



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE CONFERENCE HALL, BRENT CIVIC CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 10 SEPTEMBER 2025 AT 6.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor S Butt (Vice-Chair in the Chair) and Councillors Akram, Begum, Dixon, Johnson (for item 5 onwards) and Mahmood.

1. Welcome and Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kelcher, Chappell (with Councillor Mahmood attending as substitute) and Jayanti Patel.

As Councillor Kelcher (Chair) had submitted his apologies for absence Councillor S. Butt (as Vice-Chair) took the chair for the meeting.

2. Declarations of interests

It was noted (in relation to Agenda Item 4: 24/2877 - 1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN) that due to his publicly stated position against the provision of gambling establishments within the borough, and to avoid any allegations of bias or pre-determination, Councillor Johnson had declared a personal disclosable interest and therefore withdrawn from the meeting for the consideration of that item.

In relation to Agenda Item 5 25/0413 – Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN - all members of the Committee (with the exception of Councillor Mahmood attending as a substitute) confirmed they had received an approach from the applicant and owners of the neighbouring property (as objectors) but had not engaged in discussion or sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the application impartially and without any form of predetermination.

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meetings held on Monday 4 August 2025 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. 25/1112 - 1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN

PROPOSAL

Change of use of basement and ground floor from vacant bank to Adult Gaming Centre (AGC) with alteration to front elevation at ground floor level.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives detailed in the committee report.

Parag Dhanan (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application site was a commercial property located on the north side of Walm Lane at the junction of High Road. The property fell within the primary shopping frontage of the Willesden Green Town Centre and, whilst not containing any Listed Buildings, was located within the Willesden Conservation Area. Members were also reminded that the site had been subject to a previous application (Ref 24/2877) for which permission had been granted on 17 February 2025 which related to a change of use for the basement and ground floor from vacant bank to bingo hall with alteration to front elevation at ground floor level.

Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which outlined an additional representation received from the Brent East MP (Dawn Butler) objecting to the proposed development. Members were advised the comments raised reflected those already received and addressed within the main Committee report with the recommendation therefore remaining to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives outlined within the main report.

The Chair thanked Parag Dhanan for introducing the report and advised that as there were no representatives who had registered to speak in relation to the application he would move straight on deal with questions and points of clarity from the Committee, with the following being noted:

- Further clarification was sought in relation to application of the Local Plan Policy BE5: Protecting retail in town centres and the criteria on active frontages that proposals for adult gaming centres were required to meet. In terms of the existing town centre, members were advised that there were two pawnbrokers and two adult gaming centres but no payday loan shops in Willesden Green Town Centre. The total existing length of the town centre frontage consisting of those premises had been assessed as 38m with the total frontage length being 1877m which meant that, as existing, 2.02% of the total frontage length was in adult gaming centre and pawnbrokers/payday loan shop use.

In terms of the application site (1 Walm Lane) that had a frontage length of approx. 9.75m with members advised that if consented for adult gaming centre (AGC) use, the total frontage length in AGC and pawnbrokers/payday loan shop use (including the premises already outlined) would be 47.75m which would result in 2.54% of the total frontage length being in AGC and pawnbrokers/payday loan shop use. The proposals would therefore sit within the threshold criteria of no more than 3% of the town centre frontage

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

consisting of AGC or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops, in line with Local Plan policy BE5. Whilst criteria (d) under Policy PE5 required that there was a minimum of 4 units of alternative use in-between each relevant use officers advised that the wording was open to interpretation as the wording within the policy referred to a “minimum of 4 units in alternative use in-between each” without clarifying whether that was between each separate use of each separate unit. As further clarification, members were advised the matter had been tested at appeal with the interpretation being that the policy was intended to avoid an overconcentration of particular uses within any single length of frontage, with the policy designed to prevent AGC, pawnbrokers, betting shops and takeaways locating in close proximity to a unit in the same use. Whilst noting that there was a pawnbroker located at 1d Walm Lane this would be regarded as an alternative use and with no other AGC within 4 units of the proposed site it was confirmed the proposal had also been assessed as being in accordance with criteria (d) of Policy BE5.

- Following on, additional clarification was also provided in relation to the distinction between town centre frontages and local neighbourhood parade frontages in terms of application of the criteria within Local Plan Policy BE5, with confirmation provided that Walm Lane had been classed as a town centre rather than neighbourhood parade frontage given its location with the Willesden Green town centre boundary. As a result, members were advised that criteria (c) (no more than 1 unit or 10% of the neighbourhood frontage consisting of betting shops, AGC or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops) within Policy BE5 had not been applicable in terms of the current application.
- Further details were sought on the reason no noise assessment had been provided in support of the application. In response, members were advised this was not felt to have been necessary given the town centre location of the site and as the upper floors of the host property were not currently in residential use. The existing office use of these floors was also not considered to be particularly sensitive to the proposed use. Whilst an electrical room had been included at basement level, no external/plant equipment had been indicated at the premises with a condition also secured to limit the cumulative rated noise level from any plant, gaming machines or other equipment to 10dB(A) below the measured background noise level when measured at the nearest noise sensitive premises so as to prevent the transmission of noise and vibration into neighbouring premises.
- As further assurance, in terms of complaints relating to noise or anti-social behaviour members were advised that the proposal would also be subject to licencing restrictions and reasonable use. No specific objections had been lodged by the Council's Environmental Health Team in relation to noise complaints or concerns and it was not therefore considered likely, from a planning perspective, to result in significant adverse noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. Confirmation was provided that any subsequent

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

complaints regarding noise would be subject to monitoring, investigation and enforcement action through the Council's Environmental Health Enforcement Team with any breach in planning conditions subject to planning enforcement activity.

- In recognising that the application site was located within a Conservation area, further details were sought on the impact in relation to character and appearance of the proposal on the surrounding area. In response, members were advised that in order to facilitate the change of use, the application had proposed minor alterations to the shopfront to include a new street-facing front entrance and window at ground floor level. It was confirmed that the existing shopfront was not original, and the proposed works were in keeping with the existing arrangements. As a result, the proposal had been assessed to be in keeping and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and also to be compliant with the Council's Shopfront SPD. Having referred to accompanying drawings displayed at the meeting, members were advised that the works would be similar to those approved under the previous application relating to the same site (Ref:24/2877). In terms of the site's previous use as a former bank and potential impact on the current building as a heritage asset, confirmation was provided that the Council's Heritage officer had been consulted and raised no objection to the heritage impacts of the proposal. Clarification was also provided, in relation to concerns identified regarding the loss of banking use on the site as a community use, that use of the site fell within Use Class E and would not therefore be defined as social infrastructure.
- Returning to focus on the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity, further details were sought on the approach and controls available in relation to controlling the hours of operation. Whilst outlining the extended hours of opening sought within the submitted application, officers advised that nearby residential premises were located in proximity to the site and that direct neighbouring uses also operated under earlier closing times, designed to limit disturbance to the residential occupiers surrounding the site. On this basis, officers had recommended the inclusion of a condition to be secured restricting the opening hours to between 0800 to 2300 Mondays to Fridays and 0900 to 2300 on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank and Public holidays. In terms of any further restrictions (with it noted that nearby betting shop units along Walm Lane and the adjoining High Road were only open until 10pm in the evening) members were advised that these were consistent with the hours conditioned as part of the previous application (Ref:24/2877) and felt to be reasonable given the nature of other surrounding uses.
- Further details were sought on the status of any planning application submitted in relation to the vacant upper floors of the host property for residential purposes. In confirming that an application had been received in relation to the upper floors as residential units, members were reminded this

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

would need to be regarded as a separate application still to be determined and could not therefore be treated as a material planning consideration in terms of the application being considered by the Committee.

- Details were also sought on the proposed arrangements in relation to cycle storage facilities, which members were advised included internal provision shared between visitor and employee parking.
- Having clarified the way in which objections received in relation to the application had been assessed on the basis of relevant planning considerations, members were reminded that the proposed change of use to an AGC had been assessed as being in accordance with the Council's adopted policies. The minor external changes proposed to the shopfront of the site, were not felt to generate any impact in relation to the character and appearance of the conservation area with the condition limiting opening hours and noise levels from plant and gaming machines having been secured to protect neighbouring amenity.

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

DECISION

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

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 4 For and 1 Against).

Having declared an interest in respect of the previous item, Councillor Johnson joined the meeting at this stage in proceedings and was present for the remainder of the Committee meeting.

5. **25/1246 - Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN**

PROPOSAL

Proposed erection of two storey 3x bedroom dwelling house with installation of a front brick boundary wall for the vacant parcel of land directly to the North of 125 Preston Road.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives, as detailed in the committee report.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

Janseway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the proposal sought planning permission for a two storey 3-bed 5-person dwelling which would form a new end of terrace property adjoining with the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings at No.123 and No.125 Preston Road. The dwelling would have an angled mono-pitch roof design, with the highest point towards Pellatt Road, where it met the junction. The proposed development would also incorporate a 6.0m deep single storey rear element that would have a flat roof set at an eaves and maximum height of 3.0m. Other associated works involved the creation of a front forecourt with planting and combined cycle and refuse storage, the erection of a brick front boundary wall, and wooden fenced side boundary treatment. Private external amenity space would be provided to the rear garden for the residents of the property.

The application site related to a grass verge with some shrubs that was located to the north of the dwelling at No.125 Preston Road and was sited on an open road junction, fronting Preston Road to the east and Pellatt Road to the north. Members were advised that the site was not situated within a Conservation Area and did not contain any designated or undesignated heritage assets and for highway purposes, whilst not within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), was located within the Wembley Event Day Parking Zone.

Attention was also drawn to the Supplementary Report circulated in advance of the meeting, which outlined additional representations received in objection from the adjoining neighbour at 125 Preston Road. Members were advised the comments raised mainly reflected those already received and addressed within the main Committee report, with the recommendation therefore remaining to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives outlined within the main report.

The Chair thanked Janseway Cheung for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to the consider the requests which had been received to speak on the application and invited Nisha & Kunal Shah (who had registered to speak in objection) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

Advising that they were speaking as the adjoining neighbours to the site at 125 Preston Road Nisha & Kunal Shah outlined what they felt to be a number of weaknesses in the basis of the assessment supporting the recommendation within the report with specific concerns highlighted in relation to the following areas:

- The impact arising from the design of the proposal on the character of the area. Members were advised that the proposal would have the effect of attaching a new dwelling directly to 125 Preston Road, converting a semi-detached pair into an end-of-terrace, removing the visual gap and unbalancing the symmetry of the pair which it was felt conflicted with adopted SPD1 guidance in relation to removing openness of a sensitive corner plot

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

and creating the impression of a continuous terrace. The use of flat roofs, pale bricks and minimal detailing was also felt to contradict the Metroland nature of red brick, pitched roof and mock tudor character style of buildings in the surrounding area.

- Overdevelopment, based on the rear projection of the building having been felt to exceed the maximum set for semi-detached properties within Brent's Residential Extension Supplementary Planning Document. In addition, concerns were expressed in relation to the impact in terms of daylight and amenity, with it pointed out no daylight/sunlight assessment had been submitted and the proposal also breached the 45 degree rule on the ground floor habitable window as a minimum safeguard.
- The impact in relation to the Boundary Wall and Drainage deliverability relation to 125 Preston Road as the adjoining property, with members advised that it was felt the proposal would block access to an existing rainwater downpipe with no provision for its rerouting making the scheme undeliverable. In addition, concern was expressed at the biodiversity net loss arising from the scheme which it was felt represented a breach of Local Plan Policy BG11 & London Plan policy G6.
- As a result, the scheme was felt to have breached multiple Brent and London Plan policies and be undeliverable as designed, introducing permanent harm to both 125 Preston Road and the wider character of the surrounding area. Concern was expressed that whilst the officer report had acknowledged breaches of Brent and London Plan policies, as well as the statutory biodiversity duty, these had been assessed as "not significant." Referring to two previous refusals at 125 Preston Road of over dominant extensions on the same corner site and the significance of the area as a gateway to the Wembley Stadium complex it was not felt the assessment had considered the reputational and design impact of the proposal, with the need also identified to recognise the weight given to the conflicts in terms of the adopted policy framework. Based on the breaches identified it was felt the Committee therefore had clear grounds to refuse the application and on this basis members were urged to reject the recommendation for approval within the report.

The Chair thanked Nisha and Kunal Shah for addressing the Committee and with no questions or points of clarification raised by members of the Committee then moved on to invite Adam Dainow supported by Joe Williams (who had registered to speak as the applicant and agent respectively) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

In opening his comments, Adam Dainlow (as applicant and owner of the application site) outlined the nature of his business in seeking to develop imaginative, design led homes on small plots of land in a way that mirrored the aim

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

within the London Plan to support considered intensification. In terms of the application presented to the Committee, it was pointed out the design had reflected the positive work and engagement process with the Council's Planning Officers which had led to the development of what regarded as a highly considered scheme seeking to utilise an underused piece of land in order to provide a family sized home based on an exemplary and high quality design and which it was felt would serve as a benchmark development for the local community. In providing further detail Joe Williams (as the applicant's agent) took the opportunity to highlight:

- The proposal was for a new two-storey, three-bedroom family home on the vacant parcel of land directly north of 125 Preston Road. Members were advised that at present, the site was under-utilised and made a limited contribution to the local character of the area. The scheme therefore sought to enhance the use of the land and make positive and efficient use of what was felt to represent a sustainable location, with good access to local amenities, employment opportunities, and public transport links, including Preston Road Station and three bus stops all within easy walking distance.
- The new home had been designed to meet national and London Plan housing standards, providing generous internal space, triple aspect daylighting, and over 50 square metres of private garden and would also respond directly to Brent's identified need for family housing of three bedrooms or more.
- Design quality had been a central focus of the proposal with the architecture felt to offer a contemporary response to the character of Preston Road, contributing to the variety of neighbouring styles ranging from 1930's Tudorbethan semis to neighbouring 1960's and 1990's estates. To ensure continuity, the design had reflected the established palette of local materials such as the red brickwork base and reinterpretation of the white render with all representing high-quality, durable finishes. The proposals had also been assessed as consistent with Policy 6.1.7 of the Brent Local Plan, which supported excellence in contemporary architecture and design that evolved and enhanced local character.
- Members were advised that care had also been taken in developing an appropriate massing, with it highlighted that the scheme had been praised in the pre-application advice as 'a well-designed contemporary exemplar, in which the angled roof form would follow the geometry of the existing roof at No.125 Preston Road and would respect the eaves level of the neighbour'.
- In terms of the design, it was pointed out that the new building, acknowledging its prominent corner position, aimed to provide a more

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

defined corner to the junction with Pellatt Road, which it was felt would contribute positively to the identity of the street.

- Members were also advised of the work undertaken by the applicant with the Council's Planning Department to ensure that the proposals responded appropriately to the recommendations of the pre-application advice, including refinements to materials, boundary treatments, and landscaping. It was also pointed out the development had achieved the required Urban Greening Factor, through the introduction of new trees and planting and incorporation of sustainability measures such as green roofs, water efficiency, and secure cycle storage.
- In summing up, it was therefore felt that the proposal not only made effective use of a small brownfield site in line with local and national policy, but also would provide a much-needed family home designed to meet all space and design standards whilst contributing to the local built environment with a high-quality, contemporary approach that also embedded sustainability, biodiversity, and accessibility at its heart. As such it was hoped the Committee would recognise the application as representing a positive, policy-compliant contribution to Brent's housing provision and urban character.

The Chair thanked Adam Dainlow & Joe Williams for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented, with the following being noted:

- In response to queries raised regarding the proximity of the application site to the adjoining property at 125 Preston Road and nature of the design compared to the surrounding area, the applicant advised that whilst recognising the impact likely to be experienced during the construction phase of the development the overall design quality of the development was felt to be high. This included the type of materials which members were reminded had been designed to reflect the established palette of materials used locally.
- Referring to images of the design displayed at the meeting, members sought further assurance regarding the impact on neighbouring properties and surrounding area noting the difference in character and style of the development and adjoining property. In response, members were advised of the efforts made to ensure design of the development respected and reflected the nature of the area. Whilst recognising the contemporary design approach it was pointed out the proposals were policy compliant with careful attention having been paid to proportions, detailing and materials and the appearance felt to be suitable in terms of the established urban nature of the surrounding area and based on the corner location of the site, which also lent itself to a more contemporary and ambitious architectural approach.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

- In seeking further details on the consultation undertaken in relation to the application, members were advised this had complied with the Council's statutory requirements and involved notification being provided for properties in the immediate surrounding area and adjoining neighbours.
- In response to a final question, clarification was also provided in relation to the standard of the accommodation in relation to internal space, ceiling height access to daylight and outlook, with confirmation provided this had been designed to comply with policy standards with reference made to the plan for the ground floor in terms of the size and layout of the development. which were felt to provide high levels of outlook and daylight and confirmation that the rear extension would have a depth of 6.0m as allowed for single storey rear extensions within Brent's Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD.

With no further questions raised, the Chair thanked Adam Dainlow & Joe Williams 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 clarification was sought in relation to assessment of the design and character of the development in relation to the criteria within the London Plan and Brent Design Guide SPD1. In response, officers advised of the need outlined with SPD1 for new development to positively respond to the existing context, scale and existing character of the surrounding area particularly with regards to massing and materials. In terms of the application site, Preston Road was identified as a residential street consisting of mainly two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings typically set back from the road behind a front forecourt with low brick boundary walls/open driveways and rear gardens with dwellings representing a mix of architectural styles, including metro-land and mock Tudor. Whilst recognising the proposed development adopted a contemporary architectural approach, which was different from the traditional character of neighbouring residential properties, it was considered to be of high design quality, demonstrating a thoughtful response to both its context and its constraints with the building well-proportioned and carefully composed, including deep window reveals, use of shadow gaps, well articulated openings and a high-quality material palette that contributed to a strong architectural identity.

In this respect, the design was assessed to have been informed by principles set out in Brent's Design Guide SPD1, which members were reminded encouraged high-quality infill development that complemented its surroundings while avoiding pastiche replication. Although the proposed dwelling was acknowledged to depart from the more traditional appearance of the adjacent semi-detached pair, officers felt it had also taken visual cues from the local area in terms of scale, height, and building line with the overall

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

height and footprint of the dwelling reflecting that of the adjoining property, ensuring that the proposal fitted comfortably within the established streetscene and the angled roof design providing a distinctive architectural feature and defined presence.

Whilst recognising that the scheme would result in the loss of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached property, this had been considered acceptable given the neighbouring dwelling included a cat-slide roof design which would preclude any addition or more traditional design approach in that location maintaining its symmetry. The corner nature of the site and transitional role played within the street hierarchy also meant the site was felt to offer the opportunity for a more innovative architectural response. Members were also advised that the footprint and height of the propose dwelling were also aligned with the prevailing scale of adjoining semi-detached dwellings with the depth of the rear extension also broadly following the rear building line of the neighbour at No.125 Preston Road and therefore maintaining the relationship of the dwellings within the rear garden plots.

In acknowledging the concerns outlined by the Committee in respect of the design and character of the development compared to the surrounding area and relationship with neighbouring properties, confirmation was provided that the proposed development was considered to be a good example of modern design and acceptable in relation to the terrace aspect whilst also creating a positive visual interest given its siting on a road junction. Whilst recognising the building had departed from the architectural language of the adjacent properties its design was felt to have been developed in a way that respected the footprint, building line, geometry and materials of the neighbouring dwellings along the street and was not therefore considered to disrupt the metro-land character of the area meaning that Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Local Plan were felt to have been complied with.

- Following a query relating to the overall principle of the development, confirmation was provided that given the sites location within a residential area with good access to public transport, it did fall within a priority area for new homes under Policy BH4 of the Brent Local Plan. In this regard, the development had been recognised as contributing towards the borough's housing targets given it would deliver a family-sized dwelling for which there was an identified need in the borough with the general principle of providing a residential dwelling in that location therefore considered to be acceptable.
- In response to confirmation sought in relation to the standard and quality of the proposed accommodation, members were advised that the proposal had been assessed as compliant with the standards within policy D6 of the London Plan relating to internal space, ceiling height, access to daylight and outlook and the delivery of a high-quality dwelling for future residents.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

- Further details were sought on the position regarding the biodiversity net gain (BNG) relating to the proposed development, which it was noted had been assessed as achieving a net loss of 46.39% in relation to the baseline habitat value. In response members were advised that whilst measures had been included to improve biodiversity such as biodiverse roofs, pollinator perennial planting, trees and lawn these were not enforceable over the period required and only recognised as “vegetated garden” of low ecological value. It was, however, permissible for acceptable development proposals that fell under the BNG requirement to provide either off-site units and/or statutory biodiversity credits. To address this issue, an informative had therefore be included within the recommended consent to remind the applicant that their development did not benefit from a statutory exemption, and that a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan must be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development commencing to be secured through the purchasing off site habitat units.
- In querying the constrained nature of the site in relation to the landscaping and Urban Green Factor required to be achieved for developments of the type proposed, members were advised that the existing grass verge which formed the basis of the application site comprised heavily modified grassland with limited ecological value, consisting primarily of amenity grass and some ornamental shrubs. Whilst recognised as contributing to the visual amenity of the street scene, it was not designated as protected open space under the Brent Local Plan. Enhancements in relation to the sites landscaping as part of the proposed development were outlined, which members were advised had been designed to maximise on-site soft landscaping, introduce a greater diversity of plant species and incorporate measures to support biodiversity and wildlife, such as habitat features and native planting. These enhancements had been assessed as sufficient to satisfy the relevant policies of the Brent Local Plan with respect to meeting the Urban Greening Factor, landscaping and on-site ecological improvements with details of the hard and soft landscaping works to be secured by condition prior to commencement of the development.

In response to a further query regarding external amenity space, members were advised that the provision of external amenity space in the rear garden would comply with the numerical standards required under Policy BH13 of the Local Plan.

- Members also sought further clarification in terms of the impact on residential amenity arising from the size of the proposed rear extension. In highlighting the requirement that rear extensions and alterations should not have a significant impact on the outlook or amenity of any neighbouring properties (enforced through the height and depth limits of Brent’s Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD) members were advised that whilst the proposed extension would be built to the shared boundary and project (to a

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

limited extent) beyond the existing extension, the development (having regard to the levels of distancing with the rear garden of the adjoining neighbours and the relationship of the proposed ground floor rear extension and the first-floor rear building line with the adjoining neighbours) was not considered to have an unduly detrimental impact to the neighbouring amenities in terms of an overbearing nature, loss of light, outlook and an increased sense of enclosure. Members were advised, however, that given the scale of the proposed development a condition restricting further extension had been secured.

- Confirmation was also provided that as the development sat to the north of 125 Preston Road there would be no overshadowing of the neighbour and the submission of a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment had not therefore been required in support of the application.
- In querying the lack of a drainage strategy members were advised that the proposed development was not sited within a flood zone with the proposed hard and soft-landscaping scheme site-wide assessed as ensuring that sufficient surface water attenuation would be achieved.
- In once highlighting the relationship of the proposed dwelling in terms of its proximity to the neighbouring property members queried whether any party wall agreement would be required in order to address drainage concerns. In response, members were advised that party wall arrangements did not form part of the relevant material planning considerations relating to the application so had not been addressed as an issue within the main report. Confirmation was, however, provided that the conditions to be secured as part of the application included the restriction of permitted development rights.
- As a final comment, members also sought further details on the assessed highway impact of the scheme. In response, officers advised that no off-street parking spaces had been proposed for the house, which would meet maximum parking standards set out in policy. Whilst the property was located within the Wembley Event Day Parking Zone, there was no CPZ within the local area and on-street parking could not be controlled outside of event days. Although confirming that no parking survey had been submitted for the current application, a previous survey submitted for the planning application for the residential development at the junction of Pellatt Road with Walton Gardens and Chamberlayne Avenue had shown that there was sufficient capacity on-street to safely accommodate any parking from the dwelling with cycle parking and bin storage also be provided to comply with standards.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 September 2025

DECISION

In view of the issues highlighted the Committee **RESOLVED** to refuse the recommended granting of planning permission for the following reason(s):

- The design of the proposed development was not considered to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: - 4 in favour of refusal, 1 in favour of granting planning permission and 1 abstention).

6. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 7.51 pm

COUNCILLOR SAQIB BUTT
Chair