



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Wednesday 3 June 2026 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor S Butt (Chair), Councillor HB Patel (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Gallagher, Ibrahim, Mahmood, Maurice Lorber and Thomas.

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of interests

In relation to Agenda Item 4: 25/2875 - Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 – it was confirmed that all members of the Committee had received an approach from both the applicant and an objector but had not engaged in discussion or sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the application impartially and without any form of predetermination.

Councillor Maurice additionally advised that he had been approached by an objector, who had been unable to submit their comments on the planning application via the online portal and therefore requested that the councillor forward the document on their behalf to the Planning officers, which he had done. Councillor Maurice confirmed that no discussion had taken place regarding the content, and he therefore felt able to consider the application with an open mind 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 meeting held on Wednesday 11 February 2026 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. 25/2875 - Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9

PROPOSAL

Proposed construction of a dwellinghouse with landscaping works to the front and rear gardens, installation of boundary wall and bike and bin storage.

RECOMMENDATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report.

Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full 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 development was designed with a pitched roof, with a ridge height of c.8.15m. The proposal also included a single-storey rear extension, measuring 6.0 m in depth, with a flat roof and an eaves and maximum height of 3.0 m. Additional works comprised the creation of a front forecourt with landscaping, combined cycle and refuse storage, the erection of a brick front boundary wall, brick side boundary treatment, and timber fencing along the remaining side boundary. Private external amenity space would be provided to the rear garden for the use of residents at the property. Members also noted that the application had followed refusal of a previous application (ref: 25/1246) on design and appearance grounds that was subsequently upheld and dismissed at appeal on 19 January 2026. The key difference with this scheme was related to the amended roof form from a mono-pitch roof to pitch roof to the dwelling, the altered siting, size and design of the first-floor front facing window and first floor flank window. This was in contrast to the previous scheme, which proposed a predominantly white-coloured external finish to the dwelling, the revised proposal incorporated red brickwork, red clay roof tiles, white render, and PPC matte white aluminum framed windows and doors.

Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which noted the receipt of one new objection and a further objection from an individual who had previously commented. Members were advised that a summary of the issues raised, together with the officers' responses, had been detailed within the supplementary report. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions and informatives set out within the main committee report.

The Chair thanked Janesway Cheung for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Kunal Shah (who had registered to speak as an objector, online) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- In opening his comments Kunal Shah began by stating that the proposed development would be physically attached to his home as his property adjoined the application site.
- Attention was drawn to the Planning Inspector's appeal decision dated 19 January 2026. Kunal Shah advised that the Inspector had undertaken a site

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

visit, assessed the proposal and reached a clear conclusion that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and that the appeal had been dismissed. It was noted that the Inspector had identified three specific elements giving rise to harm, namely the attachment of the building to his property, the occupation of the roadside verge at the junction, and the combined visual effect of introducing a new building in that location. It was stated that these factors, taken together, had led the Inspector to conclude that the development would be visually uncomfortable.

- Kunal Shah further advised that, at paragraph 7 of the appeal decision, the Planning Inspector had described the site as a plot effectively formed of a roadside verge, rather than a building plot with a verge alongside it. It was emphasised that the verge itself constituted the plot and that no revisions to the roofline or choice of brick could alter the fundamental characteristic of the land.
- Attention was drawn to paragraph 16 of the committee report, where it was noted officers had acknowledged that the footprint of the dwelling remained unchanged from the scheme previously dismissed. It was stated that the same attachment to his property, the same verge, the same junction location and the same loss of openness identified by the Inspector all remained.
- Kunal Shah additionally stated that the officer's assessment relied on changes to the roof form, materials and fenestration, which he described as architectural amendments. It was felt that the Inspector's concerns had not primarily related to architectural design, noting that the Inspector had accepted that a contemporary design approach would not necessarily be inappropriate, but had nonetheless dismissed the appeal because the harm arose from where the building was placed and what it was attached to.
- Concern was also expressed that revisions to the roofline would not address the loss of the corner, that changes in materials would not remove the attachment to his property, and that design features such as shadow gaps would not restore the sense of spaciousness identified by the Inspector. It was reiterated that the characteristics giving rise to harm remained.
- Kunal Shah advised that, in his view, the key issue for the Committee was whether the specific harms identified by the Inspector had been overcome, rather than whether the revised scheme represented an improvement from the previous proposal.
- Reference was made to the supplementary report, noting that officers had expressly acknowledged that the footprint remained unchanged. It was reiterated that the attachment to his property, the occupation of the verge

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

and the loss of spaciousness remained, and that only the appearance of the building had been amended.

- In reiterating the concerns highlighted, Kunal Shah advised that he relied on the conclusions of the Planning Inspector, who had visited the site, assessed the proposal and identified significant harm, which he considered had not been addressed. In concluding, he therefore asked that the proposed planning application be refused and requested that, should any member be minded to approve the application, they state which specific harms identified by the Inspector they considered to have been overcome and the reasons for that conclusion.

The Chair thanked Kunal Shah for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- Members sought clarification as to whether it was important for a plot to be square or rectangular, rather than of the form presented within the proposed application. In response, Kunal Shah referred to the Planning Inspector's description of the site as a roadside verge, rather than a typical building plot and expressed the view that the plot ought to be of a regular shape and should not be attached to existing dwellings which had been established for approximately 50 to 60 years prior.

The Chair thanked Kunal Shah for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Adam Dainow (who had registered to speak as the applicant), who highlighted the following points:

- In opening his comments, Adam Dainow began by stating that Caswell and Dainow specialised in the development of underused sites to deliver high quality family housing through what he described as gentle densification, in line with national, London and local planning policy.
- It was explained that the proposal related to the provision of a single-family dwelling on a small and underutilised parcel of land to the north of 125 Preston Road. It was stated that the site was sustainably located, with strong public transport accessibility, and was consistent with the types of sites identified in the London Plan and Brent Policy BH4 for small scale housing delivery.
- It was noted that a previous application had been recommended for approval by officers and refused by the Committee solely on the grounds of design and appearance. It was highlighted that no concerns had been raised in relation to the principle of development, neighbour impacts, transport, amenity or sustainability.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

- Members were advised that careful consideration had been given to the concerns raised previously and that the current proposal had been comprehensively redesigned in response. It was further stated that the previous minimalist approach had been replaced with a more contextual design reflecting the character of neighbouring Tudorbethan properties. It was additionally noted that the revised scheme incorporated massing aligned at eaves level, a roof pitch reflecting neighbouring properties, window proportions consistent with adjacent homes, and a material palette of red brick, white render and clay tiles drawn from the surrounding streetscape.
- As an additional issues, reference was made to the wider context of housing need, with it noted that the Borough continued to face significant pressure to deliver new homes, particularly larger family housing. It was also mentioned that the Council's own evidence indicated that over 53% of identified need was for family homes with three or more bedrooms, which the proposal would provide. It was added that small windfall sites made an important contribution to meeting this need and could typically be delivered within shorter timescales, as recognised by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- The concerns raised by neighbouring residents were acknowledged with it recognised that sensitivity to change was understandable. However, it was emphasised that planning decisions should be based on compliance with planning policy. It was reiterated that the previous reason for refusal had related solely to design and appearance and that officers had concluded that this matter had now been addressed.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Adam Dainow requested that the Committee therefore endorse the officer recommendation and grant planning permission.

The Chair thanked Adam Dainow 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:

- As an initial query, members questioned why the proposed three-bedroom dwelling had not been provided with at least one car parking space. In response, Adam Dainow stated that the proposal complied with relevant planning policy and noted that, as the site was classified as being in a sustainable location within walking distance of Preston Road and Wembley, there was no requirement to provide off-street car parking. It was further explained that sustainability had been prioritised within the design, noting that the frontage of approximately 73 sqm had been largely retained as soft landscaping, including grassed areas and tree planting, rather than hardstanding. It was additionally stated that this approach placed emphasis

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

on the streetscape and aligned with the Council's transport and sustainability policies for new housing developments.

- Members sought confirmation as to whether the property would be sold, following the development of the proposed site. In response, Adam Dainow confirmed that the property would be sold on the local market, intended for occupation by local families, and described it as a well-designed triple aspect family home.
- Supplementary queries were raised regarding what would prevent a future owner from removing the grassed frontage and installing hardstanding. In response, Adam Dainow noted that the front of the property would be enclosed by a brick wall and that the proposal complied with the Council's Urban Greening Factor (UGF) policy, which required a proportion of the site to be retained for green infrastructure and sustainable drainage. It was further mentioned that any alteration by a future owner that conflicted with these requirements would be in breach of planning policy and would be subject to the Council's usual enforcement procedures.
- Members were keen to seek details as to the reasoning behind developing an unusually shaped wedge-shaped plot. In response, Adam Dainow stated that opportunities for development on regular square shaped plots were limited within London. Adam Dainow advised that his business specialised in delivering family homes on constrained and irregular sites and acknowledged that such development sites required significant investment and careful design consideration. The view was expressed that, with an appropriate design approach, such sites could deliver high quality architecture and well-designed homes.
- Views were then sought regarding how the safety of families, particularly those with children, had been considered in the design of the proposed application. In response, Adam Dainow advised that a brick wall was proposed along the side of the property, similar to other properties on that road which was quiet, with relatively low vehicle movement. It was further highlighted that the proposal included two garden areas, which he considered beneficial for family use, particularly given that comparable developments often prioritised parking provision. It was added that, while it was not possible to control the use of outdoor spaces by children, the design had sought to provide a suitable and safe family environment.
- Members sought clarification as to whether there was an entrance and exit included at the rear of the property, with a focus on the safety of children accessing the road. In response, Adam Dainow confirmed that a secure gate was proposed for bin access. It was also noted that any access points would be lockable, consistent with typical arrangements in residential properties across London. Adam Dainow further added that, should officers

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

consider additional security measures necessary, he would be willing to incorporate such requirements into the design.

- Further details were sought on the size and dimensions of the plot in metres or feet, rather than hectares as detailed in the committee report. In response, Adam Dainow advised that he did not have those specific measurements available. However, he stated that the proposal provided a dwelling of approximately 93 sqm, formed as a three-bedroom, five person home, in accordance with London planning standards. It was further noted that, due to the positioning of the site, the dwelling would benefit from a triple aspect layout, with windows on three elevations and roof lights serving the kitchen area, which he considered to be an advantage over typical dual aspect properties. The Chair further clarified that the width of the proposed site was 6 metres and confirmed that officers would be able to provide further detailed measurements when responding to members' questions in the subsequent part of the meeting.

The Chair thanked Adam Dainow 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:

- Clarification was sought as to the potential security measures that could be secured, either through suggestion or condition, to improve the safety of families with children, particularly in relation to access to the side road and the prevention of children entering the road. In response, Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) referred specifically to Condition 10, part ii, which required the submission and approval of detailed proposals for garden walls, fences and other forms of boundary treatment. It was stated that both the appearance and height of such measures would be assessed at the stage when the condition was discharged. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further added that, in order to ensure clarity when details were submitted, Condition 10 part ii, would be amended to include explicit reference to the security of the gate.
- In querying the practicalities of enforcing biodiversity and Urban Greening Factor (UGF) requirements, particularly in circumstances where a future occupier might seek to install hardstanding in the front garden, members questioned how compliance with these requirements would be monitored and enforced. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that permitted development rights would be removed under Condition 4, which prevented a range of alterations that would otherwise be permitted, including the paving of front gardens. It was stated that any works would require planning permission. It was further noted that landscaping conditions required planting to be maintained, with any planting that failed within a period of 5 years to be replaced. It was

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

confirmed that the removal of permitted development rights would apply in perpetuity for the lifetime of the property.

- Members then sought confirmation as to whether the removal of permitted development rights extended to loft conversions, to which Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) confirmed that it did, advising that Classes A, B, C, D, E and F were included, which encompassed loft conversions.
- Concerns were highlighted regarding the shape of the plot, noting that it measured approximately 6 metres in width and became narrowed to around 1.5 metres at the rear. Members queried whether this would provide a suitable family home. In response, Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) noted that, in terms of internal space, the dwelling complied with London Plan standards, with a total floorspace of 93 sqm for a three bedroom, five person dwelling. It was further added that the proposal met the requirement for 50 sqm of external amenity space. The presence of trees planted to the rear of the site was acknowledged. It was explained that the design needed to balance the constraints of the plot with the requirements for Urban Greening Factor and biodiversity net gain. It was also stated that approximately 19 sqm of grassland would be available for use by future occupants, with additional shaded areas provided by the trees. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) additionally noted that all bedrooms met London Plan minimum size standards and that the dwelling provided large bifold doors, roof lights and good outlook from habitable rooms. It was further noted that the triple aspect structure and a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5 metres across at least 75% of the floorspace would contribute to a sense of space, ventilation and overall quality.
- In referring to the Planning Inspector's report, members sought clarification on the meaning of the terms 'character' and 'appearance', noting that they had visited the site and expressed the view that the proposal would result in a substantial change to the character of the area and that the introduction of the proposed dwelling would result in the loss of an open outlook. In response, John Stiles (Placemaking Manager) explained that the terms character and appearance were commonly used in urban design and that 'appearance' related to visual aesthetics, whereas 'character' encompassed a broader range of factors, including scale, built form, landscape and the width of the streets. It was further stated that the prevailing character of Preston Ward was generally metroland in origin, although this specific area of Preston Road exhibited a more mixed character, with buildings dating from the 1960s, 1970s, late 1990s and 2000s. It was considered that there was no single definitive character for the specific area. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further added that the Planning Inspector had considered all aspects of the previous scheme, including

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

siting, location and design, and had weighed these against the benefits of the proposal. It was noted that while the footprint remained unchanged, the design and appearance had been revised. It was further noted that members were required to assess the current proposal in its entirety, considering its relationship to the character of the area and balancing this against the benefits of the scheme. It was additionally mentioned that policy recognised the need for change in order to meet housing requirements and that the key consideration was whether such change was acceptable in this instance. John Stiles (Placemaking Manager) further advised that the character of an area was not fixed but evolved over time, which should be taken into account.

- Further information was sought on whether the existing dwelling at No. 125 Preston Road had side windows facing the grass verge. In response, Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) presented the site plan and advised that there was one ground floor flank window, which had a fence built against it, and a further first floor flank window within a rear extension. It was stated that the rear building line of the new dwelling would be in line with the first floor of the existing house next door, resulting in no loss of outlook. It was also noted that the ground floor window was obscure glazed and likely served a non-habitable room, such as a toilet, and concluded that there would be no undue detrimental impact.
- Members sought further clarification on whether any trees would be removed to accommodate the development, to which Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) confirmed that no trees would be removed, advising that the site currently consisted of ornamental shrubs and grassland.
- Members commented that the proposal would detract from the character of the area, noting that most of the houses on Preston Road were 1920s and 1930s metroland housing and expressed concern that the development would not be in keeping with the original dwelling. As an additional issue, members questioned whether the proposal contributed positively to the architectural character of Preston Road. In response, John Stiles (Placemaking Manager) stated that the design drew cues from neighbouring properties and reinterpreted them in a contemporary manner and considered this approach to be more architecturally appropriate than direct replication. It was also suggested that the site should be considered as a corner plot. Victoria McDonagh also reiterated the importance of small sites in contributing towards the Borough's housing target of over 2300 homes per annum. It was noted that the proposed design had sought to respond to the Planning Inspector's previous concerns through the use of more contextual materials, including a pitched roof, red clay roof tiles and red brickwork.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

- Further concern was expressed regarding the apparent scale of the building, given its width of only 6 metres. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that a typical residential frontage was approximately 6 metres and that extensions to a house were often between 3 metres and 3.5 metres in width. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further added that some photographs could influence perception, with elements appearing wider when viewed from closer proximity and narrower when viewed from a greater distance. He also explained that narrower properties were not uncommon, citing examples as small as 4 metres in width. The need to deliver a range of housing types and sizes, particularly given the shortfall in housing delivery was emphasised. It was additionally stated that the quality of the proposed dwelling met all relevant standards.
- Details were sought on what was the minimum requirement for external amenity space, to which Janesway Cheung (Career Grade Planning Officer) advised that the requirement was 50 sqm and confirmed that the proposal met this standard. It was additionally stated that 37.78 sqm would be planted with new trees, and the area between the patio and tree planting would be 19.22 sqm.
- Clarification was sought on the measurements of the overall site area, to which Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that the total site area was approximately 220 sqm.
- Further questions were raised on whether all rooms would benefit from natural light and ventilation. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) presented information taken from the drawing pack to illustrate the proposed ground floor plans and confirmed that the habitable rooms would receive adequate daylight and outlook. The internal layout was also described, which included a ground floor bedroom, open plan kitchen and dining area with bi fold doors, and roof lighting. It was further stated that the first floor bedrooms met London Plan Space Standards and received adequate daylight and outlook to each of the rooms.
- The Chair sought clarification on whether the dwelling was dual or triple aspect, to which Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) clarified that the dwelling would be triple aspect overall, providing adequate outlook, daylight and ventilation.
- As a final query, the Chair questioned whether future occupants would be eligible to apply for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) or Wembley Event Day permits. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) noted that the proposal did not include off-street parking.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

Residents could apply for a parking permit in the Wembley Event Day Zone. It was also clarified that the scheme was classified as car free.

DECISION

Having considered the application, the Committee **RESOLVED** to grant planning permission subject to:

(1) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report, together with an amended Condition 10ii:

- That the details of garden wall, fences or other form of boundary treatment be provided within the site (including details of external materials and heights), and security measures relating to any gates to the rear garden).

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 5 in favour of granting planning permission, and 3 in favour of refusal).

At the conclusion of the previous item, the Chair agreed to adjourn the meeting for a period of 15 minutes to allow for a short break prior to the consideration of the next item. The meeting reconvened at 7:15pm.

5. **25/2230 - Garages rear of 60 Olive Road, London, NW2**

PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing garages and proposed erection of a two-storey building with basement level to provide 2 residential dwellings with front lightwells, associated private amenity space, boundary treatment, cycle and refuse storage.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of existing garages and proposed erection of two storey building with basement level to provide 2 homes, each with two bedrooms, with front lightwells, associated private amenity space, boundary treatment, cycle and refuse storage. Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which noted the revised plans received in response to updated information relating to the recently constructed outbuilding at No. 64 Olive Road. It was also noted that the submitted existing and proposed drawings had been amended to accurately reflect this development. Moreover, as part of Part A of Condition 11 (wildlife and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

nesting features), members heard that the wording of the condition had been updated to provide more site-specific requirements, in line with the Council's Ecology Officer's advice. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out within the main and updated within the supplementary committee report.

The Chair thanked Mahya Fatemi for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Adrian Boylan (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Adrian Boylan began by noting that his property overlooked the application site and stated that he had not been included in the list of consultees when the proposals were initially announced. He confirmed that he had become aware of the application through word of mouth.
- It was noted that 16 objections to the proposal had been received, including objections submitted by both local ward councillors.
- Members were advised that the proposal involved the replacement of four structures described as garages but contended that these were not used as garages and were instead utilised for commercial storage purposes by the owners.
- Adrian Boylan expressed the view that development within rear garden land should generally be discouraged. He clarified that his objection was not to the principle of development on the site, provided that the existing green space was preserved, but rather to the form and design of the proposed development. It was considered that the introduction of new buildings within a street characterised by 1920s semi-detached properties would be out of keeping with the established appearance of the area.
- As further observations it was highlighted that properties on Wren Avenue typically featured open front gardens, whereas the proposal included a front wall of approximately head height. It was additionally noted that the properties within Wren Avenue did not include basements, whereas the application proposed the introduction of basements as part of the development. The view was expressed that the inclusion of basements was intended to maximise income for the owner and stated that, notwithstanding this addition, each dwelling would still only provide two bedrooms.
- A further concern was raised that a significant proportion of the existing green space to the rear of the current garages would be lost as a result of the construction of what he described as small and visually unattractive dwellings.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Adrian Boylan stated that the proposed development would also result in increased overshadowing of neighbouring gardens and would lead to a reduction in privacy for adjacent flats.

The Chair thanked Adrian Boylan 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:

- Views were sought from the objector as to how the plot might be used as an alternative to the proposed development. In response, Adrian Boylan stated that, in his view, the site would have been more appropriately developed in a manner that reflected and maintained the established character of the surrounding area. It was expected that any development would seek to preserve the open front garden aspect characteristic of other properties along the road, and to be in keeping with the existing architectural style and appearance. It was acknowledged that it would not be possible to replicate the exact design of buildings from the 1920s within a modern development however, it was felt that it would be feasible to avoid introducing a structure that appeared out of keeping within the local context. The view was expressed that the current proposal resembled a brick structure that had been imposed between a Victorian street and an Edwardian street, without sufficient regard for the surrounding environment. By way of comparison, Adrian Boylan referred to other developments within the local area, including those at the Waterworks site near the end of Olive Road and around the corner in Sneyd Road. It was noted that approximately 15 years previously, an empty plot in that location had been developed with a pair of semi-detached houses. The development was described as modern in design but broadly complementary to the style of the surrounding Edwardian housing. Concern was expressed that the current proposal made no meaningful attempt to integrate with the existing environment. It was suggested that the design appeared to prioritise maximising the use of available space, potentially at the expense of acceptable living conditions for future occupants. It was further stated that the proposed development would not provide suitable family housing and indicated that the properties would instead be purchased and used as bedsits, which he described as a typical outcome for developments of this nature within the area. Further concerns were raised regarding the potential for basement accommodation with limited natural light and restricted outward views, given the presence of surrounding high walls, as well as the absence of effective garden space. Adrian Boylan concluded that, in its current form, the proposed development would not provide a desirable living environment and would not be a place that individuals would wish to live.

As there were no further questions raised at this point, the Chair thanked Adrian Boylan for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

- In referring to paragraphs 62 and 64 of the committee report, members sought clarification on the constrained nature of the site in relation to the Urban Greening Factor and queried what factors had contributed to the site being considered constrained. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) noted that the scheme achieved an Urban Greening Factor score of 0.22. It was explained that this had been achieved through measures including the provision of green roofs, planting and permeable paving. Members were advised that the site was currently predominantly hard surfaced, with only limited areas of ivy and general shrubbery that had developed over time due to lack of maintenance. It was additionally stated that the development would deliver some improvements in urban greening. However, it was explained that the site was constrained by its limited width and depth, particularly given that it accommodated two dwellings without the benefit of a substantial garden area. As a result, opportunities for more significant landscaping interventions such as large communal gardens or extensive tree planting were limited. It was emphasised that while the scheme included enhancements, there was limited opportunity in being able to provide substantial landscaping which would contribute towards urban greening. It was further added that the scheme would nonetheless deliver two dwellings, each comprising two bedrooms, and would contribute to meeting the demand for smaller homes within the borough.

In considering the response provided, members stressed the importance of considering whether environmental policies such as the Urban Greening Factor were being treated as optional where sites were developed more intensively. Members highlighted the Council's declaration of a climate emergency and expressed concern that high density development on small sites could undermine environmental objectives if policy standards were not fully met. In addressing the concerns raised, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) stated that the delivery of housing targets relied on a combination of site types, including both large allocations and smaller sites. It was explained that larger sites, such as those previously occupied by large retail premises, offered greater opportunities for significant landscaping, communal amenity spaces and tree planting, which could more easily achieve higher Urban Greening Factor scores. It was further mentioned that smaller sites also played an important role in delivering housing targets, particularly in providing a mix of housing types including one and two bedroom properties. Reference was made to both local policy and the London Plan, which supported the optimisation of site capacity on smaller plots. It was acknowledged that smaller developments might not meet all policy targets in full, including the 0.4 Urban Greening Factor target. However, it was confirmed that officers considered the provision within this scheme to represent the maximum

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

achievable level, alongside ecological enhancements designed to improve biodiversity. It was emphasised that the proposal involved a balance between policy compliance and delivery of housing. Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) further added that, on larger sites, there was more capacity to incorporate significant landscaping and greening features and explained that some sites could more easily achieve a score of 0.4 where large areas of existing green space were retained, whereas this site had limited such opportunities.

- Members raised supplementary points of concern regarding the cumulative impact of developments that did not meet the 0.4 target. Reference was made to recent extreme weather conditions, including an extreme heatwave in May 2026, and emphasised the importance of achieving climate objectives. The role of tree canopy, green roofs and permeable surfaces in mitigating heat, managing surface water and improving flood resilience was highlighted. It was felt that allowing repeated shortfalls on smaller sites could undermine broader environmental outcomes across the borough. Whilst recognising the issues highlighted, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) stated that it was important to consider performance across the borough as a whole and advised that while some schemes fell below the 0.4 target, others exceeded it, and that overall performance needed to be considered. He agreed that efforts should continue to achieve policy targets wherever possible.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further added that the proposed development would deliver improvements in flood management when compared to the existing condition of the site. It was explained that the introduction of permeable paving and green roofs would help to manage surface water runoff and reduce pressure on drainage systems.

- Members questioned whether a visual Computer-Generated Imagery (CGI) representation of the proposed development from the front could be provided in order to better understand its appearance within the surrounding context. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) advised that CGI did not demonstrate the full materiality and detailing of the scheme. It was noted that conditions had been attached to the application to secure the quality of materials and construction details, including windows, roof detailing and green roofs. Slides were then presented from the drawing pack, including a 3D model, to illustrate the proposed development.
- Following up, members queried why CGI images showing the development within the surrounding street context had not been provided, noting that such images were commonly included for comparison in other applications. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) advised that there was no requirement for applicants to submit CGI images.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

It was explained that while such images were useful, they were often expensive to produce and were therefore less common for smaller developments. It was further noted that the models provided were felt to be sufficient to demonstrate the scale, form and siting of the proposed development, although they did not convey the full materiality of the scheme. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) additionally noted that conditions had been imposed to secure detailed information on external materials and contextual material palettes.

- As a further issue highlighted regarding the proposed basement excavation, members queried the potential risks to neighbouring properties, including any risks associated with subsidence or ground movement. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) confirmed that the applicant had submitted a Basement Impact Assessment. Members were advised that the assessment included structural details, engineering calculations, ground stability analysis, flood risk considerations and construction methodology. It was further noted that certain aspects of the basement construction would also be regulated through Building Control and Building Regulations, in addition to the planning process.
- Concerns were expressed that the proposed development did not sufficiently consider long-term sustainability. Members questioned whether the delivery of two dwellings would meaningfully contribute to meeting housing needs and asked whether any assurance existed that the units would not be used as bed and breakfast accommodation in the future. Members further expressed the view that the development constituted overdevelopment and could result in a detrimental impact on the character and quality of the surrounding area. In response, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) informed members that properties on Sneyd Road generally occupied larger plots and were more closely aligned in size and form to the original houses. He further advised that local planning policy, particularly in areas with higher Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL), supported flexibility and anticipated changes in character over time. It was explained that these policies enabled greater optimisation of smaller sites, including those that did not reflect traditional plot sizes. In relation to the question of occupancy and use, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) stated that it was not possible at the planning stage to determine definitively how the properties would be occupied. It was noted that similar developments had been delivered elsewhere and were, in many cases, occupied by residents within the borough. Members were advised that the proposal met relevant space standards and policy requirements for high quality residential accommodation, and on that basis it was considered acceptable from a planning policy perspective.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further added that the use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

(HMO) would require planning permission due to the presence of an Article 4 direction in place since 2002. It was explained that even small-scale conversion to an HMO or flats, would require a separate planning application. It was confirmed that the application under consideration had been assessed as Class C3 dwellinghouses and that any alternative use would need to be considered independently through the planning process.

- Questions were then raised on whether the Council would be reviewing its Local Plan, to which David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) responded that work on the new Local Plan was scheduled to commence later in the year. Following on from the previous question, members queried whether issues relating to the adequacy of dwelling size and quality could be addressed within the new Local Plan by future decision makers. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) noted that current standards for residential space were derived from the London Plan, which in turn reflected national standards. It was further explained that these standards established a consistent baseline for housing quality across the country, with some limited adjustments at London level. Members were advised that standards relating to daylight and sunlight had been in place for a number of years and had been updated to provide detailed guidance on acceptable living conditions. It was confirmed that policies could be reviewed as part of the Local Plan process.
- Members observed that previous planning decisions had shown that refusals could lead to redesigned schemes and suggested that, in this case, refusal might encourage a more comprehensive development involving adjoining properties, potentially delivering larger family sized homes. It was suggested that such an approach might result in greater long-term benefit. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) advised that refusals could result in an appeal, a revised application, or the abandonment of a proposal. It was emphasised that the Committee must determine the application based only on the proposal presented before it.
- With reference to page 74 of the committee report, members then moved on to question the statement that breaches of the 45-degree guideline in relation to the rear garden of Nos. 60A and B, 62 A, B and C and 64 Olive Road must be weighed against the benefit of delivering two new homes. It was questioned whether this implied that housing need took precedence over established planning guidelines. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) presenting slides from the drawing pack to illustrate the proposed plans and elevations. It was explained that much of the proposed footprint would align with existing structures, with an approximate projection of 1.1 meters on the ground floor and from the outbuilding towards No. 60 Olive Road, it would project forward. Members were advised that some impact on light and outlook was anticipated, but this had been assessed against the benefits of delivering additional housing and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

improving the current site conditions. It was confirmed that a daylight and sunlight assessment had been submitted, including an assessment of overshadowing. The results indicated that No. 60 Olive Road would retain 99% of its former daylight value, No. 62 Olive Road would retain 94%, and No. 64 Olive Road would retain 98%, while other properties would experience no measurable impact. Members were informed that these findings formed part of the overall assessment of impact on neighbouring properties and their gardens.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further mentioned that the proposal complied with Building Research Establishment guidance in respect of sunlight. It was acknowledged that the flank wall of the new dwellings would be visible from neighbouring gardens and would alter visual outlook to some degree. Members were advised that the impact was partly mitigated by existing outbuildings, but that some change in visual amenity would occur. It was confirmed that these impacts had been clearly identified and weighed against the benefits of the scheme in accordance with relevant planning policies, including those relating to site optimisation and changing character in line with the London Plan and Policy BH4.

- In considering the overriding position for more homes in Brent, members were keen to seek details on whether there was any evidence of changes in demand for specific housing types, particularly in relation to two bedroom dwellings. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that planning policy did not specify exact percentages for different dwelling sizes beyond an expectation that approximately 25% of housing provision should be family sized, taking into account the overall housing target of delivering approximately 2,300 homes per year. It was noted that the current proposal fell below that threshold, as it consisted of two bedroom units. However, it was highlighted that there was no policy requirement for every scheme to provide specific types of housing, particularly where no existing family sized dwelling was being removed. It was additionally stated that housing delivery was guided by overall targets set by Government and the Local Plan, rather than by detailed requirements for each individual application. It was also noted that market demand also influenced the types of housing that developers chose to bring forward.

David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) additionally noted that housing need was assessed at the plan making stage. It was explained that national Government set out to local authorities methods for calculating housing need, which informed targets subsequently embedded within the London Plan and local plans. Members were informed that the London Plan was currently under review and that updated figures were expected in the near future. It was further stated that future Local Plan work would include a detailed housing needs assessment to inform policy.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2026

Members were further advised that current indications suggested that housing targets could increase significantly to approximately 3,000 homes, with a substantial proportion comprising two bedroom dwellings alongside other housing types.

- As a final query, members sought details regarding the size of the rear amenity space and whether this would consist of hardstanding. In response, Mahya Fatemi (Career Grade Planning Officer) clarified that the proposal would provide approximately 34 sqm of private amenity space across basement, ground floor and first floor levels, including a balcony. It was confirmed that the plans showed peripheral planting within the amenity areas and that the provision exceeded the policy requirement of 20 sqm per dwelling.

Granted planning permission subject to:

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

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 5 in favour of granting planning permission and 3 in favour of refusal).

6. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8:10 pm.

COUNCILLOR S BUTT
Chair