



## Planning Committee

**Wednesday 10 September 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, 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		
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) Monday 4 August 2025  (Agenda republished to include this item on 9 September 2025)		1 – 16

## APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

4. 25/1112 - 1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN	Willesden Green	21 - 36
5. 25/1246 - Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN	Preston	37 - 62
6. Any Other Urgent Business Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Deputy Director Democratic & Corporate Governance or their representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 60.		

**Date of the next meeting: Thursday 23 October 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**

**Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Monday 4 August 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:** Councillor Long (for item 7).

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

There were no apologies for absence.

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

In relation to Agenda Item 4 (Application 25/0413 – Matalan Discount Club, Cricklewood Broadway, London, NW2 6PH) all members of the Committee confirmed they had received an approach from the applicants agent but had not engaged in discussion on the application or sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the application impartially and without any form of predetermination.

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 Wednesday 11 June 2025, be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

#### **4. Order of Business**

Councillor Kelcher (as Chair) advised that given the number of requests to speak received in relation to Application 25/0938 - 81 Balmoral Road, Willesden, NW2 5BH (listed as Agenda Item 6) he intended to change the order of the agenda, with that item to be considered following Application 25/0413 - Matalan Discount Club, Cricklewood Broadway, London, NW2 6PH.

The minutes therefore reflect the order in which items were considered at the meeting.

#### **5. 25/0413 - Matalan Discount Club, Cricklewood Broadway, London, NW2 6PH**

**PROPOSAL**

Demolition of the existing building and erection of 2 buildings ranging from 3 to 9 storeys comprising student bed spaces and ancillary facilities with commercial floorspace on the ground floor.

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

Lena Summers (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, detailing that the site sat at the western side of Cricklewood Broadway and was bordered by Longley Way to the north and Temple Road to the south. The proposal was for the demolition of the existing Matalan building and the erection of two buildings ranging up to 9 storeys predominantly for purpose-built student accommodation housing 826 bed spaces alongside two commercial units; one along Cricklewood Broadway and a smaller unit along Longley Way. The development comprised a private courtyard and a publicly accessed pedestrian street running north and south between the two blocks.

Attention was drawn to the Supplementary Report detailing revisions in the plans and elevations including a reduction in the massing of the building to the western side, as well as a revised roof profile, the enlargement of cycle storage, reduction of the post room and updated landscaping along Temple Road, which would allow retention of the existing parking alignment.

The Chair thanked Lena Summers for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to the representatives who had registered to speak in relation to the application.

The Chair advised that as he had been informed (prior to the meeting) that the first speaker Lauren McLaughlin (who had registered to speak online in support of the application) had been unable to join the meeting due to travel disruption we had asked for the representations submitted to be read out on her behalf by the Governance Team at the meeting with the following points highlighted:

- The Committee was advised that Lauren McLaughlin lived a few streets away from the current Matalan site, having resided in the area for 5 years and deeply cared about the future of the neighbourhood.
- Expressing her full support for the planning application for Stoll Square, she had felt the application represented a considered and thoughtful proposal that would significantly enhance the local area.
- Currently, the site was disused and run-down and was not felt to contribute anything positive to the community, having become a hotspot for littering and fly-tipping with the feeling of being neglected.

- In contrast, the new development included green spaces, environmentally conscious materials and public areas that local residents could actually use and enjoy. It was felt the plans showed a real effort to create something modern, sustainable, and community focused with it highlighted that more green planting areas and better-designed public space was needed in the area. It was pointed out this reflected not only the need to consider how an area looked but also how it felt to live there. When an area was cared for and invested in, people tended to treat the area better. As such Laren McLaughlin strongly believed the proposal would help reduce litter and improve the general atmosphere for everyone.
- Highlighting the area as a key route into Central London it was not felt the current site created a good impression attracting traffic, noise and pollution. In comparison, the proposed development included bike facilities, considered planting and peaceful areas that were far more welcoming, cleaner and healthier for the local environment.
- The proposals were also felt to provide a clear economic benefit supporting the high street, local café's, shops and businesses and as such was felt to provide the kind of responsible regeneration needed within the area.
- In closing her comments, Lauren McLaughlin had advised that she was aware many local residents felt the same with the development replacing an underused, unattractive site with something that offered real long-term value for the community and delivering strong visual, social, environmental and economic improvements to the area.

As Lauren McLaughlin was not present to respond to any questions, the Chair advised that the comments submitted would be noted and then moved on to invited Ben Tansley (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application as representative of NorthWest Two Residents Association. The following points were highlighted:

- Mr Tansley advised that whilst not opposed to development he was concerned at the scale of the current proposals within the application with the 9-storey frontage on the Broadway highlighted as a key concern given its mass, small windows which the CGI showed were barely visible from further along the road.
- The top storeys were not set back and concern was also expressed regarding the roof styling with the development greatly in excess of anything else fronting the Broadway. The 5 storey height against Temple Road was also felt to overwhelm and did not relate to the 2 storey terraced homes opposite and presented a bleak aspect.
- The proposed development was not in accordance with the Local Plan with members reminded of the need to ensure that the design principles previously established were reflected within any final decision in terms of the development reflecting the general character and scale of the high quality residential area to the south along Temple Road and on the opposite side of Edgware Road with heights up to 5 storeys therefore considered appropriate.

- It was also highlighted that the indicative capacity of 200 was exceeded by the previous scheme as well as this one.
- As a result, it was felt approval of the previous scheme should not be taken as establishing a new baseline, which could now be exceeded just as the application exceeded the Local Plan. Members were reminded that the Planning Committee's previous decision did not amend policy. The Local Plan was carefully considered and needed to remain the policy basis for considering the current application which it was felt needed to be considered as a new application on its own merits.
- Reference was also made to other local developments taking place, such as 249-289 Cricklewood Broadway and Hassop Road where permission was granted for up to 5 storeys, 194-196 Cricklewood Broadway where a 6 storey development was near completion, the B&Q site with up to 18 storeys and the 1-13 Cricklewood Lane site consisting of 6 storeys fronting Cricklewood Lane with 9 storeys behind it.
- Lastly, it was pointed out that Brent Cross Town had approximately 1250-1300 units already consented for student accommodation and was situated less than 100 metres away.

The Chair thanked Ben Tansley for addressing the Committee and invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented.

- When asked what would be more of an appropriate development, Mr Tansley said a development with no more than 5 storeys. Any more storeys and the development would be drastic and stark, towering above Cricklewood Broadway, taller than neighbouring building and not in-keeping with the area.
- The Chair highlighted the housing crisis in London and that tall storeys may need to be built in order to meet housing targets. Whilst recognising the need identified Mr Tansley stated that in his view the proposed development was imposing and disproportionate and negatively impacted residents of Temple Road and those passing through.
- Further clarification was sought on whether the view and height of the proposed development effected the residents of Temple Road. Mr Tansley replied that the site was directly opposite residents' homes.
- As Mr Tansley was a member of the NorthWestTwo Residents Association, Members asked whether this organisation were against or for the previous planning application for this site. Mr Tansley explained that the association was in agreement with the plans when the proposal was reduced from 9 storeys to 7 following community engagement. Members were also keen to explore what scale of development would be felt to be more appropriate by the Resident Association with Mr Tansley advising that the first planning application was felt to be more suited; not only in scale and massing but also in the type of tenures being offered for households, something nearby developments were not offering.



- The Chair highlighted that the provision of student accommodation was identified as a need and also to alleviate pressure on local housing. Mr Tansley highlighted that there was a lot of student accommodation being built locally. The area did not have a high density of students and a lot of student accommodation was being built close together.

The Chair thanked Ben Tansley for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to invite Mark Pender (who had registered to speak as the Applicant's Agent) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- As the applicant's Planning Consultant, Mark Pender explained that the originally consented scheme had not been bought forward due to a change in market conditions and viability considerations. As a result, the current proposal now included 826 student bed spaces made up of individual rooms and clusters with two 2 commercial units.
- The scheme was policy compliant in regard to affordable accommodation as 289 rooms (35%) would be affordable rent. The height and massing were broadly the same as the consented scheme with a few areas being marginally taller and a few marginally lower.
- In terms of outlook, privacy, daylight and sunlight the proposal had achieved a high standard of accommodation. There were no north facing rooms and dual aspects units were proposed at each corner.
- The current proposals 'green' credentials including the landscaped central avenue connecting Longley Way and Temple Road, a new pocket park and over 52 new trees. These helped in achieving an urban green factor of 0.49, a biodiversity net gain of 180% compared to the 10% requirement and a CO2 reduction of 60% compared to the 35% requirement.
- A detailed supply/demand assessment had been prepared, which concluded there was a significant need for more student bedspaces in London and indeed Brent. It also identified that in 2023 740 Brent homes were occupied by students. To further demonstrate need, a meeting with Middlesex University and Sheffield Hallam University revealed that both were interested in the development.
- Whilst recognising the current application was not providing conventional housing, the Committee was reminded that the application was seeking to make use of an under-utilised site that would still contribute towards the Council's housing targets with the 826 rooms proposed equivalent to 330 dwellings and also potentially releasing existing family homes occupied by students in Brent.
- Whilst acknowledging that some residents on the opposite side of Cricklewood Broadway had raised concerns including overlooking/privacy and the impact on the railway terraces conservation area it was pointed out that the nearest home on Grafton Terrace was just under 40m away, therefore it was over double the 18m habitable room to habitable room distance set out in the Local Plan.

Compared to the consented scheme, there would also be no balconies on this elevation and no rooftop garden.

- With regard to the conservation area, it was pointed out that Council officers and those at the GLA considered there to be less than substantial harm with the significant public benefits also detailed in the Committee Report.
- In concluding his representations, Mark Pender hoped the Committee would therefore agree with the recommended approval of the application.

The Chair thanked Mark Pender 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:

- The Chair added that moving away to study for the first time could be stressful and asked how the scheme had been designed to ensure students were able to mix and socialise. Mark Pender replied that the scheme consisted of two primary elements; a student unit with individual rooms comprising a shower room and a kitchen. Approximately 80% of the rooms were made up of clusters comprising 8 rooms each. Each cluster had a communal lounge/kitchen area for socialising. In addition, on the ground floor there were a number of communal areas including workspaces, private and mixed. Outside the building, there was a landscaped boulevard and a pocket park, again providing further opportunities to mix and socialise with fellow students.
- The Chair asked if there was any detailed evidence to support the assertion that this scheme may assist in releasing family homes currently occupied by students. Ed Fisher, Consultant replied that studies had been carried out by the property sector by companies like Savills and there was evidence to suggest that there was a need for this type of student accommodation.
- Members asked if there was a management scheme in place for the accommodation. Mark Pender confirmed that a student management plan had been submitted and had been seen by the student accommodation specialist.
- Clarification was sought on whether a similar student management plan had been implemented elsewhere. The Consultant replied that the company selected to carry out the student management plan was one of the largest in the country and managed around 40,000 students. The company had thorough experience of implementing student management plans including logistical aspects including security, cleaning, H&S, pastoral care, parking and starters and leavers.
- Members asked how long the tenure was for the student accommodation. The Consultant explained that the tenure was for 38 weeks for affordable accommodation, which could increase to 51 weeks.

Further clarification was sought on where students were likely to seek accommodation once their initial tenure had ended, given concern this may have an impact on demand for private sector rented accommodation. The Consultant stated that typically students went home during the summer holidays but if they

wanted to stay, they would be able to extend their tenancy, subject to the rate being confirmed. Mark Pender advised that whilst not providing conventional housing student accommodation scheme did have the ability to contribute towards delivery of housing targets. A formula was used to establish how many conventional homes a student accommodation scheme would equate to and in this instance, the figure was 330 new homes.

- Members asked if a financial contribution had been considered which could be utilised for the provision of affordable family housing, for which there was significant need for. The Consultant advised that a financial contribution was not considered, as the policy was for affordable student accommodation. Mark Pender added the policy was compliant with the London Plan and that the client would be maintaining the freehold interest and intended to provide affordable student accommodation.
- Having highlighted an objection from Barnet Council, Mark Pender clarified that this has been from their Heritage Officer with the Council itself having not objected to the scheme. The objection related to the proposed elevation at Cricklewood Broadway. Members were advised, however, that the GLA and Brent Council officers had reviewed the proposals and concluded the scheme to result in less than substantial harm with numerous public benefits. There was no longer any impact causing limited daylight hours, the buildings were not close together and privacy was maintained for residents. The storeys were lower at the junction of Temple Road and overall, it was felt to be a positive scheme.
- Further clarification was sought on the breaches identified in terms of Policy, for example in relation to dual aspect and sunlight with members also seeking detail on the average cluster size and how they compared to previous applications. Mark Pender replied that the clusters were just over 80% cluster units and under 20% individual units. Julian Williams, Scheme Architect said that the design of the building was simple and rational with regular steps and in line with student needs. There were 662 rooms within 82 clusters and 164 individual rooms.
- As a final issue, members queried the changes made since the pre-application stage. Mark Pender highlighted that these included improved changes to the landscaping as well as lowering the boundary to 3m at Stoll Close and internal changes to fire and privacy. The Scheme Architect relayed how the planning application had been subject to input from Brent Council's design team, resident input and via two Quality Review Panels. One of the key changes was the development of pocket parks within the units. Also, all students could benefit from shared facilities and amenity space on the ground floor. Additionally, two courtyard spaces offered further amenity spaces, which was part of offering students a mixture of landscaping spaces in the private areas of the development as well as the shared public spaces.

The Chair thanked Mark Pender and his team 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 regarding the cluster sizes of the development and asked if there was currently any developments with 9 cluster units. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) confirmed that the Watkin Road development had 9-10 cluster units with a communal kitchen and was comparable. More traditional residential schemes contained clusters of 8 to allow for socialising. Additionally, unlike a traditional residential scheme, criteria was not specific for student accommodation and room sizes had been compared to other schemes with communal provision also available to enable students to be able to socialise and meet.
- Members welcomed the inclusion of two commercial units in the scheme and asked if not occupied whether one could be used as a GP surgery, pharmacy or community hub. Lena Summers, (Principal Planning Officer) explained that the application was for an open class E, which included retail, commercial and a gym and there was scope to vary the consent if needed.
- Members queried the adequacy of the available bike storage facility proposed within the development which John Fletcher (Team Leader – Development Control, Transport Planning) confirming that if required further bike stands would also be available at Willesden Green and Cricklewood Stations. Bicycle usage would, however, continued to be monitored.
- Members sought clarification on paragraph 17 on Page 39 of the Committee Report stating that London Policy H15A supported purpose-built student accommodation provided that at the neighbourhood level, the development contributed to a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood and asked if this scheme met that criteria. Victoria McDonagh explained that this referred to an over concentration of student accommodation. When comparing to other existing purpose built student accommodation, there were 9433 existing bed spaces of which 8434 were in the Wembley growth area. No other similar schemes had been granted in the area covered by the application and student accommodation was needed. The students would add to the local economy and the scheme would not lead to an over concentration in the borough. Student accommodation contributed to a mix in society as well as to the regeneration of the area.
- Further details was sought on utilisation of the site and whether this was being maximised to meet needs in Brent. It was noted that the previous application had been designed to propose residential homes rather than purpose built student accommodation site with details on how much weight was given to this. Lena Summers explained that this was only one part of the site allocation and another part near the car park was not developed and could be used for conventional C3 dwellings. The original site allocation set out 380 units and this application would (based on the formula outlined) be counted as contributing 330 units whilst also developing and improving the local area along with the associated benefits. David Glover, (Head of Planning and Development Services) highlighted that the scheme was in line with regulations and in accordance with the development plan. Victoria McDonagh added that housing delivery was for a range of accommodations types including self-contained and non-self-contained accommodation. This scheme was in line with policy H15 of the London Plan as well as policy B7 of the Brent Local Plan, which related to

non-self-contained accommodation with student accommodation also recognised as a London wide need and applied as such.

- Clarification was sought on how this scheme met the London Plan without a mix of tenures. Victoria McDonagh said that when looking at the benefits, the scheme contributed to the wider housing targets by providing 35% affordable student accommodation. Amongst other benefits, there would be enhancements to the public realm for all residents, an urban green infrastructure enhancement, employment and training opportunities and the regeneration of an under-utilised site. Lena Summer added that the tallest part of the scheme was where Longley Way met Cricklewood Broadway and then the building reduced in height at the south. The lower end of the building matched the frontage of the existing property next to it and the highest element was set away from the main site. Members were shown a range of CGI that showed the different heights of the building.
- In response to concerns relating to daylight/sunlight internal targets Lena Summers advised the assessed levels had been deemed appropriate, as the type of accommodation was not lived in full term, most rooms were single aspect and it was recognised that the target was not met in the same way as C3 dwellings.
- Members identified that there was a need to balance the benefits of student accommodation in light of the current housing crisis and demand for that type of accommodation. In response, David Glover outlined the location of the scheme as a benefit given its transport links to London and surrounding facilities with evidence of significant demand in London for student accommodation.
- In terms of the number of student accommodation sites being provided across the borough David Glover advised that any assessment included the impact on balance of the wider community within the local area and demand.
- Although members understood the need for student accommodation, it was noted that all 330 homes consisted of single bedrooms and were not family units and therefore asked if a financial contribution could be considered to contribute towards delivery of the Council's wider housing targets. In response, Victoria McDonagh pointed out that policy H15 did make reference to affordable student accommodation and that a payment in lieu would not be in line with the policy nor an obligation of the provider. The scheme was viable and had benefits.
- Members highlighted that policy D9 was not compliant with the Tall Building Zone nor was it assisting with the housing crisis and it seemed like many developers were coming forward for student accommodation schemes, which may be deemed to be more viable than private housing schemes. Whilst recognising the issue highlighted, members were reminded the scheme would be assessed as delivering an equivalent of 330 new homes to contribute towards the housing targets with students also contributing to the surrounding local economy. David Glover stated that financial contributions had been secured on a number of occasions towards traditional housing due to very particular need but there was evidence of the need for affordable student housing. Referring to the Committee

report, Victora McDonagh pointed out this had referred to the London Plan acknowledging the role that purpose build student accommodation had in meeting housing needs both directly and indirectly through helping to alleviate pressures on traditional rented homes and, as such, counted towards housing supply and may also have a role in supporting wider housing delivery in an area. There was a shift from the situation where in 2010, consumer surveys suggested that all-inclusive rented properties and brand quality was increasingly significant in student's housing choices with dedicated sleeping, study and social spaces, which were well designed and maintained. David Glover highlighted that students needed accommodation whilst they were at university and this reduced the demand on the private rented sector. Policy D9, in relation to the Tall Building Zone was applied but was not the end point of consideration.

- Members asked if alternative massing options had been explored with Lena Summers advising this had been detailed within the Supplementary Report provide for the Committee. Some of the changes made included the profile of the roof to be shunted in order to angle away from the neighbouring property.
- Clarification was sought on how nominations to the site would be managed. Victora McDonagh advised that the S106 Agreement would include a Nominations Agreement with at least 50% room occupancy and also show evidence of universities nominated including the treatment of international students.

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

## DECISION

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

- (1) The applications referral to the Mayor of London (Stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the main committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the main and updated within the Supplementary Committee Report.

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 5 For and 3 Against).

## 6. **25/0938 – 81 Balmoral Road, Willesden, London, NW2 5BH**

### PROPOSAL

Proposed rear dormer extension with Juliet balcony, new patio doors and ground floor kitchen door to rear, installation of 2x front roof lights, new front boundary treatment, conversion from dwellinghouse to a 7 bedroom 8 person house in multiple occupation (HMO), soft landscaping and installation of refuse storage and cycle storage to front garden.

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

Curtis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the planning application committee report, detailing that the proposal involved a rear door extension and the site was not within a conservation area. In total 26 objections had been received. Following the publication of the main Committee Report, another objection had been received by a neighbour and one from Councillor Choudry regarding a party wall agreement, although this would not form a relevant planning consideration.

The Chair thanked Curtis Thompson for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider the request which had been received to speak on the application. Members were advised that whilst two objectors had registered to speak on behalf of the representatives (Kathy Leonard) had advised they were unable to attend due to illness so had nominated the other person registered to speak in objection (TP) to make the representations on her behalf, which the Chair advised he had agreed.

On this basis, the Chair then invited a resident TP (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

- TP explained that she was speaking on behalf of four adjacent households who shared 6 party walls and a household with a boundary to the garden of the application site highlighting the main objections as relating to noise, and nuisance (given the detrimental impact on the surrounding residents including children and vulnerable people) alongside the density of the proposal.
- Concern and objections were also raised in relation to what was felt to be an overconcentration of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in the immediate surrounding area (for which it was felt the data provided in the report had been inaccurate) and need for family sized accommodation alongside the need to ensure (that if approved) a robust HMO Management Plan was provided to address concerns relating to the prevention and management of noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour and the management of waste disposal and storage facilities.

The Chair thanked TP for addressing the Committee and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask any questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

- As an initial query, further clarification was sought on how many HMOs were in the area. TP said that she had counted 14 and some were not showing as they were not licensed yet.
- Members asked TP to inform them of any issues she had with the conditions. TP said that she had an issue with Brent's review of the concentration of HMOs, secondly the noise assessment done by the Council particularly internal noise.

The noise nuisance should be stopped with immediate intervention. TP felt there should be a binding management agreement to address management of the HMO including the storage of bicycles and rubbish along with recycling arrangements with the density of the development was also a matter of concern. Lastly, it would be positive to raise the environmental standards and have solar panels and the ability to collect rainwater.

The Chair thanked TP for addressing the Committee and then moved on to invite Councillor Long (who had registered to speak as local ward councillor) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

- Concerns were highlighted in relation what was felt to be the high concentration and proliferation of HMOs in the area, recognising the impact of the high PTAL rating in the surrounding area and impact on the balance of the surrounding community given the nature of tenancies provided and associated complaints relating to noise nuisance, and rubbish.
- The need to ensure the assessment relating to the number of HMOs in the immediate surrounding area was accurate, recognising that not all had been registered under the Selective Licensing Scheme.
- The existing front garden of the property was currently providing a small functional garden space with concerns raised about its potential use should the application be approved to incorporate a cycle as well as bin store. The concerns raised by the objectors in relation to the increase in rubbish and how waste would be separated, were also supported with additional concern in relation to parking.
- In summary, Councillor Long did not feel the proposed development would protect or enhance the supply of family sized housing and would lead to an over-concentration of HMOs in the area and cause an unbalance in the community and for these reasons advised she was supporting the objections raised.

The Chair thanked Councillor Long 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 clarification regarding the concerns relating to application of the Selective Licensing Scheme Councillor Long advised that the registration of small HMOs had not yet commenced, which had meant they were not all on the system for assessment purposes.

As there were no further questions, the Chair then allowed TP to read Kathy Leonard's speech (who had also registered to speak as an objector), with the following noted:

- Kathy Leonard had felt that HMOs could work well if they were well designed and not cramped but this did not feel the case with this development. Her main objection was around the party wall and boundary, which it was felt would create significant noise nuisance.



- As further concerns, issues were highlighted in relation to the management and storage of waste with a condition sought to ensure plans were provided for the internal sorting of waste; privacy for neighbouring properties and overlooking and the need to ensure provision was included as part of any management plan for the arrangements relating to recycling.
- Concerns were also highlighted in relation to the density of the development given the detrimental impact with the additional tenants would create in terms of additional noise and disruption with the potential impact on community cohesion and quality of life for the existing residents immediately adjacent to the site felt to outweigh any associated benefits the additional housing units would provide.

The Chair thanked TP for speaking on behalf of Kathy Leonard and without the ability for members to follow up with any additional questions then moved on to invite Peter Lee, (as the Applicant) to address the Committee, with the following being noted:

- Mr Lee began by advising that he was aware of the concerns and objections raised, which he felt had been addressed in seeking to develop the application. This included the provision of good quality amenity space, bedroom size and home working space as well as landscaping in the garden.
- In regard to HMO concentration, the opportunity was taken to highlight the high density nature of accommodation within the surrounding area including houses being divided into maisonettes and the assessment in relation to concentration of HMOs measured, as required, by the nearest 10 houses within walking distance to the front door.
- The property itself was currently under-utilised with assurance also provided, in relation to the objections and concerns expressed that the development would include a management plan with a professional and experienced HMO management company being engaged to manage the HMO.

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

- Further clarification was sought on the HMO Management Plan and how this would be monitored and enforced. In response Peter Lee advised that the Management Plan would include guidance for occupants on issues relating to their conduct and use of the premises, including measures designed to address concerns relating to noise nuisance and potential anti-social behaviour with detailed records maintained of any reported incidents. Should issues persist then tenants would be subject to ongoing monitoring and warning with the ultimate sanction leading to eviction. The management company would also provide contact details for tenants to report issues.
- In terms of experience in managing similar properties, Peter Lee advised that he was a long standing Brent resident with the development designed to secure investment and provide additional accommodation locally.

- In response to the concerns raised relating to noise nuisance detail was sought on whether noise dampening or noise suppression to party walls could be considered. In response Peter Lee advised that internal sound insulation was currently being considered.

The Chair thanked Peter Lee 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:

- Details were sought on whether any evidence of existing unlicensed HMOs or the identification of further HMOs within the area would impact on officers recommended approval of the application. Cutis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) replied that the current concentration of HMOs had been subject to detailed assessment based on the information available with members noting that in addition to the Selective Licensing database details were also held in relation to housing and planning history. On the basis of the detailed assessment undertaken there was no evidence of over-concentration of HMOs in this area. Guidance from Article 4 stipulated that no property could be converted into an HMO without planning permission. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development) explained that the properties referred to were the 10 nearest properties in any direction when starting from the front door of the site allocation with clarification also provided in relation to the definition of an HMO from a planning use and policy perspective.
- In seeking further assurance regarding the assessment undertaken on the concentration of HMOs in the surrounding area Aidan Brookes (as the Committee's legal adviser) advised that substantive evidence was needed to establish the number of HMOs in the area and there seemed to be no evidence of an over-concentration. David Glover stated that checks were carried out, records checked and site visits conducted. When looking at the nearest 10 properties located from the site, there was no evidence of any over-concentration.
- In response to a query relating to waste management, clarification was provided on the arrangements set out within the application and submitted within the HMO management plan including the bin storage arrangements, which members advised were considered to provide sufficient refuse storage arrangements without the need for larger bin capacity and had also been secured via conditions.

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

## DECISION

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

- (1) The prior completion of a satisfactory Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act to secure the planning obligations as set out within the main committee report.

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

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

**7. 25/0422 – 82 Chevening Road, London, NW6 6EA**

**PROPOSAL**

Proposed single-storey side-to-rear extension, basement extension with front and rear lightwells, and replacement of existing timber windows to front and rear elevations of dwellinghouse.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

Parag Dhanani (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the planning application for a two storey dwelling house located on the south side of Chevening Road and located within the Queens Park conservation area. The proposal involved extensions to a side and rear extension, a basement extension with front and rear lightwells and the replacement of front and rear timber windows with the application having been submitted to the Committee for determination as the result of a request submitted by three local councillors.

The Chair thanked Parag Dhanani for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then invited Alistair Newton (who had registered to speak as the agent) to address the Committee, who highlighted the following points:

- The application followed a planning consent (reference number 24/0414) granted in July 2024 for a proposed single story extension, side extension, basement extension with front and rear lightwells, demolition of shed, alterations to front, side and rear fenestrations and three roof lights to the rear outrigger of dwellinghouse.
- Further to the approved application, an application had been made for enlarged side infill extension to match that of the immediate neighbour (no.84) and to introduce a 2 metre single storey extension beyond the existing outrigger with a minor adjustment to the approved basement to accommodate for this extension.
- As the result of further adjustments, the proposed enlarged side/rear infill extension had since been omitted from the proposal resulting in a more limited scope beyond that of the previous planning consent granted in July 2024.

- The proposal was limited to a 2 metre rear extension beyond the existing outrigger and a minor adjustment to the extent of the approved basement to accommodate for this enlarged ground floor single storey rear extension.
- The limited scope of the application was reflected in several constructed extensions in the local context, including addresses on Milman Road, Creighton Road and Chevening Road. Many of these on Chevening Road were also 'wrap around' extensions where the rear positions met the side infill extensions.
- The proposal did not differ from other approved and constructed extensions in local area and the application has been adjusted in negotiation with the Planning Officers to reduce the scale and the proposal and to remain in keeping with local guidance with the application.

The Chair thanked Alistair Newton for addressing the Committee. Whilst no questions were raised in response confirmation was sought from the Planning Officers that the proposed development was felt to be in keeping with the surrounding area, which was confirmed by Parag Dhanani.

As there were no further questions or points of clarification raised by the Committee for response by the Planning Officers the Chair then moved straight to the vote.

#### DECISION

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

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

#### 8. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8.51 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair

## 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

10 September, 2025  
04  
25/1112

## SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	10 April, 2025
WARD	Willesden Green
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Willesden
LOCATION	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
PLAN NO'S	Refer to condition 2
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><b><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></b></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view <b>ALL</b> document associated to case  <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_173071">https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_173071</a></p> <p><b><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy _</u></b></p> <p><b>Please use the following steps</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please go to <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk">pa.brent.gov.uk</a></li> <li>2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "25/1112" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box</li> <li>3. Click on "View Documents" tab</li> </ol>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.
- B. That the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions:


1. 3 Year time period
2. Approved plans / drawings
3. Materials to Match
4. Opening Hours
- 5 Plant /Gaming Machine noise levels
6. Active Frontage
7. Servicing Management Details to be Agreed
8. Cycle Storage

Informatives:

1. Party Wall etc Act
2. Adverts may require advertisement consent
3. BNG Exempt
4. Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Head of Planning

That the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person 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 or other duly authorised person 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.

## SITE MAP

 <b>Brent</b>	<b>Planning Committee Map</b>
Site address: 1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN	
© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260	

Basemap Map

This map is indicative only.



1:1250

0 0.02 0.04 kilometres



## PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

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

## EXISTING

The application site is a commercial property located on the north side of Walm Lane at the junction of High Road. The property is within the primary shopping frontage of the Willesden Green Town Centre. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings however it is located within the Willesden Conservation Area.

## RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

### Relevant planning history

#### **25/1950 – Under consideration**

Prior approval for change of use from vacant bank to x2 self-contained flats on first and second floor; with refuse and cycle storage at ground floor.

#### **24/2877 – Full Planning Permission – Granted – 17/02/2025**

Change of use of basement and ground floor from vacant bank to bingo hall with alteration to front elevation at ground floor level

## CONSULTATIONS

Letters were sent to 138 neighbouring and nearby properties on 23/04/2025. A site notice erected on a post adjacent to the site on 29/04/2025 and a Press Notice was published in the Local Press on 01/05/2025.

At the time of writing this report, 66 representations were received from raising objection to the proposal. A summary of objection comments alongside officer remarks are tabulated below.

Reasons for objecting	Officer's Comment
Existing adult gaming centres are located in close proximity to proposal site.	The application has been assessed in line with policy BE5 which looks at existing AGCs within the town centre – please see remarks section below.
Proposed Adult Gaming Centre would increase such uses and negatively impacting the neighbourhood.	As above the application has been assessed in line with policy BE5. Conditions are recommended to restrict the opening hours.
Gambling use harmful to wellbeing and safety.	Please see principle of use section of the report.
A full and transparent community consultation is sought.	The planning application was consulted on in line with statutory requirements and Brent's Statement of Community Involvement.
Better uses that serve the community could be provided within the proposal site.	The application has to be assessed on its own merits against relevant planning policies.
The proposed use will have unsocial hours of operation resulting in increase noise and disturbance to residents.	Please see impact on neighbouring amenity section of the report.

Increase criminal activity – The submitted Planning statement provides an inaccurate representation of the criminal activity in the area.	Within a number of appeals for AGCs elsewhere within the Borough, the Planning Inspector did not support the Local Planning Authorities view in terms of impact of the proposal on crime, anti-social behaviour and disorder.
Proposal contrary to Local Plan Policy BE5 - Adult Gaming Centres.	An assessment of how the application is considered against policy BE5 is discussed below.
Loss of banking use which is a community need	A bank falls within class E and is not defined as social infrastructure. The change of use of the former bank into the AGC is discussed below.
Proposed use will have detriment to house prices.	House prices are not a material planning consideration.
The proposed use contravenes the Council's SPD3 shopfront which encourages positive shopfront character and good quality displays to encourage activating the High Road.	Minor alterations to door and windows are proposed to the shopfront. These are assessed within the character and appearance section of this report.
The former Lloyds Bank building holds historical and architectural value for Willesden Green. Transforming it into a gambling site risks overshadowing its cultural significance.	The council's heritage officer was consulted and raised no objection to the heritage impacts of the proposal.
Both the NPPF and the London Plan emphasize the creation of healthy, inclusive, and resilient spaces for all community members.	Please see the report for further assessment.
The Gambling Licensing Policy Consultation 2025-2028 states that gaming establishments should avoid areas where children are present.	This would fall within the Licensing assessment which is required separately to planning permission.
Clarification required regarding number of gambling establishments are permissible, how many residents have to object to demonstrate there is not a local need.	<p>Please see principle section of the report on the planning assessment for this application.</p> <p>Planning applications are evaluated in line with planning policies set out within the development plan. An application can not be refused simply based on a large number of objections.</p>
Permission has already been granted for a "bingo hall" Ref. No: 24/2877.	This is referenced within the report and is an extant permission.

## POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

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

D12 Fire Safety

D14 Noise  
SD6 Town centres and high streets  
T5 Cycling  
T6 Car Parking  
T6.3 Retail Parking

#### **Brent Local Plan 2019-2041**

DMP1 Development Management General Policy  
BD1 Leading the Way in Good Urban Design  
BE5 Protecting Retail in Town Centres  
BE7 Shopfront Design and Forecourt Trading  
BHC1 Brent's Heritage Assets  
BT1 Sustainable Travel Choice  
BT2 Parking & Car Free Development  
BT3 Freight and Servicing Provision and Protection of Freight Facilities

#### Other material considerations

The following are also relevant material considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- National Planning Practice Guidance
- Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:
  - SPD3 Shopfronts 2018

## **DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Principle**

1. The development seeks the change of use of the ground and basement levels of 1 Walm Lane, from a bank (Class E (c)(i)) to an Adult Gaming Centre (AGC) (Class Sui Generis).
2. The application property was previously occupied by Lloyds Bank which closed in March 2024. Planning permission ref. 24/2877 was granted on 17 February 2025 for 'Change of use of basement and ground floor from vacant bank to bingo hall with alteration to front elevation at ground floor level.'
3. The property is within the primary shopping frontage of Willesden Green Town Centre. Local Plan BE5: *Protecting retail in town centres* sets out criteria that proposals for betting shops, adult gaming centres and pawnbrokers/payday loan shops must meet:

'Betting shops, adult gaming centres and pawnbrokers will be permitted where it will result in:

- a) no more than 4% of the town centre frontage consisting of betting shops;
  - b) no more than 3% of the town centre frontage consisting of adult gaming centres or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops;
  - c) no more than 1 unit or 10% of the neighbourhood parade frontage, whichever is the greater, consisting of betting shops, adult gaming centres or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops;
  - d) a minimum of 4 units in an alternative use in-between each.
4. Criteria b) and d) are relevant to the current application.

### **Existing adult gaming centres and pawnbrokers**

5. There are two pawnbrokers and two adult gaming centres but no payday loan shops in Willesden Green Town Centre.
6. The following units are in pawnbroker use:

H&T Pawnbrokers, 1d Walm Lane, NW2 5SJ (5m frontage)  
H&T Pawnbrokers, 70 High Road, NW10 2PU (5m frontage)
7. The following units are in adult gaming centre use:

Merkur Slots, 51-55 High Road, NW10 2SU (24m frontage)

8. The total existing length of the town centre frontage consisting of adult gaming centres or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops is 38m. The total frontage length is 1877m. Therefore, as existing, 2.02% of the total frontage length is in adult gaming centre and pawnbrokers/payday loan shop use.

### **Assessment of current proposals**

9. 1 Walm Lane has a frontage length of around 9.75m.
10. If 1 Walm Lane were consented for adult gaming centre (AGC) use, the total frontage length in AGC and pawnbrokers/payday loan shop use (including the above four premises) would be 47.75m (5 + 5 + 24 + 4 + 9.75m), 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 of no more than 3% of the town centre frontage consisting of adult gaming centres or pawnbrokers/payday loan shops in line with Local Plan policy BE5.
11. Criteria d) requires that a minimum of 4 units in an alternative use in-between each use. It is acknowledged that the wording within criteria d) is arguably open to interpretation as the wording within the policy itself refers to a "minimum of 4 units in alternative use in-between each" without clarifying whether that is between each separate use of each separate unit.
12. Supporting text has been provided to explain the purpose of the policies within the plan, this is considered to be the correct interpretation. For clarity, the following is specified within paragraph 6.4.39 within the Local Plan:

*'To ensure there is not an overconcentration of particular uses within any single length of frontage the policy seeks to prevent adult gaming centres, pawnbrokers, betting shops and takeaways locating in close proximity to a unit in the same use.'*

13. The matter was also tested at appeal at 5-6 Park Parade (LPA Ref: 24/1335) where an AGC was proposed next to a betting shop. At Paragraph 10 of the appeal decision (Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3332772) the Inspector noted.

*'Although there would be a betting office adjoining, there would not be another AGC within 4 units either side of the proposed AGC. The proposed sub-division of the property and the creation of a betting office and AGC would, therefore, not conflict with BLP Policy BE5 and, as such, the retail function of Harlesden town centre would be protected.'*

14. There is no other AGC within 4 units of the proposed one. It is noted that there is a pawnbroker at 1d Walm Lane but as set out above this is an alternative use to an AGC and therefore the proposal would be in accordance with criteria d of policy BE5.

### **Character and Appearance**

15. To facilitate the change of use, the application proposes alterations to the shopfront to include a new street-facing front entrance and window at ground floor level.
16. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (as amended) requires that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
17. NPPF (2024) Paragraph 202 recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and seeks to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is appropriate to consider the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness. The thrust of this guidance is reflected in policies within the London Plan 2021, HC1 - Heritage conservation and growth and Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041, policy BHC1 Brent's Heritage Assets.
18. The new pair of grey double doors and the new window in place of the ATM machines will be simple alterations. The existing shopfront is not original, and the proposed works are in keeping with the existing arrangement. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and be in compliance with the Council's Shopfront SPD. As such there would be no impact on the elevations of the property and no impact to the streetscene. The works would be very similar to that approved under

19. An informative is recommended to remind the applicant that whilst it does not form a part of this application, any signage or advertisement associated with the proposed use may require advertisement consent.

### **Impact to Amenity**

20. Local Plan Policy DMP1 seeks to ensure new development, amongst other things, does not unacceptably increase exposure to noise, light and general disturbance. This is supported by SPD1 and SPD2 which both contain guidance that seeks to protect neighbour amenity.
21. The submitted planning application form outlines that in terms of opening hours, the applicant would advise that the premises shall be open to the public between the hours of: 08:00 and 00:30 Mondays to Fridays (into the morning of Saturdays); 09:00 and 01:00 on Saturdays (into the morning of Sundays); and 09:00 and 00:30 on Sundays and Bank and Public holidays. It is noted that there are nearby residential premises in close proximity of the subject site. The nearby Ladbroke's and William Hill units along Walm Lane and the adjoining High Road are open until 10pm in the evening, therefore the proposed hours would exceed nearby opening hours of other types of gambling establishments. There are some instances of later uses in the wider area however these appear to be largely limited to hot food takeaways. Directly neighbouring uses have earlier closing times which would be appropriate to limit disturbance to the residential occupiers surrounding the site. It is therefore recommended that a condition is secured to restrict the opening hours to between 0800 to 2300 Mondays to Fridays and 0900 to 2300 on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank and Public holidays. These are the same hours as conditioned as part of application reference 24/2877 for the bingo hall application, which is an extant consent.
22. The applicant has not provided a noise assessment. The upper floors of the host property are not in residential use. The existing office use of these floors is not considered to be particularly sensitive to the proposed use and the operating hours are likely to be compatible. Whilst an electrical room has been labelled at basement level, no external/plant equipment has been indicated at the premises. As per application reference 24/2877 it is recommended that a condition is 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.
23. In addition, the proposal would be subject to licencing restrictions and subject to reasonable use is not considered likely to result in significant adverse noise and disturbance to the neighbouring occupiers.

### **Transport Considerations**

24. Walm Lane is a local distributor road & bus route. The site is adjacent to a signal-controlled junction and pedestrian crossing along site frontage. There is no off-street parking or servicing.
25. Car parking allowances for the existing bank use are stipulated in Appendix 4 of the Brent's Local Plan and require compliance with the standards at Table 10.5 of the London Plan. As the site has very good access to public transport, the use is expected to be 'car-free'.
26. With no existing off-street parking, maximum standards are complied with.
27. There are no particular standards for the proposed gaming centre, with retail standards being the most relevant. This parking allowance would not therefore change and the continued absence of off-street parking within the site means maximum standards will still be complied with.
28. Servicing requirements are set out in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan and as the site is below 500m<sup>2</sup>, the site will require servicing by 'transit' sized vans.
29. Whilst the gaming centre is not expected to have frequent servicing activity, a servicing management plan is sought to ensure that vehicles do not obstruct the junction and pedestrian crossing fronting the site.
30. Cycle parking standards are stipulated in the London and require four bicycle parking spaces for visitors. Drawing number 1WImL/AGC/FUL/25/03 proposes an internal foyer cycle store which will provide vertical cycle parking with a minimum ceiling height of 2m. Nine cycle hangers are proposed and these can be



shared between visitors and employee parking, which is welcomed.

31. There are no transportation objections to the proposal, subject to the submission and approval of further details of a delivery strategy for the site.

### **Fire Safety**

32. Policy D12 of the London Plan requires all new development to take account of fire safety in design. London Plan policy D12 indicates that the fire safety of developments should be considered from the outset. This includes measures to demonstrate space identified for the appropriate positioning of fire appliances, appropriate evacuation assembly points and floor layouts and cores planned around issues of fire safety for all building users.
33. The proposal would not include any access, evacuation or layout changes to the property. Therefore, given the scale and location of the development, the absence of the fire statement does not render the scheme unacceptable.

### **Equalities**

34. 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**

35. The proposed change of use to an Adult Gaming Centre (AGC) accords with the Council's adopted policies. Minor external changes are proposed to the shopfront of the site, for which there are no impacts with regards to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Subject to a condition to limit opening hours to protect the neighbouring occupiers together with a limit on noise levels from plant and gaming machines, the use would sufficiently protect neighbouring amenity. Furthermore, subject to transport related conditions, the use will provide the required servicing needs and cycle storage facilities for the users of the premises.
36. Approval is accordingly recommended subject to conditions.

## DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



# Brent

## DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

## DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: **25/1112**

To: Mr Cunningham  
140 Weston Road  
Aston Clinton  
Aylesbury  
HP22 5EP

I refer to your application dated **10/04/2025** proposing the following:

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

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:  
Refer to condition 2

at **1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN**

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: 02/09/2025

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 (2024)  
The London Plan (2021)  
Brent 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 drawings:

1WLML-AGC-FUL-25-01 - Existing and Proposed Site Plans  
1WLML-AGC-FUL-25-02 - Existing Drawings  
1WLML-AGC-FUL-25-03 - Proposed Drawings

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

- 3 All new external work shall be carried out in materials that match, in colour, texture and design detail those of the existing building.

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

- 4 The premises shall not be open to customers and shall not operate as an adult gaming centre other than between the hours of:

0800 to 2300	Mondays to Fridays
0900 to 2300	on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank and Public holidays

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

- 5 Plant, bingo/gaming machines or other equipment shall not be installed unless the cumulative rated noise level from such plant, bingo/gaming machines or other equipment is 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.

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

- 6 A clear and unobstructed window display shall be maintained at all times with non-tinted/obscured glass in the entrance door and front windows. Additionally, signage and/or visual obstructions on the entrance door and any of the windows may be allowed to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from ground level with no promotional material shall be displayed on the windows or entrance door.

Reason: In order to provide and maintain active frontage and to maintain a positive character of the shopping area.

- 7 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a servicing management plan for the site required by 'transit' sized vans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Upon first occupation of the development, the servicing management plan shall be fully implemented for the lifetime of the Development, or as amended following the submission to and approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority of a revised plan.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles do not obstruct the junction and pedestrian crossing fronting the site.

- 8 Details of cycle storage for the scheme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first use of the property as an Adult Gaming Centre (Sui Generis). The cycle storage shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development solely in accordance with the approved details and permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate provision of bicycle storage infrastructure.

## 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 is reminded that the advertisements introduced to the shop frontage would require advertisement consent in line with the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisement) Regulations 2007.

3 - Based on the information available, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, this development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements. This exemption applies as the development falls within the specified criteria outlined in legislation and regulations. The applicants are advised to review the statutory guidance for further details on exemptions and any other environmental obligations that may apply.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Parag Dhanani, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 6007

This page is intentionally left blank

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 10 September, 2025

Case No.

**25/1112**

---

Location	1 Walm Lane, London, NW2 5SN
Description	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

#### **Agenda Page Number: 5 - 18**

#### Further representations

One further representation with comments has been received raising objection to the proposed development. The objections are from Dawn Butler MP (Labour Member of Parliament for Brent East). The comments that have been raised broadly correspond to those already received and addressed within the Consultations section of the Committee Report. The comments raised refer to existing gambling problems and impacts within the borough. It is suggested that limited information pertaining to the building has been provided, however it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted in line with the Council's Validation requirements for the purpose of planning assessment. Finally, the concluding objection is directed to the 'Licencing Authority'. In response, Licencing is an independent department to Planning within the Council. As well as seeking planning permission the applicant would be required to obtain the relevant licences to operate as an Adult Gaming Centre. An informative to this effect would be included within the Decision Notice.

#### **Recommendation:**

Remains to grant consent subject to the conditions and informatives as set out within the committee report.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank



## COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on  
Item No  
Case Number

10 September, 2025  
05  
25/1246

## SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	24 April, 2025
WARD	Preston
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Wembley
LOCATION	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.
PLAN NO'S	See condition 2.
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><b><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></b></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view <b>ALL</b> document associated to case  <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_173215">https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_173215</a></p> <p><b><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy</u></b> .</p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please go to <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk">pa.brent.gov.uk</a></li> <li>2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "25/1246" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box</li> <li>3. Click on "View Documents" tab</li> </ol>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

### Conditions


1. Three year commencement rule
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. No access to roof of extension
4. Restriction of PD rights for dwellinghouses
5. Cycle and refuse store in accordance with approved plans and kept from obstruction
6. Water consumption
7. Urban Greening Factor
8. External materials
9. Hard and soft-landscaping scheme
10. Wild life and biodiversity enhancement strategies

### Informatives

1. CIL liability
2. Party Wall Act
3. Building near boundary
4. Signs for potential contamination
5. Biodiversity Net Gain

1. That the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person 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 or other duly authorised person 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.

## SITE MAP

 <b>Brent</b>	<b>Planning Committee Map</b> Site address: Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN © Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



This map is indicative only.

## PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The proposal seeks 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 meets 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 involves 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.

## EXISTING

The application site relates to a grass verge (c.0.022ha) with some shrubs that is located to the north of the dwelling at No.125 Preston Road. The grass verge is sited on an open road junction, fronting Preston Road to the east and Pellatt Road to the north. The site boundary is splayed with its width narrowing from east to west.

It should be noted that Pellatt Road slopes downwards in ground level from north to south and at the application site itself, there is a drop in ground level of c.0.50m-0.58m from the north to south.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with dwellings of mainly two storeys in height to the east and three storey residential blocks to the immediate north.

With a Public Transport Accessibility level (PTAL) of 3, the site has good levels of access to public transport.

The site is not situated within a Conservation Area, neither does it contain any designated or undesignated heritage assets.

## AMENDMENTS SINCE SUBMISSION

- Size of the cycle store has been amended to be 1m by 2m;
- Labels detailing numbers of and types of trees that would be planted and proposed surfacing type;
- Provision of green roof specification for ground floor rear extension;
- Photo samples of external finishing provided upfront for front brick boundary treatment, side boundary fence and combined cycle and bin store;
- Provision of water butt.

## SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key planning issues for Members to consider are set out below. Members will have to balance all of the planning issues and objectives when making a decision on the application, against policy and other material considerations.

**Representations Received:** As of the date of this report, 25 representations were received from nearby residential occupiers of which 24 objected to the proposal and 1 was in support of the proposal. The nature of the objections predominantly relates to the design of the development being out of keeping with the surrounding area, an over-intensification to the use of the site, the potential impact to neighbouring residential amenity, pressure on parking, pedestrian and highway safety, loss of biodiversity, drainage concerns, development being used for monetary gain and the lack of public engagement.

These comments are summarised in the 'CONSULTATIONS' section and will be discussed in detail throughout the body of this report.

**Principle of Development:** The site is located within a residential area that is within good access to public transport and therefore within a priority area for new homes under Policy BH4 of the Brent Local Plan. It would contribute towards the borough's housing targets and would deliver a family-sized dwelling for which there is an identified need in the borough. The general principle of providing a residential dwelling in this location is considered to be acceptable.

**Design/Scale/Bulk:** The proposed dwelling adopts a contemporary design approach that is distinctly different from the traditional character of neighbouring properties. However, it is considered to be of

exemplary architectural quality, with careful attention paid to proportions, detailing, and materials. Features such as deep window reveals, high-quality materials, the use of shadow gaps, well-articulated openings contribute to a refined and confident architectural expression.

While the building departs from the architectural language of the adjacent semi-detached pair, it responds positively to the established urban grain. Its footprint and height align with the prevailing scale, and the building’s angled roof form provides a strong and considered presence at the road junction.

Although the new dwelling would disrupt the symmetry of the adjoining pair, this symmetry would be somewhat compromised by any addition here due to the neighbouring property’s distinctive cat-slide roof, and any attempt at a pastiche design would result in an awkward or inauthentic outcome. Given the prominent corner location, the site lends itself to a more ambitious architectural approach.

**Neighbour Impact:** Having regard 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, it is 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.

**Standard of Accommodation:** The proposal would comply with policy standards to deliver a high-quality dwelling for future residents.

**Highway Impact:** No off-street parking spaces are proposed for the house which would meet maximum parking standards set out in policy. While the property is within the Wembley Event Day Parking Zone, there is not a CPZ within the local area and on-street parking therefore cannot currently be controlled outside of event days. Notwithstanding this, parking surveys submitted for the planning application for the residential development at the junction of Pellatt Road with Walton Gardens and Chamberlayne Avenue (see ref: 24/2139) showed that there is sufficient capacity on-street to safely accommodate any parking from the dwelling. Cycle parking and bin storage would also be provided to comply with standards.

**Landscaping and Biodiversity Impact:** The existing grass verge comprises heavily modified grassland with limited ecological value, consisting primarily of amenity grass and some ornamental shrubs. While it contributes to the visual amenity of the street scene, it is not designated as protected open space under the Brent Local Plan.

The proposed development would enhance the site’s landscaping through a well-considered scheme that maximises on-site soft landscaping, introduces a greater diversity of plant species, and incorporates measures to support biodiversity and wildlife, such as habitat features and native planting. These enhancements are sufficient to satisfy the relevant policies of the Brent Local Plan with respect to landscaping and on-site ecological improvements. The scheme would also secure the mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity through purchasing off site habitat units.

**Flood Risk:** The proposed development is not sited within a flood zone. The proposed hard and soft-landscaping scheme site-wide would ensure that sufficient surface water attenuation would be achieved.

**RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

No relevant planning site history.

**CONSULTATIONS**

25 nearby neighbours were consulted by post on 01/05/2025 for a period of 21 days. A total of 25 representations, with 1 in support of the proposal and 24 objecting.

Reasons For Support	Officers Comments
The proposed development sets a good precedent for modern builds, particularly as it appears to be more efficient in the use of space and energy.	This is discussed within ‘Layout and Design’ and ‘Water Consumption’ section of the assessment below.
It is acknowledged that while the proposed development would result in the loss of greenery, it would make provision for housing which is required in the local community rather than for a high-rise building.	The report has considered the acceptability of the scheme with all aspects of the development and the benefits of delivering a high-quality, family-sized dwelling —contributing to the borough’s housing targets—are considered to outweigh the loss of the

	grass verge.
The front garden proposal is a new concept and represents a visual improvement than normally seeing the flank wall of the house.	This is discussed within 'Layout and Design' of the report below.

Reasons For Objection	Officers Comments
The proposed development would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings and eliminate the gap between them. It is also contrary to policy SPD 1 where terracing effect on corner plots are discouraged. This would disrupt the visual rhythm along Preston Road.	The 'Layout and Design' section of the report has discussed the design considerations in which the footprint, massing, scale and design of the development would respect that of the adjoining neighbour. Terraced dwellings are also not considered to be uncommon within the suburban context.
The proposed development, particularly with regards to its roof form, material palette and minimalist design does not accord with the surrounding area and theme of the neighbourhood.  A number of objectors have highlighted that the theme of the area is 1920s metro-land style which features mock Tudor detailing, bay windows, red brickwork and pitched tiled roofs.	The 'Layout and Design' section of the report has discussed the considerations to the design, massing and scale of the development which is not considered to disrupt the metro-land ethos of the area.
The height of the proposed development is too high for a corner plot property.	As discussed within the 'Layout and Design' of the report, the proposed development would be two stories which would be consistent with the height of the dwellings in the surrounding area. The eaves level would respect that of the adjoining neighbour at No.125 Preston Road and the highest point of the roof is considered to provide visual interest on the road junction.
The site is over-intensified, given its narrow plot.	As discussed in the report, the proposed dwelling would be policy compliant and is considered to be a well-designed modern example for an infill development.
The proposed development is contrary to Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD where only a 3.0m deep rear projection is allowed for semi-detached properties. The 6.0m deep projection would create an overbearing mass that harms amenity and garden usability at No.125 Preston Road.	Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD allows for single storey rear extensions for an adjoining property to have a depth of up to 6.0m provided that the width and height limits of guidance are also adhered to. This is unless there are other material considerations that would justify a departure from guidance. Please refer to the 'Impact on Residential Amenity' section of the report.
Concerns that the appropriate due diligence has not been done -the grass verge belongs to the public and this should be investigated.	The applicant has completed certificate A denoting land is in their ownership. Land registry information does not show the land as being owned by the council. The land also does not form a part of the adopted highway.
Concerns that there is a dispute between the owners and management company -there is a tribunal decision concerning whether the land should be maintained at the leaseholder's expense.  The planning application should therefore be put on	Land disputes are not a material planning consideration. As set out above, the applicant has completed Certificate A denoting land is in their ownership.

hold until the issue has been resolved between the concerned parties.	
The loss of the grass verge would unacceptably block residents who reside on Chamberlayne Avenue, Edison Drive, Crown Green Mews and Walton Gardens where Preston Road provides the only means of access to the neighbouring roads.	The proposed development would take place within the red line boundary of the applicant and would not extend over onto the public foot path.
The proposed development would restrict access to parents with children and persons with disability.	The proposed development would not extend over onto the public foot path.
Concerns that no car parking is allocated to the new development and that no Wembley Event Day parking permits should be allocated. An increase in the number of cars would further exacerbate the heavy traffic and parking along the road, especially on event days.	As discussed in the 'Transport Considerations' -sub section 'Car Parking' of the report, the proposed development is car-free. Parking surveys undertaken for the scheme - ref: 24/2139 also confirms that there is sufficient kerbside capacity to accommodate for overspill parking.
The entrance is sited to a busy corner and crossing point which would pose as a risk to pedestrian and vehicular safety.	The proposed development would not extend over onto the public footway and would not involve in the creation of any vehicle crossings, as it would be car-free.
The proposed development would result in the loss of a green space for children to enjoy.	It should be noted that the greenspace is not defined within the Local Plan to be a 'Protected Open Space.' Whilst the grass verge would have some visual amenity, the loss of the grass verge has been considered throughout the report where the benefit of the scheme has a whole is considered to outweigh the loss of this grass verge.
Concerns that the proposed development would have an impact on the daylight, sunlight, the open outlook and an increased sense of enclosure to the adjoining neighbour at No.125 Preston Road and would dominate their rear garden views.	This is discussed in the 'Impact on Residential Amenity' section of the report below.
Concerns that the proposed development is in breach of the 45-degree rule when considered with the ground floor habitable room window on the rear/side of No.125 Preston Road.	Please refer to the 'Impact on Residential Amenity' section of the report below.
Concerns that the proposed development would be contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan.	This is discussed in 'Quality of Accommodation' section of the report below.
The proposed development would result in a biodiversity net loss of 46.39% which is far below the 10% net gain required under the Environmental Act 2021.	Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows for acceptable development proposals which fall under the 10% requirement to provide either off-site units and/or statutory biodiversity credits. An informative would be included with any consent to remind the applicant that their development does not benefit from a statutory exemption, and that a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan must be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development is begun.
The proposed development would result in the loss of the last accessible patch of greenery on this junction which would be contrary to Brent's aims in promoting a healthier, greener and community	The proposed development would result in the loss of some grassland and all the ornamental shrubs to the existing grass verge. However, it would introduce a diversity of planting site wide and

friendly development.	incorporate biodiversity and wildlife enhancement strategies on-site. A biodiversity net gain would also be achieved off-site in accordance with legislation.
The proposal will replace the permeable greenery with hard surfacing. However, no drainage or SUDs strategy has been provided with this submission. This could result in an increase surface water runoff and localised flooding, especially in the event of high rainfall events. This is in breach of local plan policy BSUI4 and London Plan SI13.	BSUI4 of the Local Plan supports the policy position of the London Plan. Proposals for minor developments are required make use of sustainable drainage measures which has been demonstrated in this case. The submission of a SUDs strategy is not statutorily required with this submission.
The proposed development would borderline meet a UGF of 0.4.	This would meet policy requirements.
Concerns that the flat roof single storey rear extension would be at risk of long-term moisture and drainage complications.	This matter would be considered through building control regulations.
There should be a public inquiry for the approval of the scheme.	The application is being determined through the normal local planning authority process, and it has not been called in by the Secretary of State under Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
Only a small number of residents on Preston Road has been consulted on this application, despite the site being highly visible.	Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's statutory requirements and with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, properties on the northern side of Pellatt Road (i.e., within Walton Gardens), on the opposite side of Preston Road, and to the rear on Chamberlayne Avenue, were notified, in addition to the immediately adjoining neighbours.

## POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The development plan comprises of the London Plan 2021 and the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041. Key policies include:

### London Plan 2021

GG2	Making the best use of land
GG4	Delivering the homes Londoners need
D3	Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
D4	Delivering good design
D6	Housing quality and standards
D7	Accessible Homes
D12a	Fire Safety
H1	Increasing housing supply
H2	Small sites
G5	Urban greening
SI5	Water infrastructure
T5	Cycling
T6	Car parking
T6.1	Residential parking
T7	Deliveries, servicing and construction

### Local Plan 2019-2041

DMP1	Development Management General Policy
BD1	Leading the way in good 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
BH6	Housing Size Mix
BH13	Residential Amenity Space
BGI1	Green and Blue Infrastructure in Brent
BGI2	Trees and Woodland
BSUI4	On-Site Water Management and surface water Attenuation
BT1	Sustainable Travel Choice
BT2	Parking and Car Free Development

The following are also relevant material considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework 2024  
Nationally Described Space Standards  
Brent's Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Guidance  
Brent's Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document 1 -2018  
Sustainable Environment & Development – Supplementary Planning Document - 2023  
Brent's External Amenity Space SPD -2023  
Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD -2025

## **DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Principle of development**

1. Policy H1 of the London Plan sets out the target to deliver 2,325 new homes per annum in Brent. Policy BH1 of the Local Plan supports the delivery of additional homes through granting planning permission in Growth Areas, site locations and appropriate windfall sites to achieve the London Plan target. These sites are expected to provide a minimum of 23,250 homes in the period between 2019/20-2028/29 and a minimum of 46,018 homes in the period between 2019/20-2040/41.
2. In addition to the Growth Areas and site allocations, policy BH2 of the Local Plan also identifies town centres, edge of town centre sites, areas with higher levels of public transport and accessibility levels and intensification corridors to be priority locations for the provision of additional homes.
3. The above strategic position is reinforced in policy BH4 of the Local Plan, which recognises the importance for small housing developments to deliver additional housing, and this is through intensifying and making efficient use of such sites. These sites will be supported provided that they are within priority locations of PTAL 3-6, intensification corridors, or a town centre boundary. 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.
4. With a PTAL of 3, the site is in an area that is prioritised for additional homes and would provide good levels of access to public transport. It is also sited within c.800m of the Preston Road Town Centre, which would provide reasonable levels of retail and infrastructure for future residents.
5. The proposed development would result in the loss of the existing grass verge (c.0.002ha) with some shrub planting. The siting of the grass verge on an open road junction currently provides a degree of visual amenity value to Pellatt and Preston Roads but is not, however, defined as protected open space within the Local Plan. Consideration must therefore be given to whether the loss of this green space would be outweighed by the benefits of a new dwelling.
6. While the loss of the grass area is acknowledged, the proposed development would bring forward the benefits of providing a family sized dwelling, for which there is an identified need in the borough and would also help to contribute towards the borough's housing delivery targets.
7. Overall, the site lies within a priority area, it would contribute towards achieving the borough's housing targets and would deliver a family-sized dwelling. The principle of development is therefore considered to be acceptable. The acceptability of the scheme would also need to be considered with the other aspects of the assessment below to understand whether the benefits of the development as a whole can be supported.

## **Layout and Design**

8. The NPPF emphasises that good design involves responding to local character and history and reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not discouraging appropriate innovation.
9. Policy BD1 of the Local Plan sets out that all new development must be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. Innovative contemporary design can also be supported where development can demonstrate that it respects and complements the historic character of the area but is also fit for the future. In delivering high quality design, development proposals will be expected to show how they positively address all the relevant criteria within the London Plan design policies and the Brent Design Guide SPD 1.
10. SPD 1 states that new development should positively respond to the existing context and scale, particularly with regards to scale, massing and materials. Building heights should also positively respond to the existing character. Development massing should limit its visual impact by effectively breaking up facades, creating a varied roofscape and relating positively to existing surroundings. It further outlines that buildings should generally fit in with the existing character of roof types within the street scene and minimise the visual impact from street level.
11. SPD 1 also highlights that building roofs should be designed to minimise the impact of height and positively respond to the character of the area. Roof forms of new development should fit in with the established character of the street and minimize the visual impact from street level.
12. Preston Road is a residential street which consists of mainly two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings and are typically set back from the road behind a front forecourt with low brick boundary walls/open driveways and generally spacious rear gardens. The dwellings are representative of a mix of architectural styles, including metro-land and mock Tudor and are characterised by mainly hipped roofs with front gable-end. Black half timbering, white render, and red brick work also forms as the predominant materials and colour palette of the area.
13. The proposed development adopts a contemporary architectural approach which is markedly different from the traditional character of neighbouring residential properties. However, the dwelling is considered to be of high design quality, demonstrating a thoughtful response to both its context and its constraints. The building would be well proportioned and carefully composed, with considered detailing that includes deep window reveals, crisp openings, and a high-quality material palette that contributes to a strong architectural identity.
14. The design has been informed by principles set out in Brent's Design Guide SPD1, which encourages high-quality infill development that complements its surroundings while avoiding pastiche replication. Although the proposed dwelling departs from the more traditional appearance of the adjacent semi-detached pair, the development takes visual cues from the local area in terms of scale, height, and building line. The overall height and footprint of the dwelling reflect that of the adjoining property, ensuring that the proposal sits comfortably within the established streetscene. The angled roof design not only introduces a distinctive architectural feature but also provides a defined presence at this prominent corner plot.
15. While the scheme would result in the loss of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached property, this is considered acceptable in this instance. The neighbouring dwelling includes a cat-slide roof design which would preclude any addition in this location maintaining its symmetry, and a more traditional or pastiche design approach would not have resolved this, resulting in an awkward or contrived appearance. Given the corner nature of the site and the transitional role it plays within the street hierarchy, the site offers an opportunity for a more adventurous architectural response.
16. The footprint of the dwelling would be similar to the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings at No.123 and No.125 Preston Road. The front elevation would be set slightly behind that of No.125 Preston Road, and the front boundary wall would be in common alignment with that of No.125 Preston Road, therefore respecting the well-established building line of the street. The rear extension would have a depth of 6.0m which would broadly follow the rear building line of the neighbour at No.125 Preston Road and would therefore maintain the relationship of the dwellings within the spacious rear garden plots.
17. The Council's Design Officer has reviewed this proposal in detail, and supports the justification that a contemporary exemplar to the massing of the development has been sufficiently set out in Section 3.2 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS). The angled roof form would follow the geometry of the existing roof at No.125 Preston Road and would respect the eaves level of this neighbour. While the height of the

proposed development would be set below that of the neighbours, the angled roof, with the highest point to the junction would create a defined presence to Preston and Pellatt Roads. The shadow gaps -one between No.125 Preston Road and the other to the rear would also suitably break down the massing. The design of the fenestration openings also highlights the simplicity of the building form. It should also be noted that the creation of a dwelling is not considered to be out of keeping within the suburban context.

18. While the design of the development is considered to be contemporary, the material palette (Section 3.5 of DAS) would draw upon the visual cues of the existing dwellings along the street. The light colour tone of the materials would harmonise with the white render of the existing dwellings while giving it a modern appearance. The red-brick front boundary wall, along with the red matte finishing of the cycle and refuse store, echoes with the red-brick boundary treatment, creating a cohesive connection between the white and red material pattern found along the street.
19. The prominent location of the green forecourt on the road junction would serve as visual gateway to the metro-land ethos of the surrounding dwellings.
20. In summary, the proposed development is considered to be a good example of modern design and would be acceptable when forming a new row of terraced houses and create a positive visual interest given its siting on a road junction. This is all the while respecting the footprint, building line, geometry and materials of the neighbouring dwellings along the street which is not considered to disrupt the metro-land character. Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Local Plan are complied with.

### **Quality of Accommodation**

21. In order to create quality housing, the standard of the new dwelling is required to comply with policy D6 of the London Plan, including standards for internal space, ceiling height, access to daylight and outlook, provision of external amenity to occupants and accessibility.
22. The proposed GIA of 93.0sqm would meet policy standards for a 3-bed dwelling for 5 persons. The proposed bedroom types -2x double beds and 1x single bed also complies with policy standards in terms of their size, as summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Summary of bedroom size by width and GIA

Room	Number of bed spaces	GIA required (sqm)	Width required (m)	Proposed GIA (sqm)	Proposed width	Complies (Y/N)
G/F	2	11.5	2.5	12.40	2.69	Y
1/F -to front elevation	2	11.5	2.75	14.0	2.80	Y
1/F to rear elevation	1	7.5	2.15	7.80	3.36	Y

23. Policy D6 of the London Plan requires that a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m should be achieved for at least 75% of the GIA of the development and that any area that is below the headroom of 1.5m is not counted within the GIA calculation, unless it is used solely for storage. The cross-sections confirms that this requirement would be met.
24. The dwellinghouse would be dual aspect with the proposed windows to habitable rooms by reason of their size and location are considered to provide adequate outlook, daylight and ventilation to future occupants.
25. The plans confirms that the living room/kitchen/dining room would be served by a roof light and a clear glazed door which would be of an acceptable arrangement.

### **Accessible Homes**

26. Policy D7 of the London Plan requires the new dwelling to meet M4(2) of the Building Regulation requirement in order to be accessible and adaptable. The internal floor plans with furniture layout and section 3.8 of the DAS confirms compliance with this policy. This element of the scheme will be secured by condition.

### **External Amenity for Occupants**

27. Policy BH13 of the Local Plan establishes that all new dwellings will be required to provide external private amenity space of sufficient size and type to satisfy the needs of its proposed residents. Generally, a minimum of 50sqm of external amenity space would be required for family housing situated at ground floor level and 20sqm for all other housing.
28. The proposal shows that 57.0sqm of external amenity space would be provided in the rear garden, complying with standards in numerical terms. The garden would be accessible through the respective main dwelling and from a door located on the boundary wall with Pellatt Road.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

29. To ensure that new development would provide an adequate level of privacy inside buildings and within outdoor space, Brent's SPD 1 requires directly facing habitable rooms to maintain a separation distance of 18.0m. A distance of 9m should be kept between gardens and habitable rooms/balconies.
30. The distance from the rear-facing first floor bedroom window to the rear boundary is approximately 25m and the line of sight is towards the north-east corner of the side garden of the block of flats at 1-13 Chamberlayne Avenue. Windows proposed on the north and east elevations, serving the first-floor bedroom, face developments on the opposite side of Pellatt Rd (within Walton Gardens) (30m) and Preston Road (50m) respectively. The level of distancing involved, together with the fact that windows are not directly facing, and/or are across roads, with existing and proposed trees between, would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.
31. 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, 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. The proposed development would not be in direct line of sight from any rear-facing windows at 1-13 Chamberlayne Avenue therefore the 30-degree rule would not be applicable. Similarly, the 45-degree rule would not be applicable because the development site does not abut the garden of 1-13 Chamberlayne Avenue. Notwithstanding, the separation distance from the dwelling to its rear boundary would ensure that the proposed development would not appear overbearing .
32. All rear extensions and alterations must not have a significant impact on the outlook or amenity of any neighbouring properties, and this is enforced through the height and depth limits of Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD. The SPD states that single storey rear extensions that exceeds 3.0m in depth for an adjoining property can have a height of 4.0m, provided that an eaves height of 2.50m should not be exceeded to the shared boundary.
33. As described above, there is a drop in ground level across the site of 0.58m from the north to south. The proposed development would create a sunken patio which would sit 0.2m lower than ground level of the neighbour at No.125 Preston Road. As described above, this neighbour benefits from a c.4.60m deep (c.2.80m high for the single storey rear element). A previous planning application for this neighbour (ref: 12/2722) suggests that the extension has a flank window serving a WC and the rear-facing window and patio door serves a dining room and kitchen area (habitable rooms).
34. The proposed extension would be built to the shared boundary with a depth of 6.0m and an eaves height of 3.0m when viewed from the ground level of this neighbour. It would exceed the depth of the neighbouring extension by 1.4m and its eaves height would exceed guidance by 0.50m. However, it is considered that the limited projection beyond the existing extension, the line of site from the rear-facing windows, and the fact that development is sited to the north of No.125 Preston Road, would not result in any detrimental harm to the existing amenities of this neighbouring occupier through a loss of outlook, light, or appear overbearing.
35. At first floor level, the rear building line and eaves of the proposed dwelling would be in common alignment with that of No.125 Preston Road. No concerns are therefore raised to the loss of outlook and

light to the first-floor habitable room windows of this neighbour in this respect.

36. It is considered reasonable, given the scale of the proposed development, that a condition restricting further extensions is secured so that the impact to neighbouring amenity can be appropriately considered.
37. Although a Daylight and Sunlight assessment has not been provided with this submission, as described above, the development site sits to the north of No.125 Preston Road. As a result, there would be no overshadowing of this neighbour. The submission of a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment is therefore not required in this instance.

### **Transport Considerations**

#### **Car Parking**

38. Preston Road is a local distributor road and therefore, on-street parking is restricted, especially on Event Days. However, on-street parking is available within the slip road opposite the site and along Pellatt Road. There are single yellow lines along the road which would become double yellow at junctions including the one with Pellatt Road. The site is situated within the Wembley Event Day Parking Zone, which means parking is restricted to permit holders only on Wembley Stadium Event Days. However, there is no year-round CPZ in the immediate vicinity.
39. Car parking allowances for Brent are set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan and for residential development, this requires compliance with the standards in Table 10.3 of the London Plan. For a 3+ bed dwelling in a PTAL 3 location, up to one parking space is allowed. The proposed development would not have any car parking spaces, which would therefore comply with maximum car parking standards.
40. It should be noted that parking cannot be safely accommodated within the frontage due to the proximity to the road junction whilst the rear garden is required for the provision of external amenity space and also tapers to the rear (limiting its depth).
41. Policy BT2 of the Local Plan will only support development where 'it does not add to on-street parking demand where on-street parking spaces cannot meet existing demand such as on heavily parked streets, or otherwise harm existing on street parking conditions.' Car parking surveys were submitted for the application to construct new homes at the junction of Pellatt Road with Walton Gardens and Chamberlayne Avenue (see ref: 24/2139) showed that there was sufficient spare kerbside space along the frontage of the site to safely accommodate any overspill parking from the new dwelling. The survey was undertaken at 00:30am on two nights on the 30th and 31st of January 2024 and concluded that only two of the twenty car parking spaces along Pellatt Road between Preston Road and Chamberlayne Road were occupied at night. It is therefore considered that sufficient space is available on-street to accommodate likely levels of parking for the new house.

#### **Cycle Parking**

42. The London Plan states that developments should provide cycle parking spaces in accordance with the minimum standards laid out in Policy T5, Table 10.2. A minimum of two long-stay cycle spaces would be required.
43. A combined bin and cycle store would be provided to the front forecourt. The cycle store element would be 1m by 2m with the capacity to store two bicycles which would be in line with policy standards in numerical terms. Its siting would also provide ease of access and sufficient room for future residents to manoeuvre the bicycles.
44. In design terms, the combined store would be finished in matte red and feature a sedum roof which would integrate well with the red brick boundary wall and the overall green forecourt setting.
45. A compliance condition would be imposed for the combined store to be implemented in accordance with the approved details and that it must be kept free from obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

#### **Bin Storage**

46. Brent's Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Guidance for Residential Properties sets out the following external waste and recycling capacity is required for one household.

Table 2: Waste storage capacity requirements from Brent's Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Guidance

Property Type	Receptacle Position	Residual waste (L)	Dry recycling (L)	Food waste (L)
Houses (1 household)	External	1 x 140L wheeled bin	1 x 240L wheeled bin	1 x 23L kerbside Container

47. Section 3.14 of the DAS confirms that this requirement would be met.
48. The siting of the store would also be considered to provide easy access for future occupants to wheel their bins out onto the pavement for ease of collection.
49. The design of the store is also considered to be acceptable as set out in paragraph 47 of the report and a compliance condition would be imposed.

### **Trees and Landscaping**

50. The potential effect of development on trees, whether statutorily protected (by a tree preservation order or by their inclusion within a conservation area) or not, is a material consideration that is taken into account when dealing with planning applications. Policies DMP1 & BG12 of Brent's Local Plan (2019-2041) and G7 of the London Plan (2021) emphasise the importance of protecting amenity trees from development and replacing lost trees where appropriate.
51. The grass verge currently provides some visual amenity value to Pellatt and Preston Roads but is not, however, defined as protected open space within the Local Plan. The submitted Preliminary Ecological Assessment classifies the grassland to be in poor condition and possesses low strategic significance. There are also no on-site or off-site trees that could be potentially impacted.
52. While the proposal would result in the loss of some grassland and all the shrubs, every opportunity has been taken to maximise the amount of landscaping on-site and to introduce a diversity of planting species and biodiversity and wildlife enhancement strategies. This would help to enhance the visual appearance of the site, contribute to wildlife biodiversity and with meeting the Urban Greening Factor (UGF) with policy standards. Furthermore, where a biodiversity net gain of 10% cannot be achieved on-site, it would be secured off-site. These considerations, which are discussed in detail below, combined with the contribution of the proposed development to the borough's housing targets and the delivery of family-sized homes, are considered to outweigh the loss of the existing greenery.
53. A range of planting species would be introduced site wide. The front forecourt would consist of c.57.39sqm (ie. 68.1%) of soft landscaping with standard trees and native species to form the hedgerow. The combined bin and cycle store would also be planted with a sedum roof. The prominent location of the green forecourt on the road junction would serve as visual gateway to the metro-land ethos of the surrounding dwellings.
54. Five standard trees and a range of flower-rich perennial planting would be introduced to the rear garden including *Sanguisorba Officinalis* 'Red Thunder', and *Selinum wallichianum*. The perennial planting would contribute to the species diversity site wide.
55. Opportunities to maximise soft landscaping at roof level have been achieved where a biodiverse roof with a sedum substrate of 133mm would be introduced to the top of the ground floor rear extension. The green roof would be a practical measure to prevent the need for irrigation and to avoid the drying out of the green roof. The Council's Senior Ecologist is satisfied with the provision of the green roof and has further advised for it to be planted with native wildflowers that is seeded and not turfed to increase the wildlife value. While the cross-section shown in section 3.10 of the DAS has provided limited details to the composition of the sedum roof, a landscaping condition would nonetheless be imposed to secure the details of the hard and soft-landscaping works prior to the commencement of the development.

### **Urban Greening Factor**

56. Local Plan policy BH4 has set a minimum Urban Greening Factor (UGF) requirement of 0.4 for minor developments, to make up for the loss of green infrastructure or support its re-introduction.
57. The Proposed Urban Greening Factor Plan and calculations in section 3.11 of the DAS confirms that a UGF of 0.4 would be met. This will be secured by condition.

### **Habitat and Species**

58. A Preliminary Ecological assessment (PEA), a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and a Biodiversity Metric Tool have all been submitted in support of the application and assessed by the Council's Senior Ecologist and Principal Tree Officer.
59. The PEA sets out that as the site currently consists of poor condition modified grassland which has low ecological value, the proposed development is likely to have a minimal impact on biodiversity. No impacts to any notable habitats are also anticipated due to the scale and distance of the proposed development from such habitats, given its urban location.
60. The PEA advises that measures should be incorporated to create and enhance biodiversity on-site. This includes the submission of an artificial lighting strategy to outline the area of the site that would be retained as dark corridors and for the installation of a bat box to provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The installation of bird boxes is also recommended. Furthermore, while the PEA has advised on measures for the habitat creation for hedgehogs, the Council's Senior Ecologist has advised these measures to not be necessary, as given the scale of the site, it is unlikely that it would be used by hedgehogs. Notwithstanding, the recommended enhancement measures within the PEA would be secured through a pre-commencement condition.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain**

61. A combination of the Environment Act 2021, London Plan Policy G6 and Local Plan Policy BGI1 set out a mandatory 10% increase in biodiversity for minor applications submitted from 2nd of April 2024. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a development approach creating an increase in biodiversity compared to what previously existed. This includes most species of wildlife and planting. Notable exceptions are currently species that nest and roost in or on buildings, such as bats, swifts, swallows, martins, sparrows and birds of prey. These are in themselves an important consideration in addition to BNG.
62. The results from the Biodiversity Metric Calculator concludes that the post development habitat value of the site is 0.02 units which would result in a net loss of 46.39% from its baseline habitat value of 0.04 units. This is because while measures are proposed to improve biodiversity such as biodiverse roofs, pollinator perennial planting, trees and lawn are proposed, in terms of BNG, they are not enforceable over the 30 year period that is required and are only recognised as "vegetated garden" of low ecological value.
63. Notwithstanding, Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows for acceptable development proposals which fall under this requirement to provide either off-site units and/or statutory biodiversity credits. If developers cannot achieve all of their BNG on-site, they can deliver this through a mixture of on-site and/or off-site measures. As no significant habitats would be created on-site and given the scale of the development, an informative would be included with any consent to remind the application does not benefit from a statutory exemption, a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan must be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development is begun. In addition, a landscaping condition would be secured.

### **Water Consumption**

64. Policy BSUI4 of the Local Plan requires new developments to achieve the target for mains water consumption of 105L or less per person per day for internal use and 5L for external use in order to protect water supply across the city.
65. Section 3.0 of the DAS confirms that the use of smart meters, water-saving low flow taps, water saving shower heads would be incorporated to achieve the water consumption target. To limit external use to 5L, a rainwater harvesting tank would also be installed to collect rainwater and to irrigate the garden. These measures are considered to be acceptable and would be secured by condition.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

66. Policy BSUI4 of the Local Plan requires proposed developments to control and reduce surface water run-off.
67. The proposed development would provide c.57.39sqm (68.1%) of soft landscaping to the front forecourt which would be above the 50% requirement set out in local policy to allow for surface water attenuation. Landscaping would also be provided in the rear garden, and permeable paving would be provided throughout the site. These measures are considered to be sufficient.

## **Environmental Health**

### **Land Contamination**

68. Environmental Health Officers notes that the land is potentially contaminated and an informative would be included with any consent to remind the applicant that it is important for workers to be vigilant for signs of potential contamination in the soil in the event of excavation works. This may include obvious residues, odours, fuel or oil stains, asbestos, buried drums, buried waste, drains, interceptors, tanks or any other unexpected hazards that may be discovered during site works.

## **Fire Safety**

69. Policy D12A of the London Plan now 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.
70. Section 3.9 of the DAS has included a preliminary fire strategy. The strategy includes the measures of providing emergency escape through the siting and design of the fenestration openings -where the eils of the first floor are less than 4.5m, an openable double door would be provided to the kitchen/dining/living area and an escape window would be provided to the ground floor bedroom.
71. The strategy also sets out that a protected stairway would be constructed out of fire-resistant materials to enable evacuation through the front door and gather at the assembly point, the pavement of Road.
72. A fire extinguisher would also be provided to each floor of the dwelling along with the installation of fire alarms and smoke detectors to the ground floor hallway and first floor landing.
73. This strategy can be further developed in detail in the event of planning consent and would be regulated through Building Control.

## **Equalities**

74. 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**

75. Overall, the proposed development would result in the loss of part of the existing grass verge. However,



the acceptability of the scheme has been considered with all aspects of the development and the benefits of delivering a high-quality, family-sized dwelling contributing to the borough's housing targets is considered to outweigh the loss of the grass verge.

## DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



# Brent

## DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

## DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: **25/1246**

To: Mr Williams  
Trehela Williams  
5 Blakett Street  
London  
SW15 1QG

I refer to your application dated **24/04/2025** proposing the following:

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.

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

at **Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN**

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: 02/09/2025

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 the:-

National Planning Policy Framework 2024  
The 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 material accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

- OS Location Plan
- 125PR\_05\_P1 EXISTING ELEVATIONS
- 125PR\_01\_P1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
- 125PR\_02\_P3 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- 125PR\_03\_P1 SITE SECTION AA EXISTING & PROPOSED
- 125PR\_04\_P2 PROPOSED PLANS
- 125PR\_06\_P1 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
- 125PR\_07\_P1 PROPOSED SECTION BB
- 125PR\_08\_P1 PROPOSED URBAN GREENING FACTOR PLAN

Supporting Documents

- LAND TO THE NORTH OF 125 PRESTON ROAD DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT P3 dated July 2025
- Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment by arbtech issue 1.0 dated 23rd April 2025
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by arbtech dated 03rd April 2025

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

- 3 No access shall be provided to the roof of the extension by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, terrace or sitting out area.

Reason: To preserve the amenity and privacy of the neighbouring residential occupier(s) at No.125 Preston Road.

- 4 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 and F of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended, (or any order revoking and reenacting 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.

- 5 The cycle and refuse store hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with drawing: 125PR\_02\_P2 - PROPOSED SITE PLAN and 125PR\_06\_P1 -PROPOSED ELEVATIONS prior to first occupation of the development unless an alternative arrangement has been subsequently submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority and implemented.

Access to cycle parking and refuse storage must be kept free from obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interest of promoting sustainable modes of travel in line with policy DMP1 of the Local Plan.

- 6 The building shall be designed and constructed 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.

- 7 The development hereby approved shall be implemented to achieve a minimum urban greening factor (UGF) of 0.4 as demonstrated within the UGF Calculator (Section 3.11 of the Design and Access Statement) and unless an alternative scheme to achieve this UGF has otherwise be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented.

Reason: To secure environmental benefits in accordance with policies DMP1, BGI1, BGI2 and BH4 of Brent's Local Plan.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of works (excluding demolition, site clearance, laying of foundations or any other below ground work) details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing:
- (a) materials to be used in the external appearance of the development including samples to be pre-arranged to viewed by the Local Planning Authority
  - (b) details of window reveals, head and cill details and eaves details to be provided at scale 1:10

The works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a high-quality development which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area.

- 9 Prior to the commencement of works (other than demolition, site clearance, laying of foundations or any other below ground work) details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme for the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:
- a) A planting plan, including a scaled plan to show the vegetation being retained and the provision of at least -3 fruit trees to the front forecourt, 1 native hedgerow around the front boundary, 5 standard trees and 2 multi-stemmed trees to the rear garden and a substrate green roof with wild flowers;
  - b) Details of garden wall, fences or other form of boundary treatment to be provided within the site (including details of external materials and heights);
  - c) Details of surfacing materials to be used for any areas of hard standing.

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. This is unless an alternative timescale 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.

Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next

planting season and all planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species and in the same positions, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance and setting for the development and to ensure that the proposed development enhances the visual amenity of the locality in the interests of the amenities of the occupants of the development, provides ecological, environmental and biodiversity benefits.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved (excluding site clearance, demolition works and laying of foundations), a scheme for wildlife and nesting features as recommended in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by arbtech dated 03rd April 2025 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development and thereafter maintained.

These shall include:

- a) An artificial lighting strategy which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors to safeguard commuting bats and deter bats from using the area;
- b) Installation of at least 1 bat box positioned 3-5m above the ground level facing a south or south-westerly direction to provide roosting habitat for bats;
- c) Installation of at least 1 bird box;
- d) Creation of brush piles or installation of hedgehog houses in shady areas;
- e) Installation of gaps under boundary fencing to enable hedgehogs to move freely through the site.

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

## INFORMATIVES

**1** - 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](http://www.brent.gov.uk/CIL).

**2** - (PWAL) 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 Communities and Local Government website [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

**3** - (F16) 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.

**4** - It is important that the workers are vigilant for signs of potential contamination in the soil during excavation works. This may include obvious residues, odours, fuel or oil stains, asbestos, buried drums, buried waste, drains, interceptors, tanks or any other unexpected hazards that may be discovered during site works. If any unforeseen contamination is found during works Regulatory Services must be notified immediately. Tel: 020 8937 5252. Email: [ens.monitoring@brent.gov.uk](mailto:ens.monitoring@brent.gov.uk)

**5** - Subject to exemptions and transitional arrangements, the effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required for this permission would be Brent Council.

You should consider whether the permission is subject to the biodiversity gain condition before commencing development. Commencing development which is subject to the biodiversity gain condition without an approved Biodiversity Gain Plan could result in your development becoming subject to enforcement action.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Janseway Cheung, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 2230

This page is intentionally left blank



## Agenda Item 05

### Supplementary Information

**Planning Committee on 10 September, 2025**

Case No.

**25/1246**

---

Location	Land North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8NN
Description	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.

#### **Agenda Page Number: 19-41**

Further comments have been received from the adjoining neighbour at 125 Preston Road who had previously submitted objections to the proposal. The points raised largely reiterate matters that has already been considered within the officer's report.

However, members are asked to note the following summary of issues and officer responses.

#### **Terracing Effect, Design and Character**

This is assessed under "Layout and Design" and "Reasons for Objection" (pp. 28–29, 24-26 paras. 8-20 of the report).

It is acknowledged that the proposal would form a new end of terraced dwelling with the existing semi-detached pairs at No.123 and No.125 Preston Road. However, Officers consider the impact on symmetry to be acceptable in this specific context.

The site occupies a prominent corner location where a departure from strict symmetry would be less visually disruptive. The location also offers a point of transition against the varied back drop of architectural styles.

Moreover, the introduction of a high-quality, contemporary design provides a clear visual distinction between the original semi-detached pair and the new dwelling. This architectural contrast avoids the impression of a continuous terrace and ensures that the development reads as a separate, individually designed property rather than as an incongruous extension. The angled roof form, use of shadow gaps, varied material textures reinforces this sense of distinction.

On balance, the design approach is considered to provide an appropriate response to the site's corner plot setting and would not undermine the overall character or rhythm of the street scene. It is considered that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, nor the approach to Wembley Stadium.

#### **Depth of Rear Projection**

Explicitly considered (paras. 32–34 of the report).

Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD allows for single-storey extensions to have a depth of up to 6.0m.

#### **Impact on daylight/amenity & 45-degree rule**

This is discussed in "Impact on Residential Amenity" (paras. 32-37 of the report).

The 45-degree test not applicable to ground floor rear extensions.

#### **Parking/Highways**

This is addressed in "Transport Considerations" (paras. 38–41 of the report).

*Document Imaged*

*DocSuppF  
Ref: 25/1246 Page 1 of 2*

### **Loss of landscaping/green space**

This is addressed under “Principle of development” and “Trees and Landscaping” (paras. 1–7, 50-55 of the report).

### **Consultation**

Addressed in “Consultations” (end of objections table in report).

The consultation was in line with statutory requirements and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain**

This is covered in detail in “Biodiversity Net Gain” section (paras. 61–63 of the report).

Where the BNG requirement cannot be satisfied on-site, legislation allows use of off-site units/credits to provide BNG; an added informative would remind applicants of their requirement for the submission/approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan before development commences.

### **Drainage and SUDs compliance**

This is addressed under “Flood Risk and Drainage” (paras. 66–77).

The concern regarding access to the neighbouring properties downpipe are noted, however this would not be a material planning consideration and would fall under the provisions of the Party Wall Act. An informative is recommended with regard to building works near boundaries.

### **Historic Refusals**

All applications for Planning Permission are considered on their own individual merit.

It should also be noted that the previous refusals ref: 03/2470 and ref: 03/0161 relates to extension works at No.125 Preston Road only, the refusal reasons highlighted were also assessed under different policies and guidance at the time.

### **Recommendation:**

Remains to grant consent subject to the conditions and informatives as set out within the committee report.

DocSuppF