories (including mezzanine level). The eastern part of the site which fronts Olympic Way would contain the tallest block, Block A. The development would provide 307 residential units (Use Class C3) along with flexible commercial/community use at ground level (Use Class E/F2), basement excavation, shared external amenity space, blue badge parking, cycle parking, refuse stores, plant rooms/equipment, and hard and soft landscaping including the part naturalisation of Wealdstone Brook, a Grade II SINC.

Attention was drawn to the supplementary report, detailing amendments to the main report, additions, corrections and clarifications to the heads of terms. The recommendation remained to grant consent subject to the additional and amended heads of terms, and stage 2 referral to GLA as contained in the main committee report.

The Chair thanked Sean Newton for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Terry Gamble (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- The high-quality design was believed to complement the Wembley area and respond to the height and style of the surrounding buildings.
- Despite the constraints of the site, it was noted that Hill Group had managed to retain and improve the existing open space, providing a new residential garden for all residents and achieving an Urban Greening Factor of 0.45.
- The scheme included new public realm developments, designed in collaboration with Secured by Design, The Football Association (FA), and the Metropolitan Police. These measures aimed to ensure safety and protection during stadium events, preventing a through route from Wembley Park Drive to Olympic Way, while maintaining resident access.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- The development would utilise high-performance building fabrics and air source heat pumps for heating, cooling, and hot water. Additionally, over 90% of the apartments would be dual aspect.
- The importance of delivering meaningful social value through the enabling development approach. The combined social value across both application sites included:
 - Over 110 apprenticeships
 - Over 155 local job starts
 - 20% local labour
 - Over 260 work placements
 - Over 4600 volunteering hours to support community projects within the Borough
 - Over 44 new job starts for NEETs, ex-offenders, and mothers returning to work
 - Encouragement of local spending within Brent through the supply chain
- That, subject to approval, work on the scheme was intended to commence in Summer 2025.

In concluding this representation, Terry Gamble expressed the hope that the benefits the schemes would bring to the Borough, as well as their contribution to Brent's housing needs, would lead to the approval of the scheme in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

The Chair thanked Terry Gamble 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 a question of clarification, members sought details about the part naturalisation of the Willesden Brook, seeking elaboration on what this process would involve. A supporting consultant responded that extensive discussions had been held with the Environmental Agency throughout the planning application process on various matters. The consultant explained that there was a balance to be maintained between not interfering excessively with the brook and identifying areas for improvement. The landscape plan included reed beds, which were expected to enhance water quality. This improvement had been secured as one of the planning conditions.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- Additional questions were raised around whether any housing providers had been consulted for the proposed site, to which Terry Gamble responded affirmatively, indicating that a combined approach had been adopted for the Registered Provider (RP). Members further queried whether there was consideration for having one housing provider manage one site and a different provider manage the other, or if the intention was to have a single provider manage both sites. In response, Terry Gamble explained that current discussions were based on having a single provider manage both sites.

The Chair thanked the applicants representatives 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, with the following being noted:

- As an initial query, members noted that Quintain had expressed operational security concerns regarding the potential link to the south-west of the site with the full-time quarters and sought clarification on whether these concerns had been resolved. In response, Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) highlighted that that ongoing discussions were taking place and explained that the Wembley Master Plan included an ambition to provide a linkage between the two sites. The necessity of controlling crowds along the main routes towards the stadium on Wembley Event Days was also acknowledged.
- Regarding financial contributions, specifically in relation to the £76,000 allocated for the pedestrian crossing, members sought clarification on the figures for the implementation of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), bus service enhancement, Wembley Park station improvement, and Healthy Streets improvements in the vicinity of the site. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) clarified that there had been no contribution towards Wembley Park station, as it was not requested by Transport for London (TfL), which was confirmed in the supplementary report. It was stated that there was an indicative contribution of £149,500 towards bus service enhancement, as requested by TfL. However, discussions with the applicant were ongoing and would continue through to stage two referrals and the Greater London Authority (GLA). It was further explained that the financial contribution of £76,750, as advised by John Fletcher, was intended to be flexible for allocation towards a

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

pedestrian crossing, improvements in Wembley Park Drive, Healthy Streets improvements, or the implementation of a CPZ.

- Members raised queries regarding the provision of family-sized homes within the scheme, noting that the current provision was 15%, whereas policy BH6 required 25%. Clarification was sought on the reasons why the current provision was deemed acceptable. In response, Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) explained that while the policy aimed to maximise the provision of family dwellings, viability considerations impacted the housing mix. It was stated that 15% was the maximum achievable on the site at present. Sean Newton provided a breakdown of the housing blocks, noting that Block A, the smaller affordable housing block, contained 85 dwellings, with 16 (19%) being family housing. Block B included 30 family-sized units, approximately 13.5%. Combined, this resulted in 15%, with a higher weighting in the affordable block. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) added that the delivery of family-sized accommodation was prioritised in affordable products due to the significant number of families on the waiting list for affordable housing. This balancing exercise was considered holistically when assessing viability.
- Members posed questions regarding the shortfall in amenity space and the financial contribution cited within paragraph 81 of the committee report. In response, Sean Newton explained that dense high-rise developments often struggled to provide the full quantum of amenity space required by policy. The constrained site made it difficult to provide sufficient communal space. Consequently, a financial contribution of approximately £100,000 was sought for improvements to nearby open spaces, play facilities, and/or improvements to the routes leading to these spaces. In continuing the response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) added that, given the town centre location and site constraints, the development had delivered as much amenity space as felt possible to secure and the overall assessment had been the proposed provision was felt to provide enough access to amenity space of a sufficient size and type to meet residents' needs.
- In addressing further questions regarding the allocation and impact of the £100,000 financial contribution towards improvements, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) explained that the contribution would be considered within the context of collecting funds for the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

enhancement of existing open spaces across multiple applications. It was noted that the Council's Park Service would have the discretion to allocate and combine these funds to undertake larger improvement projects within public open spaces in the vicinity of the application site as well as contributing to broader improvement initiatives that the Council intended to implement on its estates.

- Further questions were raised regarding the possibility of involving local and small businesses to ensure they benefited from the construction activities. In response, the Committee were advised that Council teams actively linked opportunities with local businesses. However, it was clarified that such provisions were not secured within the Employment and Training Plan.
- In response to further questioning regarding the delivery and servicing plan for the site, Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) explained that a delivery and servicing plan was being secured to ensure that all deliveries to the site would be timed. Additionally, there would be a central collection point for deliveries, such as those from Amazon, where residents could collect their packages. In continuing the response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) further added that the new building differed significantly from the one it replaced in terms of usage intensity. Previously, when the building was fully occupied by the college, there was a significant number of students coming and going at certain times of the day. The new building would have a different relationship in terms of the number of occupants and its intensity of use. The delivery and servicing plan aimed to ensure that arrangements worked effectively, including partnerships for waste collection.
- Concerns relating to flood risks were highlighted, with members noting the proposed site's proximity to the Welsh Harp. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) conveyed that the new building had a similar footprint to the existing one, but the residential accommodation was significantly above ground floor level. In the event of a major flooding event, the residential uses would be separated from the floodwaters. Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) further elaborated that the Welsh Harp was located approximately 1.5 km away, with an estimated reservoir volume of 1.6 cubic metres. In the event of reservoir failure, a significant amount of water would head towards the site. To address this, the applicant was required to prepare an evacuation plan, ensuring residents knew what actions to take. The plan also included

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

provisions for dry areas above floodwater levels. It was also stressed that there was no imminent flood risk from Welsh Harp. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further mentioned that sustainable drainage measures would reduce the rate of surface water flooding by 77%, representing a significant improvement. In concluding the response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) explained that in the event of surface water flooding, attenuation measures would release water into the drainage network at a slower rate, preventing system overload.

- In response to further questioning around Section 278 agreements, details were provided that a Section 278 agreement pertained to works executed by the developer, with the Council providing supervisory oversight. In this case, a Section 106 contribution would be received, with the Council determining the most appropriate use of the funds.
- Members then inquired about the provisions for electric scooters and electric cycles, specifically questioning the inclusion of charging points. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) confirmed that provisions for electric vehicle charging, including for bicycles, had been included as a planning condition. It was explained that mechanisms had been put in place within the conditions to assess the feasibility of delivering electric vehicle charging as part of the cycle parking facilities.
- The Chair observed that there was only one blue badge parking space on site and inquired about the distance to the nearest additional parking space, should there be more than one blue badge occupant within the proposed buildings. In responding to the inquiry, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) stated that the nearest additional blue badge parking spaces would be located on the opposite side of Wembley Park Drive, in front of the shop parade, or on Brook Avenue.
- As a final query, members sought details about the potential impact of the proposed tall building within the tall building zone on the views of the Wembley Arch, specifically from Barn Hill. It was confirmed that the proposed development would not compromise the views of the Wembley Arch. It was explained that while the development would come near to the bottom of the arch, the arch would still be visible from Barn Hill, which was

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

a locally protected view. Therefore, from the designated locally protected view, the arch would remain uncompromised.

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

DECISION

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

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

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous in support).

6. **20/4143 403-405 Edgware Road, Cricklewood, London, NW2 6LN**

PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing building and basements and replacement with mixed-use development (26,677 sq. m GIA) incorporating 22 storey building and 3 basements, comprising: flexible light industrial (Class E)/B8 employment space (in accordance with Part 3 of Schedule 2 (Class V) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)); Class C1 Hotel (including ancillary gym, spa and swimming pool); Class F.1 Conference Centre; Class F.2 community hall; basement car parking accessed from Oxgate Lane; cycle parking; internal service yard; coach drop-off lay-by; management and back of house areas; plant; roof garden and outdoor terraces; public realm improvements and associated works.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- (1) Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London along with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the report; and
- (2) The conditions and informatives as set out in the main Committee report.

Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the proposal for the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a maximum 22-storey building, with an employment focused mixed-use development amounting to 26,677 sq. m GIA.

Attention was then drawn to the supplementary report, detailing a number of amendments to the main committee report following initial publication. The recommendation remained to grant consent subject to the conditions and heads of terms, as contained in the main committee report.

The Chair thanked Damian Manhertz for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Justin Mills (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- A commitment to establishing a policy-compliant mixed-use development at the heart of the new Staples Corner community was highlighted by the applicant's representative. As one of the initial development proposals within the new Growth Area, it was noted that the scheme was intended to act as a catalyst for future development, setting a high-quality benchmark for subsequent projects.
- The proposal aimed to replace an unused and dilapidated building with a high-quality landmark development, capable of making a positive contribution to the character of the area, thereby creating a new gateway to Brent. Close collaboration with the Council's officers ensured that the proposed mix of uses, as well as the scale, massing, and design of the development, were appropriate and aligned with the vision for the area as outlined in the Local Plan and the more recent Masterplan.
- The development was expected to contribute to the local economy through the provision of modern, flexible employment space, capable of accommodating approximately 300 new jobs. This space was designed to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

meet the needs of smaller businesses and was anticipated to operate as managed workspace, attractive to a range of enterprises.

- At the core of the development was a large community space designed to accommodate a variety of events and activities. It was anticipated that this space would be used for community meetings, youth and social clubs, as well as learning and creative activities. This flexible space would be able to host large single events or be subdivided into smaller spaces.
- The proposed 210-bed hotel and conference centre aimed to serve local businesses and meet a broader need for hotel accommodation. Additionally, hotel facilities such as the gym, spa, café, and restaurants were expected to contribute to the social infrastructure necessary to support the new Staples Corner community.
- The £1.3 million of Section 106 benefits were intended to deliver new infrastructure in the area. This included significant contributions to transport improvements, notably £0.25 million towards a new pedestrian connection across Edgware Road. This connection was deemed essential to ensure that Brent residents and businesses could easily access the new Brent Cross West station and the adjoining town centre.
- The proposals had undergone significant engagement with the Dollis Hill community and local businesses, revealing overwhelming support for the development, as evidenced by the 40 positive comments received compared to only 4 negative comments.
- The applicant's representative conveyed that thorough testing of the proposal indicated that it would not cause harm to neighbouring properties nor detrimentally affect the wider area, which enabled the proposed building to operate alongside existing businesses and be future-proofed to integrate with new developments and public realm improvements anticipated in the future.

In concluding his representations, Justin Mills requested that planning permission be granted in accordance with the officer's recommendation.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- As an initial query, details were sought regarding the community use provision that would enable the local community to utilise the community facility. In response, Justin Mills indicated that discussions were currently underway with a number of local community organisations to identify suitable managers for the space. The facility would be designed as a large open event space, with the capability to be divided into smaller sections. Concessions would be offered to local charities and organisations for the use of the space. A booking system and a manager would also be established to organise the usage, ensuring the space was accessible to the entire community.
- As an additional issue, members questioned whether there would be subsidised space available, particularly for local residents. In response, Justin Mills confirmed that this was indeed the expectation and noted that it would also extend to certain commercial elements, such as the gym.
- Members requested clarification on the availability of a public café and community centre for local residents, and whether there would be a restaurant accessible to Brent residents or if it would be exclusive to the hotel. In response, Justin Mills affirmed that there would be a number of restaurants. The ground floor café would be classified as Class E use, meaning it would be publicly accessible with both internal and external entrances. Additionally, within the hotel, there would be another café and potentially one or two other restaurants, all of which would be open to the public.
- Members inquired whether the gym, spa, and swimming pool would be accessible to the public or exclusively to hotel guests. In response, it was confirmed that the facilities would be accessible to everyone. This raised related questions as to whether there would be concessions for local residents using the gym to which Justin Mills affirmed that this was the expectation, though the details regarding implementation had not yet been finalised.

The Chair thanked Justin Mills 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, with the following being noted:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- Members inquired whether there would be a zebra crossing near Gerard Way, noting that local residents had desired such a crossing for a considerable period. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) advised that the Staples Corner master plan had identified a crossing at this location to the new station, recognising it as a critical piece of infrastructure. It was explained that the project was costly due to the need to cross a dual carriageway, create an opening in the railings, and stagger the crossing. Additionally, the scheme would require the installation of bus stops and an anti-skid surface, further increasing the expense. While the applicant would not be financing the entire cost, thereby necessitating the identification of other funding sources, it was emphasised that the applicant was making a substantial contribution towards this vital infrastructure project.
- In response to further clarification being sought about parking provisions and the reduction in the number of electric vehicle (EV) charging points, details were provided that there were 24 electric vehicle charging points out of the 36 planned which would be provided from the outset, with passive provision for the remaining points to be added in the future, as needed. John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) additionally noted that extensive negotiations had taken place to reduce the amount of parking. Prior to the opening of Brent Cross West station, the scheme had proposed 70 to 80 car parking spaces. However, with the station now open and greater emphasis on access via the train station, the number of parking spaces was reduced to 36. Although the scheme was not a car-free development as parking spaces were still required for the hotel and workspace, the reduction had been significant.
- Members raised questions around the potential overflow of parking in the surrounding area and whether it was within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), or if there would be a contribution towards establishing a CPZ. John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) advised that the area was not currently within a CPZ, however, there was likely to be increasing demand for a CPZ due to the station. Whilst the area was not presently designated as a CPZ, a contribution of £50,000 had been secured from the applicant towards the establishment of a CPZ, and this was included in the Heads of Term.
- Members queried the contribution to the Brent Cross West connection and sought clarification on its purpose. In response, Victoria McDonagh

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

(Development Management Service Manager) informed that the contribution was intended to enhance connections from Brent Cross area to the station, specifically by improving pedestrian and cycle routes.

- With reference to the committee report in relation to the absence of competition between hotels in Wembley, members questioned whether potential competition nearing the Barnet boundary, given their regeneration scheme, had been considered. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) explained that the policy, rather than focusing on competition, primarily directed hotels to specific locations, namely Wembley and Kilburn. It was noted that while hotels were initially directed to these locations, this did not preclude them from being developed elsewhere. However, where hotels were proposed in other locations, a sequential test was required to determine if there were more favourable sites in the designated areas. The policy related to the optimal placement of new hotels within Brent, rather than considering the impact on Barnet. The sequential test process had established that there were no sites that were better suited for hotels, rendering it acceptable to have a hotel in the proposed location. Additionally, the recently adopted Staples Corner Master Plan had identified the proposed area as a suitable location for a hotel, reinforcing the established policy position.
- Members were keen to seek details around whether the development met the carbon-free standards. The Committee were informed that the planning application had initially been submitted in 2020, and the scheme had undergone significant evolution since that time, culminating in the adoption of the master plan. It was noted that, based on the 2013 version of the building, the development would achieve a 77% improvement in carbon efficiency. The scheme had incorporated essential elements as stipulated in the London Plan, including air source heat pumps and photovoltaic (PV) panels, and notably excluded a gas boiler. These features were in alignment with contemporary building standards. Furthermore, the building's fabric was of high quality. Members heard that a condition had been put in place to facilitate a district heat connection should one become available through the master plan. Any shortfall in meeting the carbon-free standards would be addressed through contributions to the carbon offsetting fund.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

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 updated within the supplementary committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and amended within the supplementary committee report.

(Voting on the above planning application was unanimous in support)

7. **24/0826 Rivington Court, Longstone Avenue, London, NW10 3RL**

PROPOSAL

Proposed second and third floor extensions to 4 x existing blocks to create new self-contained residential dwellings. Associated enlargement of refuse storage, cycle parking spaces to front / rear and improvements to soft landscaping to communal garden.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the report; and
- (2) The conditions and informatives as set out in the main Committee report.

Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the proposal for second and third floor extensions to 4 x existing blocks to create new self-contained residential dwellings, and associated enlargement of refuse storage, cycle parking spaces to front / rear and improvements to soft landscaping to communal garden.

The Chair thanked Damian Manhertz for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Maria S (who had

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- In highlighting her objections it was felt the proposed development would result in a complete transformation, with much taller buildings, including two out of four blocks doubling in size, featuring flat roofs. Changes in the layout and size of the new flats, as well as the addition of balconies were noted. The period style of the 1930s, which characterised the current buildings, was felt to be entirely lost.
- Concerns were also highlighted in relation to the significant disruption that leaseholders and occupiers would endure during the demolition and construction phases. It was felt that this disruption would be particularly challenging for residents who spent the majority of their time at home, due to noise, dust, dirt, restricted movement, and invasion of privacy. It was also pointed out, if approved, the applicant had three years to commence the works, leaving residents in a state of limbo, unable to plan their lives, sell, or rent their properties, resulting in prolonged suffering and uncertainty.
- Concerns were expressed that, even if residents survived the construction phase without severe mental health impacts, many would find themselves in a completely new environment within a much larger estate, which would no longer feel like home with the enlargement of the new floor area equivalent to 24 existing flats, not 16, representing a 60% increase. It was felt that this would likely result in a proportional increase in the number of residents, all using the existing communal areas and amenities, significantly worsening the quality of life for current residents.
- In concluding her representations the objector strongly believed it was the Council's moral duty to reject the proposal and protect the property owners and occupiers who it was felt would be adversely affected by the freeholder's financial interests and the Council's pursuit of additional properties, without sufficient consideration for the potential harm and suffering caused to the existing residents.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- As an initial query, further details were sought about the course of action the objector would take if the proposed development was her building and it required additional works and extension. In response, the objector stated that she would not require an extension of the building and noted that the building was constructed as a unit approximately 90 years ago, and it was originally intended to remain as such. It was also pointed out that the building materials and construction methods used at the time of the original construction were entirely different from those used today. It was expressed that if the buildings were no longer functional, redevelopment should be considered, but not at the expense of the current residents' quality of life.
- Following up, members inquired if there would be any circumstances under which the objector would consider altering the building. In response, members were advised that there was no necessity for any alterations with the proposed works attributed the impetus for development and council policies aimed at increasing the number of flats and generating financial gain from developers. It was felt that any financial benefits derived from the development should be allocated to compensating the residents for their significant suffering with many existing residents felt as though they did not truly own their properties and were treated as dispensable.

The Chair thanked the objector for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to invite Renata Krajewska (who had also registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- In outlining their concerns Renata Krajewska noted that the proposed development would alter the character of the estate, with concerns raised regarding the presence of asbestos.
- It was noted that the garden would be overshadowed by the new development, resulting in a significant loss of sunlight.
- It was felt that the development would lead to an increase in the number of people residing in the building and using the garden. Concerns were also expressed about a potential rise in crime.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- The objector felt that the development would generate additional noise, causing disruption to the residents with the overall disturbance to the residents' daily lives highlighted as a significant concern.
- It was felt that the new development would result in overlooking, leading to a loss of privacy for existing residents.
- It was also felt that the presence of construction sites would bring dust and other nuisances, further impacting the residents' quality of life.
- The objector felt that the development would lead to an increase in traffic in the area, exacerbating existing congestion issues.
- As a final point, concerns were raised about the availability of parking spaces, which would be further strained by the new development.

The Chair thanked Renata Krajewska for addressing the Committee. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Theo Barrett (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- The application presented had followed pre-application discussions with the officers to ensure compliance with Brent's Planning policies, the London Plan, and National policy with the proposals fundamentally compliant with the Development Plan, and no objections raised by any statutory consultees.
- The proposal aimed to deliver housing in a sustainable location, including family housing, and was described as resulting in improved amenity benefits for both existing and new residents.
- Theo Barrett highlighted that the proposed dwellings were designed to be dual aspect and would benefit from daylight levels exceeding the relevant requirements.
- It was noted that the impact of daylight and sunlight on neighbouring buildings had been assessed and found to be acceptable, with no adverse impact.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- In terms of sustainability, the proposal had included the use of Air Source Heat Pumps and photovoltaic panels to achieve high levels of energy efficiency. This was combined with a 67% reduction in CO2 emissions from the Part L 2021 baseline and a Biodiversity Net Gain of over 10%.
- The development was planned to be “car-free,” ensuring that new residents would not contribute to existing parking stress in the vicinity of the site.
- The applicants representative conveyed that public transport would not be adversely impacted by the increase in users resulting from the proposal, and the provision of cycle spaces exceeded the minimum requirements of Brent and London Plan Policy.
- It was stated that pre-commencement conditions had been agreed upon with the officers to limit impacts on local residents during the construction period with existing residents also to be kept informed about the proposals and construction activities.
- Affordable housing would be managed through early and late-stage viability assessments to determine the feasibility of delivering affordable housing within the scheme.
- The proposal was anticipated to provide planning benefits that would result in economic, social, and environmental gains for both existing and future residents.

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

- Members sought further details about the plans for securing the parking arrangements for the proposed development. In response, the supporting consultant explained that there was currently parking available on the site, but it was located outside of the red line boundary. There was an existing arrangement for some residents to use these parking spaces, however, with the new proposal, which entailed development above the existing flats, no parking permits would be issued to the new flats. The consultant affirmed that this condition could be secured either through a planning condition or via a section 106 legal agreement.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

- Members expressed concerns regarding the level of consultation with the 41 existing residents residing in the block. The supporting consultant responded that a prior approval application had been submitted in 2023. Prior to this submission, a letter had been dispatched to both owners and occupiers of the premises, informing them of the forthcoming application. Although the 2023 prior approval application was ultimately not approved, the residents had been informed of the applicant's intentions. Consequently, the decision had been made to pursue the planning application route. Following up, members sought clarification on whether the letter had included details about the proposed development to which the supporting consultant confirmed that the letter had included a description of the development but did not contain drawings or detailed plans, though these had been made available on the Council's website. This raised related questions as to whether any face-to-face meetings had been held with the existing residents. In responding to the query, the supporting consultant stated that no face-to-face meetings had been held with the residents.
- Members also highlighted concerns around the significant discrepancy between the financial viability assessment provided by the applicant and that of the Council, with it being noted that the developers projected a deficit of £853,000, whereas the Council's independent review identified a deficit of only £181,000, resulting in a difference of £700,000. Members sought an explanation for the substantial discrepancy. Additionally, members were keen to seek details regarding the applicant's offer to compensate for the major disruption to current residents. In addressing the first question, the supporting consultant explained that the viability assessment was an integral part of the application process, particularly when the policy-compliant level of affordable housing could not be met. This assessment encompassed various inputs, including sales values, finance, developer profit, and build costs. Minor adjustments to these inputs could result in significant differences in the final outcome, even for smaller schemes. The consultant identified two primary differences, which included a slight variation in build costs and a disagreement on the developer profit margin, which ranged between 17.5% and 20%. Despite these differences, both assessments indicated a deficit. The consultant assured that this matter would be secured within the Section 106 agreement, to be reviewed at both early and late stages. Should build costs decrease or sales values increase, a material difference would be reflected, potentially resulting in a contribution. Regarding the secondary question, the supporting consultant

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

elaborated on the wider benefits proposed to mitigate the disruption to current residents. A number of residents had highlighted areas for improvement, such as the garden spaces. A landscape plan had been submitted, aiming to refurbish the garden spaces, incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems, introduce new tree planting, and enhance amenity areas. Additionally, some building facades required improvement, which would be addressed as part of the development, providing a visual and amenity enhancement. The design was considered an improvement and complementary to the existing structures, developed in close collaboration with Brent's Design Officer during pre-application discussions. The supporting consultant further mentioned the submission of a construction logistics plan and a construction environmental management plan, which were expected to include clauses on community liaison, informing residents about the timing, duration, and nature of construction activities, enabling them to plan accordingly.

- Member sought confirmation on whether the building would be repainted, to which it was affirmed that the new parts of the building would indeed be repainted. Following on from the previous question, members requested details on the rendering work that would be undertaken. In response, it was explained that the proposals included rendering work in areas where the new construction joined the existing building. These areas would need to appear seamless and aesthetically pleasing from a design and visual perspective. The consultant noted that the freeholder had the authority to carry out these improvements, though alterations to individual leaseholders' flats, such as windows, would not be possible. The consultant additionally stated that no contributions would be required from existing leaseholders as part of this planning application.
- The Chair sought details on whether any insulation or EPC rating works would be undertaken to uplift the buildings, noting the age of the buildings and whether the applicant would be implementing any measures to enhance the building's green credentials, apart from the PV panels being installed on the new dwellings, which were part of the mandatory requirements. The Chair emphasised the committee's interest in understanding the benefits for the existing users. Additionally, the Chair noted that the current car parking for the site fell outside the red line area of the site boundary and inquired whether there were any EV chargers in those parking spaces or any ambition to install passive EV chargers for residents in the future. The supporting consultant addressed the first

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

question by explaining the challenges associated with the relatively complex ownerships, which limited the ability to make alterations to other people's flats. This complexity also impacted the overall viability of the scheme, which was not producing a surplus at present. Consequently, there were no proposals within the scheme to alter or amend individual leasehold flats. However, there may be improvements within some of the communal areas and within the exterior of the building. The building fabric for the new area or new flats would be of high quality, incorporating PV panels, air source heat pumps, and other credentials. This commitment aimed not only to connect to the existing infrastructure but also to improve the overall efficiency and sustainability of the new flats. Regarding the ambition to install passive EV chargers, the supporting consultant stated that they could not provide a definitive answer, as the arrangements for that parcel of land were unclear, and it was not included within the current application.

The Chair thanked representatives 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, with the following being noted:

- Member queried whether the presence of asbestos in the building was a planning consideration or if it was addressed under building regulations. In response, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) informed that asbestos in buildings was addressed through other legislation. It was explained that it was not possible to ascertain the presence of asbestos without separate testing. Other legislation covered the safety protocols for dealing with hazardous substances in building materials.
- As an additional issue, concerns about the number of flats and the adequacy of communal garden space were raised. Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) advised that the current external space was fairly large, measuring approximately 1,589 square metres. Additionally, some properties would have private balconies, which were included as part of the external space. On average, each unit would have over 28 square metres of external space, which exceeded the requirements of the Local Plan, even where ground floor dwellings were allocated 50 square metres each. The space was also scheduled to be re-landscaped, with more planting and green space to improve its overall

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

quality. It was confirmed that the amount of amenity space, considering both existing and new flats, would comply with policy BH13.

- Members were keen to seek details as to whether the applicants were providing a financial contribution to compensate for the absence of affordable housing. In response, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) advised that where there were ten or more new properties, affordable housing should be provided on-site, and a viability test would determine whether it was feasible to provide affordable housing either on-site or, if not feasible, through a financial contribution. For developments with fewer than ten homes (between five and nine), a financial contribution would be taken instead of on-site provision due to the smaller number of properties. In this particular case, as there was no profit being made to provide affordable housing either on-site or off-site, no affordable housing contribution was required. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further added that the applicants had proposed no affordable housing and were required to demonstrate through a viability assessment that they could not viably deliver any affordable housing. This assessment was reviewed and discussed in the committee report, with BNPP concluding that the scheme was in deficit. Consequently, the scheme could not viably deliver any affordable housing on-site, thereby complying with policy. The scheme would also secure an early and late-stage review, as required for non-fast track schemes. If there was any uplift, there would be an opportunity for a contribution towards affordable housing or, if substantial, the option for early-stage delivery on-site. It was clarified that under the former policy, developments with fewer than ten homes were not required to provide any affordable housing. However, the current Local Plan, adopted in 2021, recognised that smaller schemes (five to nine homes) could still contribute towards wider affordable housing. Victoria McDonagh addressed the confusion regarding the 35% and 50% thresholds, explaining that the policy required delivering the maximum viable amount of affordable housing. If a scheme did not meet these thresholds, it did not mean non-compliance with policy; rather, it required demonstrating the maximum viable delivery. In this case, the scheme was in deficit, resulting in no affordable housing. It was additionally noted that late-stage reviews tested actual construction figures, and if a surplus was identified, a contribution would be secured.

At this stage in proceedings, the Committee agreed to apply the guillotine procedure under Standing Order 62(c) in order to extend the meeting for a period

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

of 15 minutes to enable conclusion of the item and remaining business on the agenda.

- In continuing, members sought details as to whether there was a commitment from the developers to ensure that the existing building would be brought in line with the new development, thereby benefiting the current residents. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) advised that the Council could only secure improvements that would mitigate the impact of the proposed development. Legally, the Council could not secure enhancements that would solely benefit existing residents. However, improvements such as landscaping and open space enhancements could be secured, as these would mitigate the increased intensity of use. Support was also expressed for the rollout of EV charging across the Borough. However, in the context of a car-free development, EV charging would not mitigate the impact of the development. Therefore, while the Council encouraged freeholders to implement EV charging, it could not be secured through this application.
- Member sought clarification on whether the character of the development would align with the character of the area and how the rendering works would affect the area's character. Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) advised that the area featured a diverse range of buildings. Opposite the proposed site was Knowles House, a taller, more modern council building. Adjacent to the site was Fairfield Court, which had recently received permission for upward extensions and had a slightly different design. The surrounding area included various other building types, resulting in no uniform or fixed character. The design of the new development had been carefully considered and evolved to its current form. Officers expressed confidence that the appearance of the new development would sit comfortably within the surrounding area. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further added that the character of the area was expected to change over time due to site intensification, such as upward extensions and more efficient site use. It was reiterated that the design had been reviewed and deemed acceptable by the Council's Design Officer. It was also noted that details of the external materials would be conditioned as part of the planning consent.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2024

DECISION

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

- (1) The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives as detailed within the report.

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous in support).

8. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

COUNCILLOR S BUTT
(Vice-Chair in the Chair)



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 15 January 2025 at 6.00 pm

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

ALSO PRESENT: Suzanne Smith (External Planning Lawyer, Capsticks LLP)

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

There were no apologies for absence.

2. **Declarations of interests**

There were no declarations of interest made during the meeting.

3. **24/1140 - 66 Cavendish Road, London, NW6 7XP**

PROPOSAL

Demolition of the existing residential building and the construction of a new part five, part six storey residential building, together with associated landscaping, cycle parking and refuse and recycling facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

(1) The prior completion of a s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the committee report.

(2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee report, along with:

Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the proposal for the demolition of the existing residential building and the construction of a new part five, part six storey residential building containing 23 flats (with one of the floors at basement level), together with associated landscaping, cycle parking and refuse and recycling facilities.

The accommodation would comprise 1 x studio flat; 5 x 1-bedroom flats; 11 x 2-bedroom flats; and 6 x 3-bedroom flats.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

It was highlighted that all homes would have private amenity spaces from 7 sqm in size. Communal external amenity space would be provided within a 201 sqm garden at ground level and 59 sqm roof terrace at fourth floor level. Cycle storage for 44 bicycles would be provided within an internal bike store and a bike enclosure within the ground floor communal amenity space, with both accessed from Willesden Lane. Refuse storage would also be provided within an internal store accessed from, Willesden Lane.

Attention was drawn to the supplementary report, detailing one further representation received in objection to the proposals since the publication of the committee report, amendments to the main report, and an amendment to condition 11 on the Draft Decision Notice (page 36 of the main committee report) which should refer to 23 residential dwellings within Use Class C3 rather than 33 residential dwellings. The recommendation remained to grant consent subject to the prior completion of a s106 legal agreement as well as the amended condition and informatives detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee report.

The Chair thanked Mahya Fatemi for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Lewis Westhoff (who had registered to speak as the Applicants Agent) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Lewis Westhoff began by reminding the Committee of a meeting held in June 2022 to discuss a similar proposal for 66 Cavendish Road. Since permission had been granted for that proposal, it was noted that two key changes had occurred. Firstly, the owners had acquired an additional portion of land to the rear of 64 Cavendish Road, thereby enlarging the overall site area. Secondly, and more significantly, the owners had entered into a joint venture arrangement with Goldrose Sharpe Developments to execute the scheme. It was highlighted that Goldrose Sharpe, a North London-based SME developer, had a commendable track record of delivering small and medium-sized developments of this nature. It was conveyed that these two events had catalysed the current application, prompting the team to review the previous scheme to identify enhancements and optimisations that could deliver additional public and planning benefits.
- In preparing the application, the Agent shared that the team had worked closely with Council Officers throughout the pre-application and application stages.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

The agent expressed pride in presenting a scheme that delivered a package of benefits, many of which exceeded those achieved by the previous scheme.

- Lewis Westhoff described a number of benefits that included, but were not limited to the delivery of 23 high-quality new homes, an increase of 2 units; the provision of a compliant unit mix, including 6 three-bedroom, family-sized units, an increase of 1 unit; the payment of a £150,000 contribution to the Council's affordable housing fund, offered by the Applicant in recognition of this key issue for the borough, notwithstanding the conclusions of the viability review; the provision of significantly enhanced communal amenity space for residents at the rear of the site, including a biodiversity and nature trail to protect and enhance existing TPO trees and biodiversity on site and the rationalisation of the design and footprint of the building, ensuring an easier and faster construction programme.
- The Agent emphasised that the benefits had been achieved without causing any further harm to neighbouring properties or the local environment. The scheme had represented a significant enhancement and improvement compared to the previously approved and extant scheme.
- Looking ahead, Lewis Westhoff expressed excitement about the project and noted that Goldrose Sharpe were keen, subject to approval, to move into the delivery phase. The construction team were ready to commence work, subject to the Committee's approval, with the aim of starting on-site by Spring 2025.
- In concluding their response, the Agent hoped the Committee would agree with the officer's recommendation and resolve to grant planning permission for the development.

The Chair thanked Lewis Westhoff 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, the Chair raised concerns regarding the biodiversity deficit and sought an explanation of the steps taken to minimise this deficit. The Agent responded by noting that the previous scheme had not been subject to the biodiversity net gain regulations, which had since come into force. The challenges in delivering biodiversity net gain on-site due to the nature of the scheme, as a large portion of the rear of the site consisted of green grass, was also acknowledged. It was highlighted that the team had endeavoured to maximise biodiversity on-site by introducing a biodiversity nature trail with wildlife-rich

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

planting and retaining all existing trees. Additionally, all roof areas and communal amenity spaces had been covered with green roofs, and comprehensive soft landscaping had been implemented along the frontages of the site. Despite these efforts, achieving biodiversity net gain on-site was not feasible. However, the regulations allowed for securing biodiversity net gain through off-site credits, which would be addressed in the section 106 agreement. The team would collaborate with the Council's biodiversity team during the delivery phase.

- The Chair acknowledged the extant permission and the viability assessment, noting that the current scheme was larger than the previous one, with two additional homes, one additional family unit, and additional space. Details were sought around the reasons why the off-site contribution remained the same and whether an increase to £200,000 or £250,000 had been considered. In response, Lewis Westhoff explained that the viability assessment for the scheme had been influenced by several changes since June 2022, including rising interest rates, inflation, and construction costs, which had placed the scheme in a worse position compared to the previous scheme. During discussions with BNP and the Council's viability team, it was determined that the £150,000 contribution was appropriate given the scale of the deficit, as had been the case with the previous scheme.
- Members also sought further details about the removal of 18 trees on the proposed site and the replanting of only 5 trees, with it being questioned why more trees could not be supplied on-site. In response, Lewis Westhoff informed that the proposed site contained a significant amount of scrub, particularly along the Willesden Lane frontage, which included invasive species. The majority of the 18 trees being removed were not native to the area and considered invasive species. There were two TPO (Tree Preservation Order) trees on the site, one at the southwestern corner near the railway bridge and the other on the frontage, both of which would be retained. The arboriculture officer had indicated that the health and lifespan of these trees would improve by removing some of the poorer quality vegetation. In devising the landscaping scheme, the team had sought to provide as many new trees as possible. The scheme additionally included numerous small shrub plantings and various wildlife-rich species at the rear and frontage of the site. Discussions with officers had highlighted the desirability of providing more trees, and one of the section 106 obligations included a small financial contribution for planting trees in the local area and on the street.

The Chair thanked Lewis Westhoff for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

- The Member noted that the developer had acquired property no. 64, with the green space situated behind it and inquired about the management of refuse collection, given its location behind no. 64. In response, slides were presented of the ground floor plan and Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that refuse collection would be managed from Willesden Lane. The communal garden was located behind property no. 64, with bins positioned along the front of the building on Willesden Lane, allowing lorries to park on Willesden Lane for collection. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) additionally noted that the rear of the site, adjacent to the railway and behind no. 64, contained one cycle store. There was also a separate cycle store (a double-stack type) which was integrated into the building.
- Members raised questions around the flood risks to the lower ground floor and the mitigation measures considered for these risks. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) advised that the applicant had submitted a basement impact assessment, which acknowledged the effects on ground and surface water flooding. The assessment had concluded that the risk of flood was minimal due to the low permeability of the site, as the soil was predominantly clay. This assessment had been reviewed and deemed acceptable by officers.
- Members questioned whether Network Rail, located behind the proposed development, had raised any objections to the landscaping plans. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) confirmed that Network Rail had been consulted and had provided comments, which were included in the informatives within the report. It was also noted that Network Rail had also recommended certain conditions, which had been incorporated into the conditions secured as part of the planning application. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further mentioned that the trees along the railway line were existing trees that would be retained. The new trees to be planted were located within the communal garden, not along the railway.
- The Chair inquired whether the Basement Impact Survey, which covered flooding, also took into account issues such as damp and other related concerns. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) explained that the Basement Impact Survey primarily addressed flooding. Issues such as damp and ventilation were managed through Building Regulations. The Basement Impact Assessment did not specifically examine the potential for damp.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

It was additionally noted that the Daylight and Sunlight report assessed the light entering the basement, and these aspects were discussed within the report. It was reiterated that the survey did not specifically address the potential for damp, as this was covered under building regulations. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further added that the homes at the lower ground or basement level had their own garden areas, meaning they were not entirely underground. In effect, these homes were at ground level, albeit sunken from the ground level adjacent to property no. 64. The Chair observed that the report referred to the area as a basement not as a lower ground and suggested that future applications should clarify this terminology.

- As a separate issue, members questioned whether the new design for the proposed development had been assessed for its potential impact on the conservation area. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) confirmed that the new design had been assessed for its impact on the conservation area.
- Details were sought around the Section 106 contribution regarding the trees, specifically addressing whether the cost of £1,200 per tree for four trees would include the removal of existing tree stumps and the planting of new trees, or if it would solely cover the planting of new trees. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that there were no existing trees along the boundaries in question, and the contribution was solely for the planting of new trees. The figure of £1,200 per tree had been provided by the tree officer, who had deemed it an appropriate cost for the planting of new trees.
- In response to further questioning, the feasibility and practicality of providing affordable housing units within the proposed development was addressed. Challenges faced by developers in delivering small numbers of affordable units on-site, particularly due to the lack of interest from Registered Providers (RPs) and the complexities involved in managing such units and cost issues were also highlighted. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) additionally informed the Committee that smaller individual affordable units occasionally came through planning applications, typically submitted by Registered Providers themselves. It was clarified that while small numbers of affordable units were delivered, the vehicles through which they were submitted for planning applications tended to differ.
- As a final query, members sought details about the absence of a specified figure for the Section 106 contribution related to biodiversity. In response, Victoria

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that the Council's Biodiversity Officer was currently working on determining an appropriate monitoring fee, which would take into account officer time over a 30-year monitoring period. This fee would be included in the Section 106 agreement. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further noted that the monitoring would pertain to on-site biodiversity gains. For off-site biodiversity credits, a regulatory regime existed whereby credits could be purchased from accredited providers of biodiversity gain. This regime included comprehensive monitoring. Therefore, it was not necessary to secure off-site biodiversity contributions in the same manner. The focus was on ensuring that on-site biodiversity gains were monitored over the 30-year period.

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

DECISION

The Committee RESOLVED to grant planning permission subject to:

- (1) The prior completion of a s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee report, subject to an amendment to condition 11 on the Draft Decision Notice (page 36 of the main committee report) which should refer to 23 residential dwellings within Use Class C3 rather than 33 residential dwellings.

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous in support).

4. 24/2180 - 17 Shelley Gardens, Wembley, HA0 3QF

PROPOSAL

Erection of a part two storey and part single storey side extension; a single storey rear extension; hip-to-gable roof extension including rear dormer window and rooflights; gabled roof over side extension; and a front porch; partial demolition of garage; and conversion of the building into 2 self-contained flats (Part Retrospective, Part Proposed)

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main committee report.

Brooke Storey Vowles (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing the proposal for the erection of a part two storey and part single storey side extension; a single storey rear extension; hip-to-gable roof extension including rear dormer window and rooflights; gabled roof over side extension; and a front porch; partial demolition of garage; and conversion of the building into 2 self-contained flats (Part Retrospective, Part Proposed).

Attention was drawn to the supplementary report, detailing two additional comments received since the publication of the committee report, which did not specifically raise an objection but were queries, and as such, the number of objections remained the same. The recommendation remained to grant consent subject to the conditions and informatives, as set out within the main committee report.

The Chair thanked Brooke Storey Vowles for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited William Avery (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- The application followed two highly productive pre-application processes and extensive dialogue with the case officer and the planning team.
- In commending the hard work of the officers involved, it was asserted that there was nothing before the committee that, when considered in the context of the enforcement history and what were believed to be non-material unrelated objections, necessitated anything other than a straightforward delegated approval for the extensions to the house and the conversion already allowed via the appeal. However, the representative acknowledged and understood the community concerns.
- The applicant representative reassured members that the applicant was committed to resolving previous breaches and to constructing the policy-compliant design. The permission was required for the property owner to begin rectifying the previous breaches, proceed with the building works, and move forward with their

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

lives. The representative detailed that he had advised the applicant that the proposed design was entirely policy-compliant and expressed delight that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) concurred.

- The change of use had already been established through the appeal. The quality of accommodation had been confirmed to be policy compliant. The existing deviation from the previously approved roof design had been rectified with the twin gable design, which was fully compliant with the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was noted that there was no material change to the amenity impact when compared to the 2017 approval and the allowed appeal for application reference 2022/3944.

- In concluding, the applicants representative detailed that the proposed development would result in two high-specification three-bedroom homes, contributing to the Council's housing targets. While this was a modest contribution, it was described as a contribution, nonetheless.

The Chair thanked William Avery 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 a question of clarification, the Chair sought details around the reasons for the numerous previous breaches of the planning rules. In response, William Avery conveyed that he had only become involved with the development after the breaches had occurred. Upon reviewing the scheme, he considered the roof to be very well designed and the internal accommodation to be of high quality. Despite this, the appeal had failed, and it was fully accepted that the breaches now needed to be resolved. William Avery expressed regret that the breaches had occurred but emphasised the commitment to resolving the issues. Efforts to address the breaches had been ongoing for the past year, and although the process had been slow, the goal was to obtain approval and proceed with rectifying the roof.

The Chair thanked William Avery 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, with the following being noted:

- Members sought clarification about the outcome of the enforcement notice that had been served upon the applicant, to which Brooke Storey Vowles (Career Grade Planning Officer) confirmed that the enforcement notice was currently at

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

appeal. Following on from the previous question, members sought clarification on the decision made prior to the appeal. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) explained that the previous planning application regarding the roof level had been refused on design grounds as it did not accord with the SPD on residential extensions and alterations. This decision was subsequently appealed, and the appeal was upheld by the Planning Inspector. The current enforcement appeal pertained to the roof, and it was registered but undecided. This raised related questions around whether granting planning permission would resolve the enforcement appeal. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) clarified that if the works were carried out in accordance with the approved plan, it would effectively resolve the issues.

- Members raised concerns around the front of the property in Shirley Gardens, specifically noting the presence of a double yellow line and the absence of a dropped curb. Clarification was requested on the management of the landscaping and the installation of the dropped curb, as well as the party responsible for bearing the associated costs. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control) clarified that the applicant would be responsible for paying the new dropped curb and would go through the usual process of applying to the Highways Service. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) added that this arrangement had been approved by the Planning Inspector under the previous appeal, which was upheld.

- Members expressed concern about the numerous breaches of planning rules and enforcement actions over several years, and inquired about the Council's long-term strategy for handling such breaches in Brent. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that in accordance with section 73a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, an applicant could apply for retrospective planning permission once a development had been carried out. Any enforcement action was required to be proportionate to the breach and expedient, but the government also recognised the possibility of regularising breaches through retrospective applications and making changes to schemes to ensure policy compliance. In relation to the present application, planning permission had been granted in 2017 for extensions to a house, including a two-storey side to rear extension with a hipped roof to match the main house. The works were not carried out in accordance with the planning permission, leading to an application to retain the built structure. The roof over the two-storey side to rear extension was at an odd, pitched angle, steeper and higher than the main house roof, raising concerns among officers. The appeal was dismissed, and the Planning Inspector had agreed with the findings of officers. An enforcement

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

notice was subsequently served, but the applicant sought to regularise the situation by amending the roof to two gables, in line with the current SPD. Conditions had been imposed to ensure the works were completed within 12 months, should planning permission was granted. The enforcement notice would remain in effect until the works were completed and the enforcement team was satisfied that the breach had been resolved.

- As a further issue relating to the process for dealing with unauthorised developments in alleyways or converted garages into flats members highlighted the issues of resource and capacity to support enforcement action, which the Chair advised were matters that would need to be raised with the relevant Cabinet Member, as it was not within the Planning Committee's purview to make decisions on such matters. As a final comment, members commended the enforcement team and planning officers for their efforts in handling what was acknowledged as a difficult case and bringing it into compliance, and noted the importance of compassion in ensuring that developments meet policy requirements. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) additionally commended Brooke Storey Vowles (Career Grade Planning Officer) for her outstanding work in resolving the case. Proactive engagement from developers to rectify mistakes and work towards consented schemes was also welcomed by planning officers.

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

DECISION

The Committee **RESOLVED** to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main committee report.

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: For 7; Against 0; Abstention: 1).

5. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 6.50 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

Introduction

1. In this part of the agenda are reports on planning applications for determination by the committee.
2. Although the reports are set out in a particular order on the agenda, the Chair may reorder the agenda on the night. Therefore, if you wish to be present for a particular application, you need to be at the meeting from the beginning.
3. The following information and advice only applies to reports in this part of the agenda.

Material planning considerations

4. The Committee is required to consider planning applications against the development plan and other material planning considerations. The development plan policies and material planning considerations that are relevant to the application are discussed within the report for the specific application
5. Decisions must be taken in accordance with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Committee to have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application; any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application; and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Committee to make its determination in accordance with the Development Plan unless material planning considerations support a different decision being taken.
6. Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects listed buildings or their settings, the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.
7. Under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a conservation area, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
8. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for any development, the local planning authority must ensure, whenever it is appropriate, that adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees.
9. In accordance with Article 35 of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, Members are invited to agree the recommendations set out in the reports, which have been made on the basis of the analysis of the scheme set out in each report. This analysis has been undertaken on the balance of the policies and any other material considerations set out in the individual reports.

10. Members are reminded that other areas of legislation cover many aspects of the development process and therefore do not need to be considered as part of determining a planning application. The most common examples are:
- **Building Regulations** deal with structural integrity of buildings, the physical performance of buildings in terms of their consumption of energy, means of escape in case of fire, access to buildings by the Fire Brigade to fight fires etc.
 - Works within the highway are controlled by **Highways Legislation**.
 - **Environmental Health** covers a range of issues including public nuisance, food safety, licensing, pollution control etc.
 - Works on or close to the boundary are covered by the **Party Wall Act**.
 - **Covenants and private rights** over land are enforced separately from planning and should not be taken into account.

Provision of infrastructure

11. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge levied on floor space arising from development in order to fund infrastructure that is needed to support development in an area. Brent CIL was formally introduced from 1 July 2013.
12. The Council has an ambitious programme of capital expenditure, and CIL will be used to fund, in part or full, some of these items, which are linked to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
13. Currently the types of infrastructure/specific infrastructure projects which CIL funds can be found in the Regulation 123 List.
14. The Regulation 123 list sets out that the London Borough of Brent intends to fund either in whole or in part the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of new and existing:
- public realm infrastructure, including town centre improvement projects and street trees;
 - roads and other transport facilities;
 - schools and other educational facilities;
 - parks, open space, and sporting and recreational facilities;
 - community & cultural infrastructure;
 - medical facilities;
 - renewable energy and sustainability infrastructure; and
 - flood defences,
- except unless the need for specific infrastructure contributions is identified in the S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document or where section 106 arrangements will continue to apply if the infrastructure is required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
15. We are also a collecting authority for the Mayor of London's CIL 'Mayoral CIL' which was introduced from 1 April 2012 to help finance Crossrail, the major

new rail link that will connect central London to Reading and Heathrow in the West and Shenfield and Abbey Wood in the East.

16. In February 2019 the Mayor adopted a new charging schedule (MCIL2). MCIL2 came into effect on 1 April 2019 and superseded MCIL1. MCIL2 will be used to fund Crossrail 1 (the Elizabeth Line) and Crossrail 2.
17. For more information:
Brent CIL: <https://www.brent.gov.uk/services-for-residents/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy-cil/>
Mayoral CIL: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/implementing-london-plan/mayoral-community-infrastructure-levy>
18. Other forms of necessary infrastructure (as defined in the CIL Regulations) and any mitigation of the development that is necessary will be secured through a section 106 agreement. Where these are necessary, it will be explained and specified in the agenda reports

Further information

19. Members are informed that any relevant material received since the publication of this part of the agenda, concerning items on it, will be reported to the Committee in the Supplementary Report.

Public speaking

20. The Council's Constitution allows for public speaking on these items in accordance with the Constitution and the Chair's discretion.

Recommendation

21. The Committee to take any decisions recommended in the attached report(s).

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

9 April, 2025
04
24/2052

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	24 July, 2024
WARD	Wembley Central
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Wembley
LOCATION	21 Copland Avenue, Wembley, HA0 2EN
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4x 3-storey semi-detached dwellings including hard and soft landscaping, off street parking spaces, boundary treatment, alterations to existing drop kerbs and formation of new drop kerb, subject to Deed of Agreement dated xx under Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.
PLAN NO'S	See condition 2.
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_169665</p> <p><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy</u></p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk 2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "24/2052" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box 3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations:

1. Payment of the Council's legal and other professional costs in (a) preparing and completing the agreement and (b) monitoring and enforcing its performance
2. Notification of material start 28 days prior to commencement
3. Biodiversity Net Gain to include:
Habitat & Maintenance Management Plan in relation to "significant" habitat within the area marked as "communal" space as indicated within the Proposed Site Layout Plan together with a fee for the monitoring of such habitat for a 30 year period.
4. Highway Works:
 - a. A Section 38 agreement to secure the widening of the pedestrian footway by 2m
 - b. Creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access off Copland Close, removal of redundant crossover on junction of Copland Avenue and Copland Close and reinstatement to footway, and alterations to existing crossover off Copland Avenue
5. Indexation of contributions in line with inflation from the date of committee resolution

Any other planning obligation(s) considered necessary by the Head of Planning. That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions:

Compliance:

1. Three year rule
2. Approved documents
3. Restriction of Permitted Development rights
4. Building regulations M4(2) and M4(3)
4. Water compliance
5. Non-Road Mobile Machinery
6. Car and cycle parking and EVCP provision
7. Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Report
8. Obscure Glazed Windows

Pre-commencement:

9. Construction method statement

During construction:

10. Materials Study
11. Hard and soft Landscaping scheme

Pre-occupation:

12. Lighting
13. ASPH Noise
14. Wildlife and nesting scheme

Informatives:


As set out within the decision notice.

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.

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

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

SITE MAP

	Brent	Planning Committee Map
		Site address: 21 Copland Avenue, Wembley, HA0 2EN
		© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing detached bungalow at 21 Copland Avenue and the redevelopment of the site to provide four new residential dwellings. The proposed development comprises two pairs of semi-detached, three-storey dwellinghouses — four units in total — all of which would be family-sized homes with either three or four bedrooms.

The dwellings would be arranged in two pairs. Plots 1 and 2 would front Copland Avenue, occupying a similar building line to neighbouring properties, while Plots 3 and 4 would be positioned to the rear, fronting onto the head of the Copland Close cul-de-sac. The dwellings have been designed to reflect the scale and rhythm of the surrounding suburban context, with pitched hipped roofs and traditional materials such as facing brick and clay roof tiles, complemented by detailing such as soldier course brickwork around window and door openings.

Each dwelling is provided with a generous private rear garden, in line with Brent's external amenity space standards, and includes a patio, lawn and tree planting to promote biodiversity and residential amenity. A central landscaped area between Plots 3 and 4, while not functioning as formal communal amenity space, offers visual relief and supports the scheme's biodiversity objectives. The existing crossover onto Copland Avenue is to be removed and replaced with boundary treatment, while new drop kerbs and driveways are proposed to provide one off-street parking space for each of Plots 1, 3 and 4. No parking is proposed for Plot 2, consistent with sustainable transport principles given the site's PTAL rating of 3–4.

Secure refuse and cycle storage is proposed within the front gardens of each plot, and all homes are designed to meet or exceed the minimum space standards set out in the London Plan. Plot 3 is to be designed to M4(3) wheelchair adaptable standards, with the remaining homes meeting M4(2) accessible and adaptable standards. Internally, the dwellings provide spacious layouts with open-plan kitchen/dining/living areas, generous bedrooms, and additional loft-level accommodation including a media room and storage.

Landscaping forms a key element of the proposal, with the planting of nine new trees across the site and reinstated hedging along the boundaries. Biodiversity enhancements including native species planting and flowering lawns contribute to an overall net gain of at least 10% in habitat units, in line with legislative requirements.

Amendments since submission:

- Provision of a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment
- Highway works to include an area within the application site to be provided to the Local Highways Authority to achieve a 2m pedestrian footway
- Re-orientation of parking spaces in front of Plots 3 and 4
- Resiting of the parking space within the front forecourt of Plot 1
- Removal of the existing crossover on Copland Close junction
- Removal of additional access gate proposed to achieve access to Barham Park
- Improvements to the landscaping within the site

EXISTING

The application site is a rectangular plot which accommodates for a single-storey bungalow, with a large residential garden. The plot is situated on the western side of Copland Avenue as it adjoins the junction with cul de sac Copland Close.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

CONSULTATIONS

14 neighbouring and nearby properties were consulted on 16th August 2024 for a 21-day period together with

the Sudbury Town Residents Association.

On the 14th November 2024 a reconsultation was carried out owing to additional information having been provided. As further objections were received since validation, these residents' were consulted also. As such, 22 residents and nearby properties were then consulted as part of this reconsultation process.

Objections were received from 8 residents (some of which submitted multiple objections) and 2 Councillors (Cllr Lorber and Cllr Seelan). A summary of the objections is set out below:

Reasons for objecting	Officer's comment
Parking and Traffic Issues: Additional traffic and overspill car parking will occur on a cul de sac. Also, there are concerns for public safety when accessing and egressing the site and the loss of a single parking space.	Refer to 'Transport Considerations' below.
Design and Overdevelopment: The development would be out of character and proportion with the 1950's housing stock in the locality and would result in overdevelopment and would be out of character with the surrounding area	Refer to 'Design, Character and Impact on the streetscene section' and 'Standard of Accommodation' sections within the remarks section below.
The proposal would give rise to anti-social behaviour	There is no evidence to suggest that the creation of 4 dwellings would result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.
Impact on Privacy and Light: The height and proximity of the proposed buildings will compromise privacy and reduce natural light. Loss of light is particularly concerning for residents using their gardens.	Refer to 'Impact to Neighbouring Amenity' within the remarks section below.
Design and Overdevelopment: Residents are worried that the scale of the development will create a claustrophobic atmosphere, leading to overcrowding and pressure on local infrastructure. The council should encourage smaller low-rise development.	The dwellings are two-storey in height, broadly following the pattern of development in the surrounding area. Refer to 'Impact on Neighbouring Amenity' below.
Environmental and Ecological Impact: Concerns about the removal of trees and green spaces.	Refer to 'Ecology' within the remarks section below.
Impact upon property values: Concern that the development would negatively effect the value of homes in the area.	This is not a material planning consideration.
Carbon and Sustainability concerns: The proposal would have a negative impact upon the carbon footprint.	Refer to 'Sustainability' section below.
Lack of community benefit: Loss of parking bays as a result of the development imposed substantial cost on residents, as well as the reduction in	There is no loss of open green space, the area proposed to be redeveloped is a private garden. The two on-street parking bays would remain situated within the

green space.	Copland Close Cul De Sac, resulting in no loss of on-street parking.
Loss of safe play areas for children: The impact upon the cul de sac would have a negative impact upon children and their development and an area of play.	The cul de sac of Copland Close is a highway, with pedestrian footpath around the periphery, allowing access to properties within Copland Close. It is not laid out as a child playspace.

Internal consultation

Environmental Health - no objections subject to conditions being secured in relation to construction method statement, Non-road mobile machinery and noise insulation.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Policy Comments

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of this application should be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan is comprised of the

London Plan 2021

Brent Local Plan 2019-2041

Relevant policies include:

London Plan 2021

D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth

D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

D4 Delivering Good Design

D6 Housing quality and standard

D7 Accessible housing

D12a Fire Safety

H1 Increasing housing supply

H2 Small sites

HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

G5 Urban greening

G6 Biodiversity and access to nature

G7 Trees and woodlands

T5 Cycling

T6 Car Parking

T6.1 Residential parking

T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction

Brent Local Plan 2019-2041

DMP1 Development Management General Policy

BD1 Leading the Way in Good Urban Design

BH1 Increasing Housing Supply in Brent

BH2 Priority Areas for Additional Housing Provision within Brent

BH4 Small Sites and Small Housing Developments in Brent

BH13 Residential Amenity Space

BHC1 Brent's Heritage Assets

BGI1 Green and Blue Infrastructure

BGI2 Trees and Woodlands

BSUI1 Creating a Resilient and Efficient Brent

BSUI2 Air Quality

BSUI4 On Site Water Management and Surface Water Attenuation

BT1 Sustainable Travel Choice

BT2 Parking & Car Free Development

Other material considerations:

The following are also relevant material considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

London Plan Guidance - Housing Design Standards June 2023

SPD1 Brent Design Guide 2018

Residential Amenity Space & Place Quality SPD December 2024

Brent Waste Planning Guide 2013

Sustainable Environment & Development – SPD – 2023

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

1. Policy BH1 sets out the need for the Council to maximise the opportunities to provide additional homes in the period to 2041, with a minimum 23,250 homes in the period 2019/20-2028-29 and a minimum of 46,018 homes in the period 2019-20-2040/41. The policy identifies Growth Area, site allocations and appropriate windfall sites to support the delivery of the additional homes.
2. Policy BH2 sets out priority areas for additional housing provision within Brent. In addition to Growth Area and Site Allocation, policy BH2 identifies town centres, edge of town centres, areas with higher levels of public transport accessibility levels and intensification corridors as priority location where the provision of additional homes would be supported.
3. Policy H2 of London Plan identifies that for London to deliver more of its housing, a substantial contribution from smaller sites below 0.25 hectares in size will be required. It sets a Brent minimum target of 4,330 for the period 2019/20 – 2028/29. Policy BH4 relates to small sites and small housing developments in Brent ((below 0.25 hectares or 25 dwellings in size) and in line with policy H2 of London

Plan, sets out that small housing developments delivering a net addition of self-contained dwellings through the more intensive and efficient use of sites, where consistent with other policies in the development plan, will be supported within the priority locations of PTAL 3-6, intensification corridors, or a town centre boundary through:

- a) the infill of vacant or underused brownfield sites,
 - b) residential conversions, redevelopment, extensions of dwellings, or infill within the curtilage of a dwelling,
 - c) the redevelopment of flats, non-residential buildings and residential garages,
 - d) upward extensions of flats and non-residential buildings
4. In these priority locations, the character of the existing area will be subject to change over the Local Plan period. Outside the priority locations greater weight will be placed on the existing character of the area, access to public transport and a variety of social infrastructure easily accessible on foot when determining the intensity of development appropriate.
 5. The site is located within an area of PTAL 3 and would therefore be a priority area and as such is considered to be suitable for redevelopment. The principle of optimising the site for 4 new dwellings is acceptable in principle and in line with policy H2 and policies BH2 and BH4 as discussed above.

Housing Mix

6. The proposed mix delivers all four homes as family sized homes (2 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom homes).
7. Policy BH6 states that the council will seek to deliver a target of 25% of new homes as family sized (3 bedrooms or more) dwellings. For every four dwellings included within developments at least one must be 3 bedrooms or more. Exceptions to the provision of family sized dwellings will only be allowed where the applicant can show that:
 - the location or characteristics of the development are such that it would not provide a high quality environment for families, or
 - its inclusion would fundamentally undermine the development's delivery of other Local Plan policies
8. The proposal would include the provision of four family sized home, exceeding policy BH6 requirements and would provide 100% family sized accommodation, for which there is an identified need in the borough.

Design, Character and Impact on the Streetscene

9. The NPPF seeks developments of high-quality design that will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, responding to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings while not discouraging appropriate innovation, establishing or maintaining a strong sense of place, and optimising the potential of the site to accommodate an appropriate amount and mix of development. London Plan Policy D3, D4 sets out a design-led approach to new development that responds positively to local context and optimises the site's capacity for growth, supporting higher densities in well-connected locations with Policy D5 seeks inclusive design.
10. Policy DMP1 sets out the need for development proposals to be:
 - (a) of a location, use, concentration, siting, layout, scale, type, density, materials, detailing and design that provides high levels of internal and external amenity and complements the locality.
 - (f) safe, secure and reduces the potential for crime
11. Policy BD1 highlights the need for all new development must be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. Innovative contemporary design will be supported where it respects and complements historic character but is also fit for the future.
12. In delivering high quality design, development proposals will be expected to show how they positively

address all the relevant criteria within London Plan design policies and the Brent Design Guide SPD1.

13. The surrounding area features a variety of architectural styles. The neighbourhood predominantly consists of detached and semi-detached houses. The existing dwellinghouse is a bungalow, situated on the junction with Copland Close. There are not many instances of bungalows in the surrounding locality, with the majority of the nearby dwellings being two-storey dwellings, which have been extended generally to form two storey side extensions. The neighbouring property at No. 19 Copland Avenue is a two-storey dwelling, with a flat roofed two storey side extension and heavy planting along the boundary.

Loss of existing bungalow

14. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing bungalow and proposed a pair of two semi-detached dwellinghouses .
15. There is no objection in principle to the loss of the existing bungalow in design terms. While it represents a modest, single-storey dwelling with a relatively generous garden plot, it does not hold any architectural or historic merit, nor is it generally representative of the prevailing character of the area. The surrounding streetscene is characterised primarily by two-storey semi-detached and detached dwellings, many of which have been extended. As such, the existing bungalow, while contributing neutrally to the street scene, does somewhat appear as an anomaly within the established built form. The proposed redevelopment would therefore align well with the typical massing and scale of development within the locality, contributing positively to the streetscene. Furthermore, the replacement of the bungalow with a higher-density residential scheme that provides additional family-sized dwellings supports the borough's housing objectives while respecting local character, and is considered acceptable in design terms.
16. There is no objection to the demolition of the existing bungalow as the three bedroom family unit which would be lost is being reprovided and the creation of the new units would be assessed against modern day space standard.
17. Additionally, through the demolition there would be an additional net gain of 3 family sized dwellings, as discussed above, family dwellings are urgently needed within the Borough. As such, there is no objection to the demolition of the existing bungalow and the intensification of residential uses on the site to create 4 new family sized dwellings.

Impact on Locally Listed Barham Park

18. While the site is not situated within a conservation area, Barham Park to the rear of the site is locally listed (non-designated heritage assets). Its has not been considered necessary for a Heritage Statement to be submitted as the proposed development would not be harmful and is considered to continue to preserve the setting of the non-designated heritage assets having regard to Paragraph 202 and 203 of the NPPF.
19. The development is considered to not have a harmful impact upon Barham Park, this is as a result of the deeper gardens at the application site than the properties which are situated further northwards, There would be an improvement in the landscaping and tree planting within the site, in addition to the retention of 3 trees. The additional buffering from the residential boundaries towards the park, and the buildings being sited away from the shared boundary has ensured that there would not be any further additional harm to this locally listed heritage asset.

Plot Dimensions

20. The dwellings would be two-storey with additional accommodation within the roofs. Plots 1 and 2 would feature a front porch canopy, along with a ground bay window, serving the living space at the front of the unit. Plots 3 and 4 present a shared structure between the porch and bay window, allowing the roof canopy of the porch to connect with the bay window, owing to the narrower width of this building. The plots and their dimensions are set out below:

Plot	Width	Depth	Height
1	15.78m	10.03m	8.76m*
2	15.78m	10.03m	8.76m*

3	12.24m	10m**	8.75m*
4	12.24m	10m**	8.75m*

**Not including chimney*

*** Not including the ground floor bay projection*

21. It is worth noting that the ground level of Plots 3 and 4 are proposed to be recessed into the ground, as a result of excavation works. The proposal seeks to lower the ground level of these units by 0.7m and 1m across the site, to address any impact concerns, which are discussed in more detail below.
22. The façade of the buildings follow a general arrangement of 2 windows at the first floor level and the bay and one additional window for both plots. A pitched hipped roof is proposed, with a shared chimney.
23. The dwellings are proposed with facing brickwork and clay roof tiles, there are areas of details like soldier course brick details to head and cill of new windows and doors to create visual interest when viewed from the front and rear of the properties. These details along with the materiality of windows and doors and samples could be secured through condition.
24. The design of the proposed four new dwellings is considered acceptable and would complement the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development reflects an efficient and effective use of the site by increasing the number of dwellings without resulting in a cramped, incongruous building form. Importantly, the scale, height, and overall massing of the proposed buildings are broadly consistent with nearby residential properties, which results in the scheme sitting comfortably within its context. The layout and spacing of the dwellings also broadly maintain the established rhythm of the streetscene, including the cul-de-sac contributing positively to the character and appearance of the area.
25. The hedge along the boundary with No. 19 is proposed to be retained, with front boundary low walls provided on the Copland Avenue elevation. Further details of fencing, walls and enclosures would be conditioned as part of any grant of consent.

Standard of Accommodation

26. Policy D6 of London Plan sets out that housing developments should be of high-quality design and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and function layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures. Part (c) highlights that housing developments should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings. A single aspect dwelling should only be provided where it is considered a more appropriate design solution to meet the requirements of Part B in Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach than a dual aspect dwelling, and it can be demonstrated that it will have adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy, and avoid overheating.
27. Part F of Policy D6 sets out that housing developments are required to meet the minimum standards below which apply to all tenures and all residential accommodation that is self-contained.
 - 1) Dwellings must provide at least the gross internal floor area and built-in storage area set out in Table 3.1.
 - 2) A dwelling with two or more bedspaces must have at least one double (or twin) bedroom that is at least 2.75m wide. Every other additional double (or twin) bedroom must be at least 2.55m wide.
 - 3) A one bedspace single bedroom must have a floor area of at least 7.5 sq.m. and be at least 2.15m wide.
 - 4) A two bedspace double (or twin) bedroom must have a floor area of at least 11.5 sq.m.
 - 5) Any area with a headroom of less than 1.5m is not counted within the Gross Internal Area unless used solely for storage (If the area under the stairs is to be used for storage, assume a general floor area of 1 sq.m. within the Gross Internal Area).
 - 6) Any other area that is used solely for storage and has a headroom of 0.9-1.5m (such as under eaves) can only be counted up to 50 per cent of its floor area, and any area lower than 0.9m is not counted at all. 7) A built-in wardrobe counts towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements, but should not reduce the effective width of the room below the minimum widths set out above. Any built-in area in

excess of 0.72 sq.m. in a double bedroom and 0.36 sq.m. in a single bedroom counts towards the built-in storage requirement.

8) The minimum floor to ceiling height must be 2.5m for at least 75 per cent of the Gross Internal Area of each dwelling.

Type of Dwelling		Minimum Gross Internal Areas and Storage (sqm)	
No. of Bedrooms	No. of bedspaces	2 storey dwelling	Built in storage
3b	4p	84	2.5
3b	5p	93	2.5
3b	6p	102	2.5
4b	5p	97	3
4b	6p	106	3

28. The proposed dwellings have been designed to exceed the minimum space standards as set out below:

Plot 1 – 4 bed 6 person two-storey dwelling requiring 106sqm achieving 176sqm (storage included) – compliant

Plot 2 - 4 bed 6 person two-storey dwelling requiring 106sqm achieving 176sqm (storage included) – compliant

Plot 3 – 3 bed 5 person two-storey dwelling requiring 93sqm achieving 124sqm (storage included) - compliant

Plot 4 – 3 bed 5 person two-storey dwelling requiring 93sqm achieving 124sqm (storage included) – compliant

Layout

29. All four dwellings would feature open-plan living and dining spaces on the ground floor, with additional lounge spaces with bedrooms situated at the first floor. On the loft level of plots 1 and 2 there would be what is labelled to be a media space, allowing for additional living space to serve the needs of the residents. This media room and an additional storage area feature within plots 3 and 4 at roof level, which is welcomed.
30. The proposed layouts are considered to be well-organised, comfortably exceeding the minimum space standards as set out above and the design effectively maximises the use of the space. The bedrooms are spacious and offer functionality. Areas for storage have been clearly indicated within the units.
31. The units are all proposed to be dual aspect, with Plots 1 and 2 achieving outlook onto Copland Avenue and within their garden spaces which are a minimum of 9m. Plots 3 and 4 have outlook to the front of the property, over the parking spaces and allocated communal amenity area, and to the rear within their own private gardens.
32. There is an additional window at ground floor within plots 1 and 2, situated to the flank elevation of the shared living space. However, it is not the sole habitable window serving this room. Any windows serving flank elevations would be conditioned to be obscure glazed up to a height of 1.7m.
33. Within plots 3 and 4 there is an additional window serving the lounge are situated on the flank elevation, this would also be secured to be obscure glazed.
34. The windows situated at the flank elevation of the upper levels serve non-habitable rooms such as bathrooms and showers and as such, would be secured to be obscure glazed.

Floor to Ceiling Head Heights

35. London Plan Policy D6 also requires at least 75% of the GIA of each flat to have an internal floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5m.
36. All of the habitable floorspace across the main floors of the proposed dwellings would achieve a minimum internal floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5 metres, in full compliance with London Plan Policy D6. Additional floorspace is proposed within the roof spaces of each dwelling; however, these attic areas are not identified as habitable rooms and include elements of reduced head height due to the sloping roof form. Notwithstanding this, the overall proportion of the Gross Internal Area (GIA) across each unit that achieves a ceiling height of at least 2.5 metres exceeds the 75% minimum requirement set out in Policy D6. As such, the development is considered to provide a comfortable and spacious living environment in accordance with policy.

Accessible Housing

37. Policy D7 requires at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' and all other dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.
38. The proposal includes one unit (House 3) which is M4(3) compliant, this would be conditioned.

External Space Standards

39. Policy BH13 sets out that all new dwellings will be required to have external private amenity space of a sufficient size and type to satisfy its proposed residents' needs. This is normally expected to be 50sqm per home for family housing (3 bedrooms or more) situated at ground floor level and 20 sqm for all other housing.
40. Policy D6 of London Plan sets out that a minimum of 5 sq.m. of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1 sq.m. should be provided for each additional occupant, and it must achieve a minimum depth and width of 1.5m. The policy highlights that new developments should provide private amenity space to all dwellings, accessible from a main living room without level changes and planned to take maximum advantage of daylight and sunlight. Where sufficient private amenity space cannot be achieved individually for each dwelling to meet the full requirement of the policy, the remainder should be supplied in the form of communal amenity space.
41. All units proposed have direct access to amenity space and are three-bedroom family units, as such, the requirement for each unit is 50sqm.

Unit	Amenity Provided (sqm)	Policy Compliant	Overprovision (sqm)
Plot 1	85	Yes	35
Plot 2	65	Yes	15
Plot 3	111	Yes	61
Plot 4	127	Yes	77

42. The site plan indicates that each unit benefits from private amenity space, including a rear patio area, side access, and generous planting within individual gardens. Landscaping proposals include reinstated hedge planting to both the front and rear of the plots, with additional tree planting across the site. A central landscaped area is also proposed between Plots 3 and 4, though this does not function as formal communal amenity space. Instead, it serves as a visual amenity feature that enhances the setting of the development and contributes positively to the character of the site and the street scene. While not intended for active use, this landscaped area plays a key role in achieving the scheme's biodiversity net gain and urban greening objectives. Full details of all planting, materials and a maintenance strategy would be secured by condition.
43. The proposal includes a private amenity space for each dwelling that exceeds the minimum requirement set out within policy BH13 and has been designed in a well-considered manner within the site. Each garden for all four plots includes substantial planting, in the form of flower rich perennial planting, large

areas of usable amenity grassland encouraging play space, hedging for privacy, trees and a separate terrace which is considered to be usable for the number of occupants each dwelling would require. The approach to amenity provision is well-considered, offering ample opportunities for a variety of activities in line with Policy BH13 and the Amenity Space SPD.

44. The proposed external amenity space areas have been well designed and considered and further details of the planting would be secured through condition. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy BH13 of Brent's Local Plan and Brent's Supplementary Amenity Space SPD (December 2024).

Impact to Neighbouring Amenity

Privacy

45. The Council's SPD1 guidance advises that a minimum separation distance of 18 metres should be maintained between directly facing habitable room windows, and that a distance of at least 9 metres should be maintained between habitable rooms and the boundaries of private gardens. These standards are in place to safeguard privacy both within new developments and in relation to neighbouring properties.
46. The proposed dwellings have been designed to ensure a high standard of privacy is maintained throughout. All habitable room windows are located on the front and rear elevations, avoiding any direct overlooking into neighbouring gardens or properties. A separation distance of approximately 21.4 metres is maintained between the rear elevations of Plots 1 and 2 and Plots 3 and 4, comfortably exceeding the 18 metre standard required under SPD1. Additionally, the rear elevations of Plots 3 and 4 are set more than 9 metres from the rear boundaries of Plots 1 and 2, in line with SPD1 guidance, avoiding any mutual overlooking between properties within the development.
47. While some flank wall windows and rooflights are proposed, these either serve non-habitable rooms (e.g. bathrooms) or are secondary windows to rooms that already benefit from outlook to the front or rear. These openings can be secured by condition to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres above floor level, preventing any potential for overlooking of neighbouring gardens at No. 19 Copland Avenue or No. 6 Copland Close.
48. The proposed rooflights are also positioned at an angle facing the sky, limiting any possible views into neighbouring properties.
49. The layout, orientation and fenestration of the proposed dwellings have been carefully designed to prevent any harmful overlooking or loss of privacy, both to surrounding residential occupiers and between the new units themselves. The development is therefore considered to comply fully with the Council's SPD1 guidance in respect of privacy.

Overbearing appearance

50. To ensure that the plots are not visually overbearing to the neighbouring properties, SPD1 advises that the building envelope should be set below a line of 30 degrees from the nearest rear habitable room window of adjoining existing property, measured from height of two metres above floor level. Where proposed development adjoins private amenity / garden areas then the height of new development should normally be set below a line of 45 degrees at the garden edge, measured from a height of two metres..
51. Plots 1 and 2 are orientated towards Copland Avenue and set 1m from the curtilage boundary shared with No. 19. The massing of the building largely takes the bungalows siting into account. Whilst it is marginally deeper than the main bungalow, it does not project beyond the rear building line of the flat roof two storey extension at No 19 Copland Avenue. On the other side of semi, plot 2 is built up to the cul de sac and would have no further impact on any neighbouring dwellings as it shares its boundaries with Plot 1, the cul de sac road and the parking spaces situated at the rear.
52. The plans submitted indicate plots 3 and 4 that sit further into the rear of the site would comply with the 45 degree line from the rear garden of No. 19 Copland Avenue. They would sit along the flank wall of No. 6 Copland Close. Plots 3 and 4 would project around 1.5m rearward of the rear building line of No. 6 Copland Close. This distance would be within 45 degree line from the nearest rear habitable room window at No. 6 Copland Close, in line with the updated SPD on residential extensions and alterations that supersedes the 1:2 guidance that was in the former document known as SPD2. Whilst SPD1 still

makes reference to 1:2 rule it is considered that applying 45 degree line would be appropriate for this residential context. Nevertheless, the scheme would also sit within 1:2 rule when measured from the nearest rear habitable room window at No. 6 Copland Close. There do not appear to be any windows situated on the flank elevation of the ground floor garage within No. 19 Copland Avenue, and the windows in situ at first and within the loft space of this dwelling are obscure glazed windows with restricting any outlook from this elevation.

53. With regard to the 30 degree rule, SPD1 advises that buildings should be set below a line of 30 degrees from the nearest rear habitable room window of any adjoining property, measured from a height of 2m. The adjoining properties, No. 6 Copland Close and No. 19 Copland Avenue follow the same orientation as the proposed dwellings and as such, the 30 degree rule does not apply to these. For each pair of new dwellings, given the distance (18m+) between Plots 1 and 2 and Plots 3 and 4 it is not expected that Plots 3 and 4 would breach the 30 degree rule when considered against Plots 1 and 2.
54. The massing and height complies with SPD1 guidance and the proposal is not considered to detrimental to neighbouring amenity in terms of sense of enclosure or outlook of nearby occupiers. The orientation of the dwellings, sited along the existing building line of both Copland Close for Plots 3 and 4 and Copland Avenue for Plots 1 and 2 would be likely to mitigate a considerable area of overshadowing within the gardens of nearby dwellings.

Transport Considerations

Car Parking and Crossovers

55. Appendix 4 of the Local Plan states that maximum car parking allowances are based upon the London Plan standards, which for residential use are taken from Table 10.3 of London Plan Policy 6.1.
56. The site straddles the boundary between a PTAL rating of 3 and 4, with houses 1 & 2 fronting Copland Avenue having a PTAL rating of 4 (due to Sudbury Town station being within 960 metres) and houses 3 & 4 fronting Copland Close having a PTAL rating of 3.
57. As the existing house has a PTAL rating of 4, its maximum car parking allowance is 0.75 spaces. The current carriage driveway layout and garage mean that maximum allowances are currently exceeded.
58. The four proposed houses would have a combined maximum car parking allowance of 3.5 spaces in total. The proposed provision of 3 spaces is considered to accord with the maximum standards.
59. The off-street parking and associated crossovers for house 2 are proposed to be removed as part of this application, as the location onto the radius kerb at the junction with Copland Close does not accord with Brent's crossover guidance. A single parking space for houses 1, 3 and 4 remains which is acceptable. A condition would be attached to secure the removal of the existing crossover, a 900mm wall has also been proposed to the frontage where the crossover currently resides.
60. Policy BT2 of the Local Plan also requires consideration to be given to the impact of development on parking conditions. In this respect, data from the 2021 Census suggests that car ownership for houses in this area average one car per household. On this basis, one car may park on-street and with neither Copland Avenue nor Copland Close being noted as being heavily parked at night, there is plenty of spare capacity to absorb this level of demand.
61. It is also noted that the footway widths along both sides of Copland Close are below the standard minimum 2m width. This fails to provide suitable pedestrian access to the proposed houses at the rear of the site, in accordance with Healthy Streets principles. As such, the redevelopment of this site has included a strip of land along the northern edge of the site as public highway in order for the footway to be widened to 2m and a Section 38 Agreement would be required to secure the adoption of the widened footway.

EVCP

62. Policy T6 of London Plan highlights that all residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. At least 20 per cent of spaces should have active charging facilities, with passive provision for all remaining spaces. Policy BT1 of Brent's Local Plan seeks to increase coverage of Electric Vehicle charging points across the borough. A condition would also be

attached to secure the parking spaces as passive electric vehicle charging points.

Cycle Parking

63. Policy T5 of London Plan sets out the need to secure the provision of appropriate levels of cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.3, ensuring that a minimum of two short-stay and two long-stay cycle parking spaces are provided where the application of the minimum standards would result in a lower provision. This is also set out within policy BT1 of Brent's Local Plan that highlights the need for developments to include cycle parking, in line with or exceeding London Plan standards.
64. Cycle parking should be designed and laid out in accordance with the guidance contained in the London Cycling Design Standards. Development proposals should demonstrate how cycle parking facilities will cater for larger cycles, including adapted cycles for disabled people.
65. The proposed houses would require a minimum of 8 secure bicycle parking spaces. Details have been shown on the plans, which indicate that a bike store would be in situ in the front gardens of plots 1 and 2 and and 3 and 4. A condition would be attached to any consent to secure this as the bicycle lockers are shown to measure 1m x 2m for each house which would be acceptable.

Refuse Stores

66. Policy D6 of London Plan highlights the need for housing should be designed with adequate and easily accessible storage space that supports the separate collection of dry recyclables (for at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food waste as well as residual waste. This is reinforced within policy DMP1 that highlights the need for developments to provide high levels of internal and external amenity and does not unacceptably increase exposure to smells and waste.
67. In addition to the bike stores allocated for each dwelling, an individual refuse area is also provided, which would allow for sufficient collection from the highway and is acceptable.
68. Finally, it should be noted that the site has an existing private access from the rear garden into Barham Park. This is proposed to be retained for house 3 which is accepted.

Ecology, biodiversity and Urban Greening

69. Development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain. Policy BGI1 (d) sets out the need for all developments to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and avoid any detrimental impact on the geodiversity of an area.

Biodiversity

70. Brent Local Plan Policy BGI1 Green and Blue Infrastructure and the London Plan Policy G6 sets out that development should aim to secure a net biodiversity gain.
71. It is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) for minor development to deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10%, unless it meets one of the exemptions as set out within the legislation. This means a development must result in more or better quality natural habitat than there was before development.
72. The submission includes a Biodiversity Net Gain report which advises that as existing the total current on-site baseline habitat units are 0.9408, with the hedgerow units being 0.0090. It is proposed that Trees T1 (medium sized purple leaf plum), T3 (medium sized apple) and T4 (large sized Leyland cypress) and the existing hedgerow on site will be retained and protected. However, all other habitats will be lost to facilitate the development or to enable the creation of higher quality habitats on site.
73. The submission proposes to plant 5 small native trees, such as crab apple *Malus sylvestris*, rowan *Sorbus aucuparia*, field maple *Acer campestre* and cherry *Prunus* sp. and 4no. medium (semi-mature) native trees such as silver birch (to be 30cm DBH at the time of planting).
74. Additionally, the new dwellings would support private gardens, with lawn and tree and hedge planting. However, as these are private areas, these are not counted in the metric.

75. A communal green space in the centre of the site will be seeded with a flowering lawn mixture such as Emorsgate EL1 seed mix or equivalent. This mixture contains slow growing grasses with a selection of wildflowers that respond well to regular short mowing. This mixture contains species such as yarrow *Achillea millefolium*, betony *Betonica officinalis*, common knapweed *Centurea nigra*, kidney vetch *Anthyllis vulneraria*, hedge bedstraw *Galium album*, common bent *Agrostis capillaris*, crested dogtail *Cynosurus cristatus* and red fescue *Festuca rubra*.
76. The proposal includes over 19m of cherry laurel hedgerows will be planted outside the private gardens, along boundaries of the communal green space in the centre of the site and in between car parking areas. As above though, these have not been counted as they form a partial boundary with the private areas of the site, and therefore should not be counted. The value in biodiversity units as existing is 0.0173 baseline, which is proposed to be increased to 0.0263.
77. The anticipated post-development habitat units are 1.0353, resulting in a total net gain of 10.05% in habitat units. Furthermore, a 192.61% net gain in hedgerow units will also be achieved in line with National Legislation.
78. A condition is recommended to secure a range of biodiversity enhancements across the site, including hedgehog highways, habitat boxes, rubble and log piles, bird boxes and bat boxes. These features will provide opportunities for nesting, shelter and foraging, contributing to the overall ecological value of the development. Hedgehog highways will ensure permeability through garden boundaries, enabling movement between plots and neighbouring sites. Habitat boxes nestled within planting areas, alongside rubble and log piles, will create safe and naturalistic environments for hedgehogs and invertebrates. Bird and bat boxes will support species that rely on trees or built structures for nesting and roosting, and their placement will be carefully designed to minimise conflict with external lighting. These measures will help to ensure the long-term ecological resilience of the development, in line with Policy BGI1 of the Brent Local Plan.
79. It is recommended that a habitat management and maintenance plan for the significant on site habitat enhancement as noted above is secured through the Section 106 Agreement together with a monitoring fee in relation to the maintenance of such habitat enhancement for a 30 year period in line with legislation. together with a monitoring fee. Wildlife features would also be conditioned for birds, hedghogs and plants.

Impact upon Barham Park SINC and Railway Corridor SINC

80. London Plan policy G6 highlights the need for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC's) to be protected. A SINC is situated towards the rear of the site, within Barham Park open space. Additionally, the railway corridor is a wildlife corridor and SINC (Grade 1 Chiltern Line BI06F) as identified through London Plan Policy G6.
81. Where harm to a SINC is unavoidable, and where the benefits of the development proposal clearly outweigh the impacts on biodiversity, the following mitigation hierarchy should be applied to minimise development impacts:
 - 1) avoid damaging the significant ecological features of the site
 - 2) minimise the overall spatial impact and mitigate it by improving the quality or management of the rest of the site
 - 3) deliver off-site compensation of better biodiversity value.
82. Development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain. As above, the proposal is considered to provide 10% net gain and would therefore not be considered to harm the wildlife corridor or Barham Park's Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC's) to be protected.

Ecology

Barham Park SINC and Chiltern Line SINC

83. Barham Park, located to the rear of the site, is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). In addition, the adjacent railway corridor is identified as a Grade 1 SINC (Chiltern

Line – BI06F) and functions as an important ecological corridor. London Plan Policy G6 and Policy BG11 of Brent's Local Plan require development to protect and enhance biodiversity and to avoid adverse impacts on SINC's and other designated ecological assets.

84. The proposed development would not result in direct encroachment into either the Barham Park SINC or the railway corridor. The site benefits from a deep rear garden that provides a substantial buffer between the proposed built form and the boundary with Barham Park. This buffer, which includes existing vegetation and the retention of several trees, is to be enhanced through additional landscaping and tree planting, further mitigating any potential impacts on the adjacent natural habitat.
85. The scheme includes biodiversity enhancements, such as new native tree planting, flowering grassland seeding, and hedgerow planting within the site. These features contribute to a net gain in biodiversity and strengthen the ecological value of the development, without compromising the integrity of adjacent SINC's. The submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment confirms that a minimum 10% net gain in habitat units will be achieved, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, and no adverse impact on the functioning or quality of the Barham Park SINC or the railway corridor is anticipated.
86. Overall, the proposal is considered to respect and preserve the value of nearby ecological designations. It supports the policy objectives of the London Plan and Brent Local Plan by enhancing ecological connectivity and safeguarding sensitive habitats from harm.

Urban Greening

87. Brent Local Plan Policy BH4 in line with London Plan Policy G5 requires all minor development proposals to achieve an UGF score of 0.4 on site. This score needs to be demonstrated through a landscape masterplan that incorporates green cover into the design proposal. It should be accompanied by a score table measuring the UGF leading to better quality green cover on site.
88. The applicant has provided a drawing and spreadsheet that demonstrates that the planting proposed within the overall site would achieve a score of 0.425 and is therefore acceptable.

As such, the proposal accords with policy G5 and BH4.

Bats

89. An Emergence Bat Survey was submitted in support of the application. The survey was undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance issued by the Bat Conservation Trust and Natural England. It assessed the potential for roosting bats within the existing building and surrounding trees, in line with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
90. Bats and their roosts are protected under UK legislation as European Protected Species (EPS). As such, planning authorities must consider the potential presence of bats and ensure that development would not result in harm to protected species or their habitats, in accordance with paragraph 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that opportunities to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be pursued in decision-making.
91. The submitted survey concluded that no evidence of bat roosting activity, including emergence or re-entry, was observed during the survey period, and that the building has low bat roost potential. As such, no mitigation measures have been recommended. The Council is satisfied that sufficient ecological information has been provided to conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to bats or their habitat. Therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy G6 of the London Plan, Policy BG11 of Brent's Local Plan, and relevant national legislation concerning protected species.
92. Should any bats be unexpectedly encountered during demolition or construction, the applicant would be required to stop works and seek further advice from a suitably qualified ecologist. An informative can be added to remind the applicant of their obligations under wildlife legislation.

Trees

93. Policy DMP1(h) highlights the need for development proposals to retain existing blue and green infrastructure including water ways, open space, high amenity trees and landscape features and providing appropriate additions or enhancements where possible. Policy BG12 of the local plan required development to retain trees or propose replacement trees where retention is not possible.

94. The submission has been accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The report identifies 10 trees within the site or close to the site including 1 category B tree, 8 category C trees/groups and 1 category U tree. Six trees are proposed to be removed to facilitate the development all of which are category C and U trees (T2, T5, T6, T7, T8 and T9). The other three trees including the higher value category B tree within the site would be retained (T1, T3, and T4) with details provided of measures to protect the retained trees during construction works.
95. It should be noted that the site contains trees that are subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO) which protects two trees growing within the rear garden (43.10/122 (VO8/00022)) T3 a Silver Birch growing within the middle of the rear garden and T4 a Purple leaved Plum growing adjacent to the boundary with 6 Copland Close. The report does not include the TPO tree T3, which is the Silver Birch which has been removed at some point between 2018 and 2024 and additionally TPO tree T4 has been identified as a category U tree which is proposed to be removed as set out above.
96. To compensate for the loss of trees within the site including TPO tree, the proposal seeks to plant a total of 9 replacement trees within the site. This would result in a net increase of three trees overall. This would include 4 semi silver birch trees, these would be located within the communal area and along the car parking area. 5 additional trees of species Rowan, Crab Apple, Field Maple and Cherry Trees are proposed on this boundary also.
97. The planting of 9 new trees would be in line with policy BG12.

Environmental Health Considerations

98. Policy DMP1 (g) highlights that development will be acceptable provided it does not unacceptably increase, and where possible reduce, exposure to flood risk, noise, dust, contamination, smells, waste, light, other forms of pollution and general disturbance or detrimentally impacting on air or water quality.

Flood Risk and Drainage

99. The application site is located within flood Zone 1, indicating the lowest risk with a 0.1% annual probability of flooding. The minor application is therefore not required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
100. Brent Local Plan Policy BSUI4 sets out proposals for minor developments, householder development, and conversions should make use of sustainable drainage measures wherever feasible and must ensure separation of surface and foul water systems. Proposals that would fail to make adequate provision for the control and reduction of surface water run-off will be refused.
101. The proposals include a rainwater discharge plan which indicates underground attenuation tank within the site, and aco or similar gulleys along the rear of the house to collect rainwater. The submission is considered to adequately address the rainwater discharge and there is no objection.

Water Consumption

102. Policy BSUI4 highlights the need to meet the target for mains water consumption of 105 litres or less per person per day. A condition securing this would be attached to any consent.

Lighting

103. Lighting is proposed to the pathway, and further details would be secured through the landscaping condition.

Construction Impact

104. A condition is also recommended requiring the approval of a Construction Method Statement in relation to demolition and construction. It is recommended that permission is granted subject to these conditions.

Air Quality

105. As the application does not relate to a major application there is no requirement to submit an Air Quality Neutral Assessment in line with policy BG11 of Brent's Local Plan. A condition has been included requesting a Construction Method Statement given that the development is within an Air Quality

Management Area.

Fire Safety

106. Policy D12A of the London Plan (as well as the draft London Plan Fire Safety Guidance) requires all development proposals to achieve the highest standard of fire safety and requires submissions to demonstrate that they:

- 1) identify suitably positioned unobstructed outside space:
 - a) for fire appliances to be positioned on
 - b) appropriate for use as an evacuation assembly point
- 2) are designed to incorporate appropriate features which reduce the risk to life and the risk of serious injury in the event of a fire, including appropriate fire alarm systems and passive and active fire safety measures;
- 3) are constructed in an appropriate way to minimise the risk of fire spread;
- 4) provide suitable and convenient means of escape, and associated evacuation strategy for all building users;
- 5) develop a robust strategy for evacuation which can be periodically updated and published, and which all building users can have confidence in;
- 6) provide suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development.

107. The submission includes a suitable site layout, means of escape and evacuation strategy. The submitted Fire Safety Statement includes passive and active fire safety measures which include construction materials that would achieve appropriate reaction to fire ratings fire stopping and compartmentation between units, smoke alarms and internal linings. The materials for the proposed dwellings have also been confirmed to be non-combustible and there will be the installation of cavity barriers. Fire hydrants are proposed and each dwelling would require certificates for fire detection and alarm systems.

108. The applicant has provided a fire statement which has addressed the above requirement, in accordance with policy D12A of the London Plan. Detailed fire safety considerations would be addressed as part of building regulations.

Sustainability

109. The proposal includes sustainability and renewable energy commitments including the use of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) and Fabric First Approach, which is strongly supported. ASHPs also generate noise and a condition has also been recommended to ensure that this does not significantly impact the amenity of sensitive receptors.

Equalities

110. In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity, as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In making this recommendation, regard has been given to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the relevant protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation).

Conclusion

111. The proposal is considered to accord with the development plan having regard to all material planning considerations. The proposal would deliver the provision of four family sized homes contributing towards the Council's housing targets.

112. Planning permission is therefore recommended to be granted subject to conditions and legal agreement.

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



Brent

DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: **24/2052**

To: Mr Dusek
Jack Dusek & Co
Nickron House
Bury Lane
Rickmansworth
WD3 1DN

I refer to your application dated **24/07/2024** proposing the following:

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4x 3-storey semi-detached dwellings including hard and soft landscaping, off street parking spaces, boundary treatment, alterations to existing drop kerbs and formation of new drop kerb, subject to Deed of Agreement dated xx under Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:
See condition 2.

at **21 Copland Avenue, Wembley, HA0 2EN**

The Council of the London Borough of Brent, the Local Planning Authority, hereby **GRANT** permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out on the attached Schedule B.

Date: 01/04/2025

Signature:

David Glover
Head of Planning and Development Services

Notes

1. Your attention is drawn to Schedule A of this notice which sets out the rights of applicants who are aggrieved by the decisions of the Local Planning Authority.
2. This decision does not purport to convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or under any enactment other than the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DnStdG

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

- 1 The proposed development is in general accordance with policies contained in the:-
National Planning Policy Framework 204
London Plan 2021
Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning on the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

Site Location Plan

690- P- 2 Rev K - Site Plan
690-P-4 Rev D - Plans and elevations for plot 1 and 1
690- P-5 Rev D - Plans and elevations for Plot 3 and 4
690- P-6 Rev C existing and proposed streetscenes
690- P- 8 Rev A - Existing and proposed side elevation and street scenes
690-P-9 Rev A - crossover location plan
690- P-10 Sections
690-P-11 - Proposed rainwater strategy

Supporting Documents
GHA Tree Report
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment 21 Copland Avenue (October 2024 Rev 2 December 2024)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 No further extensions or buildings shall be constructed within the curtilage of the dwellinghouses subject of this application, notwithstanding the provisions of Class(es) A, B, C, D, E & F of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) unless a formal planning application is first submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In view of the restricted nature and layout of the site for the proposed development, no further enlargement or increase in living accommodation beyond the limits set by this consent should be allowed without the matter being first considered by the Local Planning Authority.

- 4 Plot 3 shall be designed to comply with Building Regulation M4(3) 'wheelchair adaptable homes' standards and the remaining residential units designed to comply with Building Regulations M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable homes' standards.

Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible homes, in accordance with policy D7 of London Plan 2021.

- 5 The building shall be designed so that mains water consumption does not exceed a target of 105 litres or less per person per day, using a fittings-based approach to determine the water consumption of the development in accordance with requirement G2 of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.

Reason: In order to ensure a sustainable development by minimising water consumption.

- 6 All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW used during the course of the demolition, site preparation and construction phases shall comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA's supplementary planning guidance "Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition" dated July 2014 (SPG), or subsequent guidance. Unless it complies with the standards set out in the SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The developer shall keep an up to date list of all NRMM used during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of the development on the online register at <https://nrmm.london/> "

Reason: To protect local amenity and air quality in accordance with Brent Policies BSUI1, BSUI2 and London Plan Policy SI1.

- 7 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless the car parking spaces (including the passive provision for EVCP for these car parking spaces), cycle storage and refuse stores have been completed in full accordance with the approved drawings and made available to residents of the development and shall not be used other than for purposes ancillary to the flats hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of accommodation.

- 8 The development hereby approved shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved Arboricultural impact assessment and method statement including the tree protection measures by GHA Trees unless alternative details are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tree protection measures shall remain in place throughout the construction of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate consideration for trees, in accordance with Brent Policy BGI2.

- 9 The windows on the southern elevation of the Plots 1 and 3 and the northern elevation of plot 4 at first floor level together with the flank roof lights shall be constructed with obscure glazing and non-opening or with openings at high level only (not less than 1.7m above floor level) and shall be permanently returned and maintained in that condition thereafter unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties or prejudice the ability of the adjoining land coming forward for redevelopment.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of the development (including demolition of the existing bungalow) a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the neighbours by minimising impacts of the development that would otherwise give rise to nuisance.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: The condition relates to details of construction, which need to be known before commencement of that construction

- 11 Details of materials for all external building work, including samples which shall be made available for viewing in an agreed location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and laying of foundations). The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development which does not prejudice the amenity of the locality.

- 12 Prior to development commencing above ground on the development, a detailed landscaping scheme and implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall incorporate the hard and soft landscaping details proposed on the approved plans, as well as further details of, but not limited to the following:

Such scheme shall also indicate:-

- (i) Details of hard surfacing, walls, fencing, screening treatment and gates and any other permanent means of boundary treatment/enclosure, indicating materials, position and heights, details of permeable paving, tree pit design, underground modular systems, etc.
- (ii) Boundary treatment, means of enclosure and retaining structures;
- (iii) Species, locations and densities for 9 trees, grass and shrubs;
- (iv) 5 year maintenance plan for landscape works within the front and rear gardens of the dwellinghouses
- (v) Details of biodiversity enhancement measures in line with the recommendations set out within the Biodiversity net gain assessment MM Ecology
- (vi) Details to maximise the urban green factor (UGF) for the site in line with policy G5 of London Plan 2021, including the requirement to submit a UGF Masterplan;

The approved landscaping scheme shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the implementation programme prior to first occupation or use of the building. The hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to the use of the dwellings hereby approved, unless alternative timescales have been submitted to and approved to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved timescales.

There shall be no excavation or raising or lowering of levels within the prescribed root protection area of retained trees unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any new trees(s) that die(s), are/is removed, become(s) severely damaged or diseased shall be replaced and any new planting (other than trees) which dies, is removed, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced. Replacement planting shall be in accordance with the approved details (unless the Local Planning authority gives its written consent to any variation).

Reason To safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the area, to provide ecological, environmental and biodiversity benefits and to maximise the quality and usability of open spaces within the development, and to enhance its setting within the immediate locality in accordance with policies DMP1 and BGI 2.

Reason: In order to introduce high quality landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value and biodiversity of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of urban greening and visual amenity having regard to Local Plan Policies DMP1, BGI1 and BGI2 and London Plan policies G5, G6 and G7.

- 13 Prior to the installation of any external lighting, details of such lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include, but is not limited to, details of the lighting fixtures, luminance levels within and adjoining the site.

The lighting shall not be installed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ecology, safety and the amenities of the area.

- 14 Prior to installation of any Air Source Heat Pumps (ASPHs) details of the proposed ASHPs including their location on the dwellings together with information to set out that the rated noise level from the proposed ASHPs would not exceed 42 dB(A) when measured at the nearest noise sensitive premises in line with the Mircogeneration Certification Scheme planning standards (MCS 020) or any revised version of the scheme at the time of installation. The ASPHs shall thereafter be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect acceptable local noise levels, in accordance with Brent Policy DMP1.

- 15 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for wildlife and nesting features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These will include:
1. Hedgehog gateways will be integrated into boundaries to allow migration between sites
 2. Within the landscape at least one hedgehog habitat boxes per plot to be nestled amongst the planting to offer safe habitat spaces.
 3. 4 house sparrow terrace, on each new dwelling (facing vegetation)
 4. Log pile formed from felled trees felled included within the planting
 5. 4 Swift bird boxes located on each house under roof eaves
 6. At least one bat box per plot, mounted at least 5m above the ground

The scheme will include full details on numbers of each feature, type of feature / box / brick, location (plan and elevation views) of each feature, height above ground (if applicable) and nearest external lighting (if likely to have an impact).

Features shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter retained for five years.

Reason: To enhance the biodiversity value of the land in accordance Policy BGI1 of the Brent Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1 - The provisions of The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. An explanatory booklet setting out your obligations can be obtained from the government website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/preventing-and-resolving-disputes-in-relation-to-party-walls/the-party-wall-etc-act-1996-explanatory-booklet>

2 - The applicant must ensure, before work commences, that the treatment/finishing of flank walls can be implemented as this may involve the use of adjoining land and should also ensure that all development, including foundations and roof/guttering treatment is carried out entirely within the application property.

3 - The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at www.brent.gov.uk/CIL.

4 - The submission/approval of the Fire Safety Statement does not replace the need for building regulation approval in relation to fire safety, nor does it convey or imply any approval under those regulations.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Nicola Blake, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5149