



Planning Committee

Wednesday 3 June 2026 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

S Butt (Chair)
H.Patel (Vice-Chair)
Gallagher
Ibrahim
Mahmood
Maurice
Lorber
Thomas

Substitute Members

Councillors:

I.Ahmed, Bajwa, Dar & Donnelly-Jackson

Councillors:

A.Patel & Chowdhury

Councillors:

Brown & Georgiou

Councillors:

Ahmadi Moghaddam & Perrin

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 a 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

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**

1 - 34

To approve and confirm the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 11 February 2026 as a correct record.

APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| 4. | 25/2875 - Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 | Preston | 39 - 62 |
| 5. | 25/2230 - Garages rear of 60 Olive Road, London, NW2 | Cricklewood
Mapesbury | & 63 - 86 |
| 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 2 July 2026



- 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 Wednesday 11 February 2026 at 6.00 pm

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

1. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of interests

In relation to Agenda Item 4: 25/0041 - Little Trainers Playground and Hazel Road Community Centre, 26 Hazel Road and Harriet Tubman House, 28 Hazel Road, London, NW10 5PP, Councillor Kelcher declared a personal interest, noting that he knew some of the objectors personally. He further advised that residents had approached him regarding their views on the application but confirmed that he had not expressed any opinion.

Councillor Kelcher had not sought to take any predisposed position in the consideration of the application and therefore felt able to consider the matters relating to the planning application impartially and without any form of pretermination. He therefore remained present for the duration of the discussion and consideration of the application for decision.

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the previous meetings

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meetings held on Wednesday 12 November 2025 and Wednesday 10 December 2025 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. 25/0041 - Little Trainers Playground and Hazel Road Community Centre, 26 Hazel Road and Harriet Tubman House, 28 Hazel Road, London, NW10 5PP

PROPOSAL

Demolition of all existing buildings and structures and erection of 4 storey mixed-use building comprising of training centre and community hall uses (Use Classes F1/F2), with roof and rear first floor terraces, associated cycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping and all other associated and ancillary works.

RECOMMENDATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

The Chair began by noting that a request had been received for an adjournment in the consideration of agenda item 4, on the basis of allegations concerning bias and predetermination of the process. The Chair confirmed that a decision had been taken not to adjourn the Committee's consideration of the application. The Chair then invited Paul Weeks (Senior Lawyer- Planning) to address the Committee on the matter.

In addressing the Committee, Paul Weeks (Senior Lawyer- Planning) advised that Legal Services had undertaken a review of the complaint that had been raised and informed the Committee that, following that review, Legal Services had concluded that there was no legal basis to prevent the meeting from proceeding. It was therefore confirmed that there was no legal reason why the Committee should not continue with its determination of the application.

In moving on to consider the application, Curtis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and structures and erection of 4 storey mixed-use building comprising of a training centre and community hall uses (Use Classes F1/F2), with roof and rear first floor terraces, associated cycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping and other associated and ancillary works. Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which outlined further objections that had been received on behalf of the Willesden Local History Society, together with further comments provided by Brent's Heritage Officer (November 2025). Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further advised that an additional condition had been proposed stipulating that no demolition of Harriett Tubman House should take place until a binding contract has been entered into for the demolition and construction of the new development. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations, the conditions and informatives as detailed in the committee report, together with an additional condition: that no demolition of Harriett Tubman House should take place until a binding contract has been entered into for the demolition and construction of the new development.

The Chair thanked Curtis Thompson and Victoria McDonagh 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 Phil O'Shea (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Phil O'Shea informed the Committee that he was a resident of Hazel Road and was speaking on behalf of the Kensal Green Residents Association. He

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

was stated that there were clear reasons why the application had attracted 134 objections and noted that even the officer report acknowledged that the proposal fell short of required standards. He felt that this alone demonstrated that the proposed development was not appropriate for the site.

- The objector explained that Hazel Road was located within a two storey Victorian neighbourhood. Reference was made to Brent's Historic Environment Strategy and it was stated that once heritage buildings such as Harriet Tubman House were demolished, their value to the community was permanently lost. It was asserted that the proposed development, consisting of a glass and aluminium structure, was wholly out of keeping with the surrounding brick built Victorian context. It was further stated that the proposed four storey height would be over dominant and would cause harm to the local character.
- The objector then referred to Brent Local Plan policies which supported contemporary design only where it respected and complemented historic character and which required development to conserve and enhance heritage assets. It was felt that the proposal failed to meet these policy requirements.
- It was stated that the demolition of the existing Community Centre, which provided space for playgroups, exercise classes, warm space provision, counselling, arts activities, church groups and community Christmas lunches, would result in a reduction of more than 53% of dedicated community space. Phil O'Shea expressed the view that the suggestion that these groups could instead hire facilities such as a training room, an IT suite or a roof terrace from Making the Leap was not viable.
- Attention was drawn to the committee report which suggested that the scheme would improve local safety. Phil O'Shea disputed this, stating that the Hazel Road frontage incorporated a covered porch and alcoves which were likely to attract anti-social behaviour after dark.
- The objector stated that residents living opposite the proposed development would experience a reduction in daylight of up to 36.5%, including in homes occupied by vulnerable individuals. It was added that users of the proposed roof terrace would have the ability to look down through the skylight of that property and into the bedroom below.
- Concern was further expressed that a significant part of Hazel Road Open Space would be lost during the construction period. It was stated that Making the Leap proposed to reclaim an area of parkland adjacent to the children's play area.
- Phil O'Shea additionally reported that Network Rail had objected to the proposal in January 2025 because of the proximity of the Bakerloo and Lioness lines, which he stated ran approximately five meters beneath Harriet Tubman House. It was noted that the objection had been withdrawn in the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

previous month without any publicly available explanation, and that it was unclear what assurances or technical information had been provided by the applicant to address Network Rail's earlier concerns.

- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Phil O'Shea (as objector) stated that when viewed as a whole, the proposal caused clear harm to heritage, residential amenity, safety and community provision. For these reasons, he emphasised that residents believed the application should not be approved.

The Chair thanked Phil O'Shea for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider an additional request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Philip Grant (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Mr Grant (as an objector) began by outlining the heritage related objections to the proposal. The Committee were referred to part e) of Policy BHC1, which stated that "proposals affecting heritage assets should ... seek to avoid harm in the first instance. Substantial harm or loss should be exceptional, especially where the asset is of high significance. Any proposed ... loss of a heritage asset ... should require clear and convincing justification and can be outweighed by material planning considerations in the form of public benefits, but only if these are sufficiently powerful.' It was noted that the proposal involved the demolition of a heritage asset. Philip Grant informed the Committee that his detailed Alternative Heritage Statement, submitted in February 2025, had demonstrated that the building had high significance. He further stated that his assessment had explained why the principal public benefit claimed by the applicant did not constitute any meaningful benefit.
- Philip Grant stated that he had shown that the proposals failed the test set out in part e of Policy BHC1 but that the Case Officer had wished to recommend approval of the application. It was stated that the Case Officer had therefore asked the applicant's agent to submit a revised heritage statement and, when that version was not considered adequate, had advised the agent on the content that the document ought to include. It was further stated that consultation on this second revised statement had opened on 10 June, although the document itself had not been published until 9 July.
- The objector stated that the comments made by the Heritage Officer in November 2025 included what he described as a serious error and referred specifically to a statement that 28 Hazel Road was not considered to have reached the threshold for local listing. It was noted that if that statement had been correct, the building's significance score could not have been greater than five. It was additionally stated that this was the score the Heritage Officer had assigned. Philip Grant informed the committee that he had raised this error with the Heritage Officer, but felt that the Committee report had

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

continued to rely on what he considered to be an incorrect assertion. It was added that the supplementary report appeared to seek to reinterpret this point, but Philip Grant believed that all non-designated heritage assets identified in 2016 would have scored at least six. It was stated that, in his view, the true significance score was nine.

- Philip Grant further highlighted that the committee report relied upon the public benefits claimed by the applicant's agent yet did not acknowledge his counter arguments. It was stated that the proposal would reduce the amount of dedicated community space by approximately half, to only 115sqm, whereas the applicant's agent had claimed that the figure should be treated as 450sqm. It was felt that this inflated figure included training rooms that might only occasionally be made available for hire. It was noted that the proposed Access Plan condition would apply solely to one small community room.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Philip Grant emphasised that the heritage asset was of high significance and that the public benefits claimed were not sufficiently powerful to justify its demolition and therefore urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The Chair thanked Philip Grant 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 sought clarification from the objector, Philip Grant, regarding the comments made by the Heritage Officer as detailed in the supplementary report in relation to the heritage value of the building. In response, Philip Grant advised that the justification for the heritage score of 9 out of 12, which he had set out in his Alternative Heritage Statement dated February 2025, had been based upon the scoring system approved by the Planning Committee in July 2015. It was stated that this scoring system had subsequently been amended, but at the time of preparing his assessment he had followed the approved guidance on how scores ought to be awarded. Philip Grant further stated that, in his view, the Heritage Officer's proposed assessment, which suggested a low to medium significance score, had relied upon the same four categories contained within the 2015 scoring system. However, he believed that the Heritage Officer had then introduced individual judgement on how the scoring should be applied within each category rather than following the scoring method as originally determined by the Planning Committee.
- The Chair then sought views on whether the objector considered that the entire building possessed a level of heritage significance that justified the high score he had attributed to it. In doing so, the Chair referred to the frontage of the building on Hazel Road, which retained the classical historic façade of the building, and contrasted this with the side and rear elevations, which featured issues relating to overlooking and overgrown trees. In response, Philip Grant emphasised that, aside from some minor alterations,

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

the frontage of the building remained largely unchanged from its original construction in 1888.

- The Chair invited the objector to comment on whether there existed any further public benefits that could be added to those identified within the committee report, which already indicated social infrastructure and community outcomes, design quality, and environmental and climate improvements. The Chair questioned whether, in the objector's view, any such additional benefits could outweigh the harm identified, or whether the demolition of the existing building would be so harmful that no benefit could outweigh it. In response, Philip Grant expressed that there was at present a purpose-built community center constructed approximately 25 years ago immediately adjacent to the application site. It was explained that this facility contained two community rooms and had been built in a Victorian style to be sympathetic to the existing heritage building. It was noted that this had been undertaken by Making the Leap shortly after the organisation had obtained the heritage building from Brent Council. It was added that the heritage building had previously operated as a youth and community center and that, as part of the arrangement with Brent Council, the delivery of a purpose built community center containing two community rooms had been secured. The objector felt that one of the principal public benefits of any redevelopment should have been at least an equivalent replacement of the existing community space. It was additionally stated that the proposal reduced that provision from two rooms to one, and that the single proposed room would be smaller than either of the existing rooms. It was acknowledged that the scheme offered some benefits, including the provision of a larger training space that would be used by local people. However, it was felt that, on the design side, the proposal was entirely out of character with the surrounding area. Philip Grant was of the view that the proposed design conflicted with three separate Brent Local Plan policies which he identified as DNP1, BD1 and BP6 Southeast. In his view, the design therefore did not constitute a benefit but represented an adverse impact. In concluding his response, Philip Grant contended that while some benefits existed, they were not, in his opinion, sufficiently powerful to justify the demolition of the heritage building.
- Views were sought from Philip Grant by members on how he would approach the site if responsibility for redesign rested with him. In response, Philip Grant opined that Making the Leap could make better use of the available space, with particular regard to the rear extension. It was noted that the existing building likely met the relevant requirements so as not to create any risk in respect of the railway tunnels located below the site. It was additionally stated that this constrained the ability to add significant weight through additional construction. Philip Grant proposed that removal of the existing brick rear extension and its replacement with a lightweight extension, designed in a manner consistent with the existing building but of a much smaller scale than that proposed in the application, could increase the amount of training space while retaining the existing community center at 26 Hazel Road intact. In his view, Philip Grant felt that such an approach would deliver improvements without necessitating the demolition of the heritage asset.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

The Chair thanked Philip Grant for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to invite a joint presentation from two Ward Councillors, Councillor Nerva and Councillor L. Smith who shared a speaking slot of 5 minutes in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Councillor L Smith began by confirming that there was no objection in principle to Making the Leap redeveloping the site and acknowledged elements of the application that described increased facilities to support the charity's purposes and trading operations. Notwithstanding that position, three specific concerns were identified.
- The first concern related to height and positioning. The Ward Councillor observed that the proposal was for a 4 storey building. Although the top storey was shown as recessed, the building would be located in close proximity to surrounding properties. While the committee report drew comparisons with other taller buildings in the locality, Councillor L. Smith highlighted that those comparator buildings were situated further away and on lower ground. By contrast, the proposal would sit on the same level as the Victorian terraces on Hazel Road. Councillor L. Smith stated that some of the comparisons in the report relied upon buildings that were positioned further down the slope or further removed from the terraces and would not therefore have an equivalent impact.
- The second concern related to community access. The Ward Councillor accepted that measures concerning glazing and lighting could be valuable in relation to anti-social behaviour. However, with regard to public and community use, reference was made to clause 22 and concern was expressed that the relevant agreement had not been made public, did not form part of the application documentation, and contained no information regarding pricing or access arrangements. Councillor L Smith felt that these matters were of considerable concern to community groups that currently used the space and to those that wished to make use of it in future. The Ward Councillor indicated a desire to see the relevant agreement before any consent was finalised.
- The third concern related to consultation. Councillor L Smith emphasised that although consultation had taken place, it appeared to have been very limited. It was noted that the Committee had initially been informed that 800 letters had been sent, whereas it was now understood that 55 letters had been issued in the first instance. Councillor L Smith stated that the applicant could and should have undertaken greater effort to engage with the community and to secure its support.
- In continuing the presentation to the Committee, Councillor Nerva indicated support for the points raised by Councillor L. Smith and proceeded to highlight further issues. First, Councillor Nerva addressed the footprint and construction matters. The site was described as being enclosed on three sides, with Hazel Road at the front and Hazel Road Open Space along the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

southern and rear boundaries. Councillor Nerva stated that the application and proposed conditions did not make clear how the building would be physically constructed within the overall footprint. It was unclear whether scaffolding would be required on public space to the front on Hazel Road or to the rear within Hazel Road Open Space, which would have a significant impact. It was also unclear whether the proposed footprint would be smaller than the existing, which might allow construction to proceed without encroachment. Councillor Nerva did not feel that these issues had not been properly explored in the committee report.

- Second, Councillor Nerva referred to the issue of benefits to residents. Disappointment was expressed that there were no formal or informal public realm improvements offered as benefits to local residents. Potential areas for improvement were identified as the pedestrianised frontage on Hazel Road and the rear area around Hazel Road Open Space. Referring to the plan, Councillor Nerva drew attention to the map on page 3, noting that while the application site was the oblong area, the remainder comprised Hazel Road Open Space. Councillor Nerva stated that no resident benefits had been identified in relation to these areas.
- Finally, Councillor Nerva observed that the application was not for housing and that no viability study had therefore been provided. Councillor Nerva additionally noted that it was for a developer to bring forward a proposal that met community needs and expressed the view that the proposal in its current form did not meet the needs of the local community. In concluding the presentation to the Committee, Councillor Nerva suggested that an alternative proposal might attract consensus.

The Chair thanked Councillors L. Smith and Nerva 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 Ward Councillors on whether it was felt, given their view that the proposed building was out of keeping with the local area, a development of approximately two to three storeys would be considered more appropriate. In response, Councillor Nerva stated that there was considerable scope for a development that was more in keeping with the character of the area. It was additionally noted that the site was directly abutted by two storey Victorian houses, and therefore a building of a similar scale would be more sympathetic to the surrounding context.
- The Chair then asked the Ward Councillors for their views on whether significant public realm improvements in the immediate locality could alter their position. The Chair observed that the open space had recently benefited from investment, including new play equipment, but that the area immediately outside the site, including the road, trees and benches, would also benefit from further enhancement. The Chair queried whether, if the Committee were to seek additional commitments or conditions to improve these areas, potentially as mitigation for other impacts, this would influence their position.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

The Chair also asked what specific improvements they would seek. In response, Councillor L Smith stated that such improvements would be welcome and that there was local consensus that the area had begun to improve but required further enhancement. However, it was felt that the height of the proposed building remained a significant obstacle.

- The Chair referred to the layout of the site, noting that one side adjoined the open space containing the playground, but that the area behind the building was underused, lacked overlooking, and had attracted episodes of anti-social behaviour. The Chair questioned whether opening up that rear area or creating additional passive surveillance might assist in addressing such issues. In response, Councillor L Smith confirmed that such measures would be helpful. Councillor L Smith accepted that a glazed, well-lit building could improve passive supervision and be beneficial in reducing anti-social behaviour. Councillor L Smith further acknowledged the earlier point raised by Councillor Nerva regarding the length of the construction period and stated that there was a risk of loss of access to the public space and potential damage to it during construction. It was also stated that safeguards would be required to ensure not only that the area was restored but ideally improved as part of the development. Councillor Nerva additionally stated that, should the Committee be minded to grant approval, there would need to be meaningful consideration of the impact of construction on an area that the Council, working with the local community, was striving to improve. It was stressed that it would be highly undesirable for existing Council investment in Hazel Road to be undermined by the effects of construction activity. Councillor L Smith further noted that the committee report referred to harm caused to the use and operation of the open space and playground during construction. It was additionally mentioned that the proposed response was to attach a condition requiring a Construction Ecological Management Plan setting out how the existing ecology of the site would be protected. It was felt that this was not the same as safeguarding the use of the space, ensuring continued access, or maintaining its facilities, all of which were vital given that the park was used daily by young families and older residents.

The Chair thanked Councillors L. Smith and Nerva for responding to the Committee's questions. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a further request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Tunde Banjoko (who had registered to speak as the applicant) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Tunde Banjoko began by informing the Committee that he was the Chief Executive and Founder of Making the Leap and had established the organisation in Harlesden, NW10, in 1993. It was explained that the organisation existed to raise the aspirations of young people from less advantaged backgrounds and to increase their access to opportunities. It was additionally stated that he was a long-standing resident of Brent, that his children had grown up in the borough, and that he was deeply committed to improving outcomes for local young people.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- The applicant advised that Making the Leap had taken ownership of the former Hazel Road Community Centre and the adjoining houses at 26 and 28 Hazel Road in the year 2000. It was stated that the organisation had raised and invested £1.2 million to redevelop what was now known as Harriet Tubman House and to construct the adjoining community centre. Making the Leap had occupied the premises since 2002. Tunde Banjoko further stated that he cared greatly for the area, knew many of the young people who had grown up locally, and had provided youth clubs free of charge and emphasised that he regarded the locality with affection and had a strong personal commitment to supporting the community.
- Tunde Banjoko noted that, with the passage of time, the existing building was no longer fit for purpose. It was explained that the organisation had grown significantly and was assisting increasing numbers of young people through activities that were making meaningful impact both within Brent and beyond. It was highlighted that Making the Leap wished to expand and improve its facilities so that it could offer more support to young people and better serve the local community.
- The applicant further informed the Committee that the site was constrained by its position above Network Rail train tunnels. It was explained that Network Rail had advised the organisation, at the outset of discussions, that no additional weight could be added to the existing structure. As a result, it had been concluded that the only viable option to increase usable space and enhance facilities was to demolish the existing building and construct a new, lighter timber-framed structure. Tunde Banjoko added that he had asked the architects to be mindful of the residential properties opposite, given that those residents were neighbours and that Making the Leap cared about their amenity. It was additionally mentioned that the part of the proposed building that would front Hazel Road would be only marginally higher than the current building and would rise in a straight line rather than including additional massing.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Tunde Banjoko emphasised that the intention behind the proposals was simply to improve the facilities available to the young people whom the organisation existed to support, and to deliver benefits for the wider area.

The Chair thanked Tunde Banjoko 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:

- Noting concerns raised by local residents that the proposed development offered limited community benefit and that the dedicated community facilities would be significantly smaller within a larger building, the Chair asked the applicant to explain what offer was being made to residents of neighbouring streets, particularly in terms of the facilities they would be able to hire and use, and how the proposed development would serve their interests. In response, a member from the applicant's team acknowledged that there

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

would be an overall reduction in the total floor area dedicated to community facilities. The Committee was advised that the existing community facilities were split across a ground floor and a first floor, and that the first floor was accessible only by stairs, with no lift access. It was explained that the proposed scheme would replace this arrangement with a single larger community space on the ground floor. The representative stated that the new space would be significantly larger than either of the existing rooms and would be more flexible, with the capacity to accommodate a wider range of uses. The member from the applicant's team further stated that, from a functional perspective, the proposed facility constituted an improvement, as it would form a single accessible space rather than being divided into two rooms, one of which was currently inaccessible. The Committee was informed that the new facility would also be entirely new, well heated, well lit, and supported by upgraded amenities including modern toilet facilities, making it a more usable and higher quality community space, albeit slightly smaller overall. Tunde Banjoko additionally highlighted that the current building was used for activities such as mothers and toddlers groups and similar sessions. It was explained that, under the new scheme, additional spaces within the building, including upstairs rooms equipped with computers and other facilities, could also be made available for use by community groups. The Committee was advised that the proposed community hall would be larger than either of the existing community rooms and that other usable space would be spread throughout the building once the two existing structures were consolidated into one.

- The Chair noted concerns raised regarding temporary loss of access to the park and the current poor condition of the public realm in front of the building. It was questioned how the applicant intended to minimise construction impacts and what improvements or contributions they might be prepared to commit to in order to enhance the playground or wider public realm. The Chair further queried whether improved public realm, rather than merely making good any damage, could be offered as a community benefit, and asked what specific commitments the applicant might be willing to consider. In response, a member from the applicant's team stated that modern contractors would ordinarily sign up to a considerate contractor scheme, involving measures to limit noise, suppress dust and mitigate disruption. It was noted that the scheme remained at a pre-planning stage, and that no contractor had yet been engaged. It was further stated that detailed construction management measures would typically be secured by condition and approved by officers. The Committee was advised that the proposed structure would be lightweight and would not require significant piling or extended construction periods. It was emphasised that this would limit disruption. On the question of access to the open space, clarity was provided that there was no reason why public access could not be maintained, subject to any minor road closures required for technical reasons.

Concerning additional public realm improvements, it was reiterated that Making the Leap was a charitable organisation and that the new building would be funded entirely through fundraising. It was explained that no fundraising could commence until planning permission had been granted,

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

because the organisation needed certainty about what it would be fundraising for. It was further noted that construction costs had increased significantly due to national inflationary pressures. It was highlighted that any additional obligations for public realm improvements would represent additional costs at a time when the projected cost of the building had already significantly increased since the process began approximately 3 to 4 years earlier.

- The Chair sought reassurance regarding the applicant's ability to secure the necessary funding to deliver the project should planning permission be granted. Questions were raised around what funding sources had been identified and how confident the applicant was that the project could be delivered once permission was in place. In response, Tunde Banjoko highlighted that fundraising could not begin until planning permission was granted. It was confirmed that no development would proceed unless and until all necessary funds had been raised. Assurance was provided to the Committee that if the funds were secured, the development would proceed in full and without delay, but if fundraising were unsuccessful, the scheme would not go ahead.
- Clarification was sought on what additional activities or services the proposed building would facilitate that could not currently be delivered within the existing premises, and what benefits would be gained in terms of outreach and the client groups served. In response, Tunde Banjoko conveyed that when Making the Leap moved into the existing premises in 2002, the building had been of a higher quality than facilities that many young people had previously experienced. Over time, however, schools and workplaces had modernised, while the existing building had not. As a result, young people often felt a stark contrast between the facilities at Making the Leap and the more modern environments they aspired to enter in employment. It was further highlighted that the new building would provide modern, open spaces with high-speed internet access, addressing current difficulties arising from the existing building's layout of corridors and doors. It was explained that the design aimed to create an environment that felt familiar and accessible to young people, making it easier for them to adjust when attending opportunities in Central London. It was further added that the upgraded building would also provide high quality facilities for the wider community. It was further emphasised that the organisation's ambition was to create a modern building capable of serving young people and community groups for the next 100 years.
- Details were sought on how the reduction in dedicated community space could be justified within the context of the proposal. In response, Tunde Banjoko advised that the current community centre operated across two floors, with the upper floor accessible only by stairs. Under the new scheme, a larger community space would be provided on the ground floor, supplemented by additional community-usable spaces upstairs that could be accessed via a lift. It was stated that the new arrangement would improve accessibility and allow the community to use areas that were currently inaccessible.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- Referring to census data identifying disproportionately high levels of disadvantage among young black boys in Brent, members queried whether this was the demographic primarily served by the organisation. In response, Tunde Banjoko that Making the Leap was a social mobility charity working with young people from less advantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, who in Brent disproportionately came from black and Asian communities. The Committee were informed that over 90% of the young people supported by the charity were from black and ethnic minority backgrounds. The organisation provided soft skills training and access to opportunities with major national employers to support young people in progressing into careers and working their way out of poverty. It was further expressed that the work undertaken by the charity was of significant value and constituted a clear positive contribution to Brent.
- Considering the concerns raised by objectors regarding the consultation process, members asked the applicant to respond to the issues that had been identified. In response, a member from the applicant's team noted that it had been suggested that the applicant had indicated that approximately 800 letters would be sent, but that only 55 had been issued. Confirmation was provided that well over 800 letters had in fact been distributed to the community. The Committee was also informed that a community event had also been held on 14 September 2024, which took place shortly before the submission of the application, the timing having been affected by delays relating to Network Rail. It was additionally noted that in the context of a planning application of this nature, a reasonable level of outreach had been undertaken. It was further stated that the existing community centre was located on the doorstep of the community and that the applicant had always been available for dialogue. It was emphasised that those conversations would continue should permission be granted, as the applicant was part of the community and intended to maintain engagement. It was acknowledged that the organisation was a charity and therefore limited in the resources available, but it was considered that the level of consultation conducted had been sufficient.
- Members were keen to seek details on what changes to the proposal had been made in response to the feedback received during consultation. In response, a member from the applicant's team confirmed that feedback had influenced the development of the proposal. One of the key areas of change concerned the massing of the building. The Committee was informed that the scheme had originally comprised a larger and more rectilinear form. However, following pre-application discussions and stakeholder engagement, massing had been drawn back from the edges of the building, particularly at the top storey. It was explained that this adjustment had increased structural costs but had been undertaken in response to community concerns regarding townscape appearance, daylight and sunlight impact. As a result, the recessed upper storey was designed so that it would not be readily visible from street level. It was stated that the building would present as a three-

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

storey structure in most views, with only long range and elevated viewpoints able to perceive the fourth storey.

- In commending the applicant for work undertaken with the community, details were sought on whether the design process had taken into account the heritage character of the area. In response, Tunde Banjoko conveyed that the organisation would have preferred to retain and build upon the existing structure. However, Network Rail had made clear that no increase in structural weight could be permitted above the railway tunnels. It was further explained that the need to increase usable space, combined with the weight restriction, had necessitated the development of a lightweight replacement structure. It was additionally noted that attempts had been made to explore retention of the existing building, but the weight constraint made this unfeasible and had influenced the final form of the proposal.
- Following on from the previous question, details were sought on whether alternatives to the proposed height had been explored in order to better align with the scale of surrounding buildings. In response, a member from the applicant's team stated that all possible alternatives had been considered and advised that it was not feasible to excavate a basement due to cost and the presence of railway tunnels. The footprint was also constrained by the surrounding streets, the open space and the parkland. It was further explained that floor to ceiling heights had been minimised to the extent possible to ensure functional spaces while keeping the overall height as low as practicable. It was additionally stated that the proposal represented the most efficient use of the available area and volume given the constraints.

The Chair thanked Tunde Banjoko and members of the applicant's 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 questioned how, in developing the proposed scheme, consideration had been given to ensuring that the design was in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. In response, Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Manager) advised that the starting point for assessment was the existing building, which he described as unique in form. It was stated that recreating what currently existed was not considered to be an appropriate design solution. It was explained that, in many cases, it was preferable to introduce a modern building of high quality and distinct appearance rather than to seek to replicate historic forms in a manner that risked appearing as a pastiche or a false addition to the street. Members were also informed that extending the existing structure was not feasible. Reference was made to the design section of the committee report, in which the proposed design quality was set out as being appropriate for the site. It was additionally noted that the perception of the building would vary depending upon a viewer's position. It was further explained that views close to the building, particularly within Hazel Road, would not reveal upper levels, whereas views from the park or more distant vantage points would show the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

building differently and would offset the perceived scale. For these reasons, the design was considered appropriate when assessed in its full visual context.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further advised that the design and character assessment had regard to designated heritage assets in the vicinity, including conservation areas and the listed park. It was indicated that these considerations formed part of the officer evaluation. It was added that there were existing buildings of four to five storeys on Harrow Road, located on the opposite side of Hazel Grove Open Space and further west. It was also noted that parts of Harrow Road were designated as an intensification corridor within the Local Plan, meaning that gradual change in character and development up to five storeys was anticipated. The proposal was therefore viewed in the context of this transitional character.

- The Chair questioned how officers were ensuring that the proposed outdoor terrace would not adversely impact neighbouring properties. Slides were presented illustrating the proposed site plan. In response, Victoria McDonagh noted that the separation distances between the lower floors of the proposed building and the properties opposite on Hazel Road were approximately 15 metres. It was explained that this reflected the established pattern of development, where shallow front gardens formed part of the local townscape. It was further explained that the upper floor containing the roof terrace was set back significantly, providing a distance of 19 metres between directly facing elevations. Reference was made to Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD1), which recommended a guidance distance of 18 metres between facing buildings while acknowledging that flexibility existed in areas where shorter distances formed part of the established character or where efficient use of land was required. It was further stated that the terrace would include screening and that any overlooking would be similar to that experienced at other floors, primarily directed towards the public realm of Hazel Road rather than private gardens. Damian Manhertz further mentioned that a condition was proposed requiring a site management plan, which would include controls such as hours of use and measures to prevent inappropriate use of the terrace.
- The Chair questioned how the heritage significance scoring undertaken by officers compared with the views held by local groups. In addition, the Chair queried why officers were confident that the scoring before the Committee represented the correct assessment, noting that this would affect the balance between public benefits and heritage harm. In response, Harry Lewis (Principal Heritage Officer) conveyed that the numerical scoring system was relevant only for determining whether a building merited inclusion on the Local List. It was emphasised that determining its heritage significance for planning purposes was a separate exercise. It was stated that, in his professional judgement, the building possessed heritage interest and some heritage significance but did not reach the threshold required for local listing. It was confirmed that he had applied the four metrics used for local list assessment, these being authenticity, architectural interest, historical interest

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

and townscape importance. For authenticity, which considered the extent to which the original fabric and form of the building could still be understood, the Principal Heritage Officer had assigned a score of 1 out of a possible 3. It was explained that while there was some ability to appreciate the building in its original form, there had been several phases of alteration, and only one elevation retained a meaningful degree of authenticity. For architectural interest, the Principal Heritage Officer had assigned a further score of 1, stating that only one elevation exhibited architectural qualities of interest. For historical interest, which assessed the extent to which the building illustrated or was associated with significant local history, the Principal Heritage Officer had assigned a score of 2 out of 3. It was stated that while the building had a long history of approximately 125 years and several associative features, he did not consider these to be of special significance. For townscape importance, the Principal Heritage Officer had assigned a score of 1. It was explained that the building was no longer experienced within its original street plan, as its immediate setting had been altered by demolition of surrounding terraces. The Principal Heritage Officer did not consider the building sufficiently prominent or distinctive to constitute a townscape marker. It was noted that this total score of 5 out of a possible 12 meant that the building would fall short of local listing. It was further stated that the Principal Heritage Officer had undertaken a comparative analysis of similar mission halls and ecclesiastical buildings within Brent and across London, and that the building scored relatively low when assessed in that wider context. It was concluded that while the building was a non-designated heritage asset with some significance, it was not found to be essential to protect.

- Assurance was sought by members that the building, once constructed, would be managed in accordance with the approved plans and would not change its use in the future without oversight. In response, Victoria McDonagh reassured members that conditions would be imposed regarding the use of the building, including a community access plan and an operational management plan. It was confirmed that any future change of use would require a further planning application, which would be assessed against the planning policies in force at the time. It was further explained that heritage policy required decision makers to consider the significance of non-designated heritage assets whether or not they were included on the Local List. Reference was made to paragraph 2.1.6 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which required the consideration of the effect of proposals on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset and to undertake a balanced judgement, weighing any harm or loss against the scale and nature of the significance. Confirmation was provided that officers had carried out that balancing exercise and had recognised that demolition would cause harm, which had been weighed against the benefits of the scheme.
- Clarification was sought, in relation to the authenticity score, whether officers were required to consider the potential for reversing previous alterations to the building and what impact such reinstatement might have, should reversal be possible. In response, Harry Lewis (Principal Heritage Officer) conveyed that in considering such matters, two key concepts were relevant, namely optimum viable use and proportionality. It was explained that, when

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

assessing whether reversal of alterations was appropriate, officers must consider whether reinstatement was genuinely desirable. Regard would be had to whether any reinstatement would risk resulting in a pastiche and whether there was sufficient certainty regarding the building's former appearance to justify attempts at restoration. Harry Lewis further stated that proportionality was a critical factor and advised that the building was not of sufficient heritage interest to justify a restoration exercise of that nature. It was acknowledged that individuals, including himself, may have personal or local attachment to buildings encountered in daily life, but emphasised that heritage assessment was undertaken within the national framework, with significance being evaluated against comparators and local building typologies. It was concluded that the building was not of a level of significance that would warrant reinstatement and that any extension intended to restore an earlier form would likely dilute the ability to understand the building. In his professional judgement, reversal was not proportionate and would not be justified.

- Reference was made to the detail provided within the committee report, which stated that the open character of the plot would be retained and that the design of the proposed building, while different, would not appear unusual for a community facility. Members questioned why the committee report did not make clearer that the buildings to the south of Harrow Road, used as comparators, were situated at a significantly lower level and at a considerable distance. In response, Damian Manhertz explained that the report referred to the existence of other four storey buildings to establish that the height proposed was not inherently out of character within the broader context. It was further clarified that assessment was not based solely on the height of surrounding buildings but also on how the proposed building would be viewed within its specific setting. It was additionally noted that the relationship between the proposed building and its surroundings was influenced by the presence of open space and the park, which provided separation and visual relief. It was further mentioned that from key vantage points the proposed building would not appear unduly bulky or dominant. It was added that the existing building already had a substantial ridge height, and the increase in height was not equivalent to an additional two or three full storeys above the current form. It was also stated that the massing was further mitigated by the recessing of the upper storey, which reduced visual impact. Victoria McDonagh additionally highlighted that the proposal had been reviewed by urban design officers who had assessed the height, massing and design quality within its broader context and had concluded that the proposal was acceptable and confirmed that they were supportive of the scheme.
- Questions were raised around what arrangements were proposed for blue badge holders. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader – Development Control, Transport Planning) stated that the scheme was a car free development and that there was no space within the site boundary to provide off street parking. It was confirmed that any blue badge parking would therefore need to occur on street. Members were advised that double yellow lines were present along the frontage of the site, and that blue badge holders

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

were permitted to park for up to three hours on double yellow lines, which was considered sufficient to support community centre use.

- The Committee queried whether the issue of scaffolding over public space during construction could be addressed at this stage. In response, Victoria McDonagh advised that detailed construction planning would be undertaken following the grant of any planning permission, during which building control matters and construction logistics would be finalised. It was noted that the proposal included a pre-commencement condition, which prevented any works from beginning until the condition had been discharged. It was confirmed that consultation with the Highways Team would occur at that stage. If any element of construction required encroachment on the public highway, this would require a separate agreement with the Highways Licensing Team. It was emphasised that the purpose of the planning condition was to manage construction to minimise disruption while ensuring appropriate engagement with relevant Council teams. John Fletcher (Team Leader – Development Control, Transport Planning) further mentioned that the applicant had prepared a draft construction plan. It was stated that scaffolding over the highway was feasible, provided that a pedestrian tunnel was maintained beneath it so that the footway remained open.
- Members noted that the 2016 local list review process stated that the side building was not locally listed because it had not reached the necessary threshold and questioned whether this meant the building had been assessed at that time, or whether it had simply not undergone a full assessment. Clarification was sought on when the assessment had actually taken place. In response, Harry Lewis (Principal Heritage Officer) explained that he had joined Brent approximately 6 months earlier and that comments previously made during the application process had been provided by his predecessor, who had been employed on a meanwhile contract. Reference was made to the 2019 Heritage Strategy, which included several categories of assets. It was further explained that the Local List comprised buildings that had undergone full assessment and had been formally adopted. A separate long list included buildings raised by community members, by the heritage officer, or by other interested parties as potential candidates for assessment. It was stated that the building in question appeared on the long list, meaning that it was recognised as having some heritage merit but had not been formally assessed for suitability for inclusion on the Local List.

David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) provided further information that the process for assessing heritage impact was the same regardless of whether a building appeared on the Local List. It was stated that decision makers were required to identify the harm generated by the loss of the non-designated heritage asset and to weigh that harm against the benefits, as set out in the committee report. It was acknowledged that differing professional views had been expressed regarding the degree of historical significance associated with the building. It was noted that where significance was greater, harm would weigh more heavily. It was emphasised, however, that the same balancing exercise must be undertaken whether or not the building was on the Local List.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

Victoria McDonagh provided further clarification that statutory listed buildings, such as Grade I, Grade II and Grade II* buildings, required listed building consent for internal alterations. Non-designated heritage assets, including locally listed buildings and buildings identified as having heritage value, did not benefit from statutory protection and would not require listed building consent, although planning permission might still be required depending on the nature of works. It was reported that officers had recommended conditions requiring a full survey of the building prior to any works, to ensure that the Historic Environment Record contained an accurate record. Members were also advised that conditions would require incorporation of memorabilia within the proposed building, such as a plaque or display boards, referencing the site's history. It was additionally stated that engagement with the Local History Society was recommended as part of this process.

DECISION

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

- (1) The completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report, together with an additional condition:
 - That no demolition of Harriett Tubman House should take place until a binding contract has been entered into for the demolition and construction of the new development.

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 6 in favour of granting planning permission, 1 in favour of refusal and 1 abstention).

5. **25/3070 - North Eastern Lands (Plots NE04, NE05 and NE06) - Land bound by Engineers Way, to the south and Fulton Road to the North and East, Wembley**

PROPOSAL

Temporary use of land for meanwhile land uses comprising of; an outdoor sports facility (Use Class F2) to provide 5 five-a-side floodlit all weather football pitches with a single storey pavilion building and an ancillary support area; a temporary building for use as a leisure, entertainment and events venue with storage buildings and external plant equipment in an ancillary support area; boundary treatment; shared informal public realm (with new seating, lighting and CCTV) along with provision for cycle parking, accessible car parking, and an internal vehicular access route with vehicular drop off.

RECOMMENDATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

That the Committee resolved to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee report, together with an amendment to the wording of condition 10 to remove reference to "Plot 01".

Jasmin Tailor (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the temporary planning permission for the meanwhile use of the land comprising of an outdoor sports facility (Use Class F2) to provide five 5-a-side floodlit all weather football pitches with a 133sqm single-storey pavilion building and an ancillary support area, a temporary building (3600sqm) for use as a leisure, entertainment and events venue with storage buildings and external plant equipment in an ancillary support area, alterations to the boundary treatment, a central shared informal public realm (with new seating, lighting and CCTV) along with provision for cycle parking, accessible car parking, and an internal vehicular access route with vehicular drop off area. The meanwhile uses would be for a period of 3 years, after which time it is envisaged that these parts of the wider Quintain Wembley Park development could be delivered. Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which outlined amendments to the hours of operation and lighting for Plot 01 and the type of cycle parking spaces. 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. Officers then presented slides taken from the drawing pack to illustrate the proposed plans.

The Chair thanked Jasmin Tailor 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 Brett Harbutt (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Brett Harbutt began by highlighting that the application sought permission for the temporary and meanwhile use of land within the North Eastern Lands area of the Wembley Park Masterplan, pending the delivery of the permanent development envisaged for the site. The Committee were informed that the proposal introduced two high-quality interim land uses, each situated on its own defined plot.
- It was stated that Plot 1 would accommodate a total of 5 five-a-side football pitches together with a pavilion building providing changing room facilities. Plot 2 would contain a temporary building intended to house a family friendly indoor immersive exhibition. The Committee were advised that both uses would be supported by a shared area of public realm incorporating lighting, closed circuit television, cycle parking, accessible visitor parking and an internally managed access road with provision for vehicular drop off.
- The applicant's representative stated that the purpose of the application was to transform an underused area of hardstanding into an active, welcoming

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

and beneficial space. Members were informed that both the London Plan and the Brent Local Plan encouraged the use of vacant or underutilised land for temporary purposes where such uses could introduce vitality and social value. Brett Harbutt emphasised that the proposal aligned directly with those policy objectives by creating a vibrant destination for sport, activity and family entertainment during the period before the long-term residential development of the land advanced under the Wembley Park Masterplan.

- In outlining the benefits of the scheme, Brett Harbutt highlighted that the outdoor pitches would provide accessible and affordable local sports provision, which Brent's planning policies specifically supported. One of the pitches would be made available free of charge to charities, community groups, youth organisations and local schools for the duration of the temporary use. This benefit would be secured by condition and was intended to increase participation in sport and support wellbeing within the local area.
- Turning to Plot 2, the applicant's representative stated that the immersive exhibition venue would host the Mundo Pixar exhibition, which was internationally recognised and would broaden Wembley's cultural offer. It was anticipated that the exhibition would reinforce Wembley's position as a national and international visitor destination. The Committee were informed that job opportunities arising from the venue would be advertised to local residents through Brent Works. In addition, discounted tickets would be offered to local residents and free tickets would be allocated to local schools and charities to promote engagement with the exhibition.
- The representative further advised that the shared public realm supporting the temporary uses had been designed to be safe and inclusive, featuring lighting, landscaping and closed-circuit television, and would be managed and maintained by the Quintain Wembley Park Estate Team.
- In respect of amenity considerations, it was noted that the committee report confirmed that lighting and noise impacts were acceptable, subject to controls secured through the proposed planning conditions.
- Regarding transport matters, Brett Harbutt stated that the site benefitted from strong public transport connections, including bus, rail and Underground services, and that cycle access had been prioritised. Transport impacts had been robustly assessed and, during the application process, the proposed drop-off provision had been reduced to five spaces. This provision was not intended to encourage car use but was a practical response to operational issues locally, designed to prevent unsafe stopping and congestion on the public highway through clear time limits and enforcement. Whilst the development would be promoted as car free, those who needed to travel by car would be directed to existing Pink and Red car parks.
- In concluding his address to the Committee, Brett Harbutt stated that the proposal was a well-designed, policy-compliant, time limited and community focused scheme that would enhance Wembley Park during a transitional

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

period and contribute to Brent's cultural, leisure and economic objectives. For these reasons, and in line with the officer recommendation, the applicant representative requested that the Committee approve the planning application.

The Chair thanked Brett Harbutt 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:

- Members noted that there appeared to be limited detail regarding the nature of the public realm elements within the proposal and requested a summary of what was being added, what changes were being made and how it would be ensured that the space would be usable. In addition, members sought information regarding the accessibility of the 5 five-a-side pitches, including the ease of access for bookings and how it would be ensured that residents from different backgrounds across the estate would be able to access the facilities fairly. In response, a member from the applicant's team explained that the landscaping details for the public realm would be secured through a planning condition requiring the submission of further information within three months of opening. Should planning consent be granted, the applicant would submit the required information within the forthcoming months. It was stated that the public realm would include a central space with seating and areas where individuals could wait prior to attending either the football pitches or the Mundo experience. This area would therefore allow people to congregate and wait for their allocated time slots. It was added that the public realm would include cycle parking and that the internal access road would be clearly marked to ensure that the site was safe and accessible. Visitors would be able to identify where to park and how to navigate the one-way route through the site and back onto the highway.

Brett Harbutt addressed the Member's second question regarding accessibility to the football pitches and stated that a planning condition had been agreed requiring free of charge access to one of the pitches during specified time limited slots for charities, community groups, youth groups and local schools for the lifetime of the development. This secured the community benefit through the planning process. It was noted that the precise booking system would depend on the operator. However, members were advised that the prospective operator was an established provider of football pitch facilities and would have an online booking platform. It was further added that the operator had expressed a willingness to work with the local community and that discussions were already taking place with the Football Association (FA) regarding opportunities for community activity, including engagement with organisations such as Middlesex Football Association. It was additionally noted that these matters remained subject to contractual agreement.

- Members sought details on which pitch would be offered for community use and what the plans were for the operation of the pitches. In response, a member from the applicant's team stated that this detail had not yet been finalised, as discussions with the prospective operator were ongoing. It was confirmed that although one pitch would be made available for community

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

use, it did not mean that the same pitch would always be allocated. Depending on bookings and the sizes of groups attending, a different pitch could be provided at different times. The arrangement would therefore be managed flexibly.

- Members then asked whether consideration had been given to restricting the hours of use of the pitch closest to nearby residential developments, in order to reduce noise. In response, a member from the applicant's team indicated that no such restriction had been proposed. It was confirmed that a noise assessment and lighting assessment had been submitted and reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, who had concluded that the impacts were not significant and that use of the pitches up to 22:30pm was acceptable. It was also noted that the previous use of the football pitches operated until 23:00pm, and that no objections had been received at that time.
- Members sought clarification regarding the meaning of 'time limited access' in relation to the free community pitch. In response, a member from the applicant's team clarified that a planning condition, set out in the committee papers, identified the specific hours during which the free pitch would be available to the community and local schools. These time slots were aligned with the hours of the former football pitch use on the site and had therefore been replicated in the new application.
- Concerns were expressed that, in the event of a maintenance or repair issue affecting the pitch allocated for community use, the operator might delay repairs because the pitch would not be generating revenue. Members were therefore keen to seek details on what measures were in place to ensure that the community benefit would still be delivered. In response, a member from the applicant's team clarified that there would be no single designated pitch for community use. Instead, community access would apply to one of the five pitches at any given time. Therefore, if one pitch was unavailable due to maintenance or repair, another pitch would be offered in its place for the time slot allocated to community groups.
- The Chair queried how the site would transition at the end of the three year temporary permission period, specifically whether the structures would be recycled or reused elsewhere and how the scheme would connect to the long term masterplan. In response, Brett Harbutt stated that, in relation to the football pitches, there were two principal structures. The pavilion structure was typical of the pavilions used across the operator's other venues. It was explained that a similar structure previously used by Power League on the site in 2020 had been demounted and transported to Northumberland for reuse, demonstrating that the pavilion could be recycled. It was further stated that the astro turf may have a limited lifespan but that the sand and hardcore used to form the level base would be reused. In relation to Plot 2, it was highlighted that the leisure venue structure was designed to be demounted and used internationally for a range of purposes including events, sports arenas and exhibitions. The applicant concluded that, with the exception of

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

the astro turf, the majority of materials would be reused at other venues upon the conclusion of the temporary permission.

- As a final query to the applicant's representative, the Chair questioned what plans were in place to enforce against informal parking. In response, Brett Harbutt stated that the opportunity had been used to implement good estate management practices that were already in place across the wider estate. These included improved lighting and the installation of closed circuit television. It was confirmed that there were 6 accessible parking bays and 5 drop-off bays within the site. It was explained that the closed circuit television cameras operated automatic number plate recognition technology, which would be used to enforce the 3 hour maximum waiting period for accessible bays and the 20 minute maximum waiting period for pick-up and drop-off locations. It was further confirmed that facilities management staff and estate security officers were present throughout the estate and enforced these measures at all times. It was also stated that the estate had full coverage over 24 hours.

The Chair thanked Brett Harbutt and members of the applicant's 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:

- As an initial query, members referred to paragraph 22 of the committee report and the proposed timetable and hours of operation for community groups. It was questioned whether this would be a stipulated condition, given that any period in which the pitches might be unusable could restrict community access. In response, Jasmin Tailor (Career Grade Planning Officer) confirmed that the timetable referred to formed part of Condition 10 of the draft decision notice and that the table had been taken directly from the Operational Management Plan.
- Further clarification was sought on the wording and the drawing referenced within Condition 10, as members observed that the condition stated that a specific pitch was identified on the drawing, while the applicant had earlier suggested that any 1 of the 4 pitches could be used. Officers presented slides from the drawing pack. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that the site comprised 2 plots. Plot 1 showed 5 five-a-side football pitches. Plot 2 contained the Pixar building. It was clarified that Plot 1 did not refer to any single pitch but to the full set of pitches as shown on the plans.
- Members raised three supplementary questions, with the first question concerning whether the community space would be affordable for the most disadvantaged community groups within Wembley Park, the surrounding neighbourhood and local social housing estates. The second question related to whether the public realm space, once detailed plans had been submitted, would be assessed to ensure that it was usable, accessible and would not encourage antisocial behaviour, particularly in potentially dark or enclosed

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

spaces. The third question concerned the likely increase in demand for loading and unloading created by the two new plots. Members noted that this could lead to a greater number of vehicles stopping on double yellow lines, thereby causing increased traffic and additional related issues, potentially tripling existing pressures on the eastern stretch of Fulton Road. Details were sought on what measures were being taken to ensure that this situation did not arise. In addressing the final question, Jehan Weerasinghe (Corporate Director Neighbourhoods and Regeneration) stated that parking fell within public realm responsibilities and highways enforcement and advised that such matters did not form part of planning considerations and therefore could not be considered by members when determining the application. It was acknowledged that the issue was valid but reiterated that it fell within public highways enforcement rather than the planning process.

John Fletcher (Team Leader Development Control) additionally noted that the site included a dedicated drop off area containing 6 disabled bays and 5 drop off bays, which would reduce pressure on Fulton Road. It was further highlighted that the wider Wembley Estate was a public transport destination and referred to survey findings indicating that only 3% of visitors travelled by car. It was also stated that planning policy did not seek to promote car use.

In addressing the first question, Sean Newton (Development Management Planning Manager) confirmed that Condition 19, as set out on page 104 of the committee report, required the applicant to submit a detailed landscaping plan within 3 months and noted that officers would consider and review the plan on receipt.

- Details were sought on whether local residents living in the Wembley area could be offered a discounted scheme for booking the pitches, to improve accessibility for the wider community. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) explained that there was no policy basis to require discounted access for general residents. It was confirmed that while planning policy could secure community access to facilities, this did not extend to residents in the immediate vicinity. It was further stated that the Council could not request such a discount through planning conditions, although the applicant was free to offer it voluntarily. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the applicant consider offering a discount scheme for Brent residents for at least 1 of the football pitches to provide a meaningful benefit for Brent residents and expressed the hope that the applicant would engage with ward councillors and other stakeholders to identify an appropriate mechanism for implementing such a scheme.

DECISION

Having considered the application, the Committee **RESOLVED:**

- (1) to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives, as detailed in the main and updated within the supplementary committee report, together with an amendment to the wording of condition 10 to remove reference to "Plot 01".

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- (2) that as an additional recommendation the applicant be encouraged to consider the introduction of a discount scheme for Brent residents for at least one of the football pitches, in order to provide a meaningful benefit for the local community. The Committee expressed the hope that the applicant would engage with ward councillors and other relevant stakeholders to identify an appropriate mechanism for the implementation of such a scheme

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous).

6. **25/1029 - 7 Randall Avenue, London, NW2 7RL**

PROPOSAL

Proposed demolition of garage and x3 sheds and, erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, addition of new fence to south side of the site, provision of 2 car parking spaces, cycle and refuse storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolved to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as detailed in the main committee report and removal of the conditions as set out within the supplementary report.

Sarah Dilley (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the proposed demolition of garage and x3 sheds and, erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, provision of 2 car parking spaces, cycle, and refuse storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue. Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which outlined an error that had been identified within the Summary of Key Issues section of the committee report. It was explained that the error appeared within the Flood Risk and Drainage subsection, where reference had been made to the need for a condition requiring the submission of a drainage strategy. It was confirmed that such a condition was not considered necessary and that no drainage condition had therefore been included. Sarah Dilley (Principal Planning Officer) further reported that an additional objection had been submitted, which raised concerns primarily relating to biodiversity net gain and the status of the proposed self-build exemption. It was stated that officers had undertaken a further review of these matters, including an assessment of relevant appeal decisions. It was noted that although the supplementary report had suggested the use of conditions to secure both the self-build exemption and any biodiversity net gain requirements, subsequent legal advice had been sought and additional research undertaken. It was confirmed that officers now considered it more appropriate for these matters to be secured through a legal agreement in order to ensure compliance with the self-build definition or, alternatively, to secure biodiversity net gain should that be required. Sarah Dilley (Principal Planning Officer) further advised that an email had been received earlier that day which contained several attachments, including a petition with 251 signatures, a copy of the Brent Council Article 4 Direction for

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

the Homestead Park Conservation Area, the character appraisal for the conservation area, and a photograph that depicted enforcement officers outside 7 Randall Avenue. The Committee were advised that much of the content contained within the email and the petition had already been addressed within the consultation section of the committee report. It was further noted that the email referred to a Home Office investigation at 7 Randall Avenue. It was confirmed that although the use of 7 Randall Avenue had been considered within the officer report, the referenced investigation was not a material planning consideration. It was also explained that the email made reference to covenants affecting the land, but it was reiterated that covenants were likewise not material planning considerations for the purposes of determining the application.

The recommendation remained to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as detailed in the committee report, removal of the conditions as set out within the supplementary report and additional requirement for a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following Heads of Terms:

- A requirement to submit the Statutory Biodiversity Metric to identify the pre-development biodiversity value of the site prior to commencement of development.
- In the event that the house is not construction as a self-build in line with the legal definition of Self Build and Custom Build Housing or subsequently sold or occupied for persons other than the applicant within 3 years after the house is completed to notify the Council in writing. The owner would then be required to secure off-site BNG units either through registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits to secure the 10% net gain in biodiversity, with such evidence submitted to the Council.

The Chair thanked Sarah Dilley (Principal Planning Officer) 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 Tim Waters (who had registered to speak as an objector online) to address the Committee in relation to the application.

While audio technical issues were being resolved with the online speaker, the Chair proceeded to invite Murtaza Poptani (who had registered to speak as the Agent) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Murtaza Poptani began by highlighting that the proposal concerned a backland site for a single-family dwelling and acknowledged the planning history, including the previously dismissed appeal. Members were advised that in the applicants view the key issue before the Committee was that officers had undertaken a detailed assessment of the revised scheme in the context of that history and were satisfied that the amended proposal had addressed and overcome the earlier reasons for refusal, particularly those relating to scale, bulk, height and design.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- It was clarified that the proposal was materially lower and smaller than the scheme dismissed at appeal. The Agent stated that the current maximum height was approximately 6.65 metres, representing a reduction of around 1.6 metres compared with the appeal scheme and being lower than the height permitted under the earlier outline consent. It was noted that officers had concluded that, when considered alongside the amended roof form and the revised siting of the building, the development would not appear visually dominant or harmful to the prevailing character of the area, including views from the adjacent Homestead Park Conservation Area.
- In relation to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, Murtaza Poptani noted that the officer report confirmed full compliance with the Council's adopted guidance. It was highlighted that the development sat below the 30 degree and 45-degree lines, that appropriate separation distances had been maintained, and that privacy would be secured, where necessary, through conditions. This included the requirement for obscure glazing to the dormer window facing Dollis Hill Lane. It was also noted that officers had concluded that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm by way of loss of light, outlook or privacy.
- In acknowledging that concerns had been raised regarding the proposed basement the Agent reported that officers had confirmed that the site lay within Flood Zone 1, that the Basement Impact Assessment was acceptable for planning purposes, and that matters relating to construction methodology, drainage and safety were appropriately controlled through pre commencement conditions and through compliance with Building Regulations.
- On the matter of parking and access, Murtaza Poptani stated that the proposal provided 2 off street parking spaces, which was consistent with the previous outline approval and compliant with the maximum parking standards. The scheme also included provision for cycle storage, electric vehicle charging, and a turning area to allow vehicles to exit the site in a forward gear. It was additionally noted that Transport Officers had raised no objection, subject to conditions.
- In concluding his address to the Committee, Murtaza Poptani highlighted that the proposal would deliver a high quality, family sized dwelling that met all space standards, accessibility requirements and water efficiency standards, and would contribute in a modest but meaningful way to the delivery of housing within the Borough. For these reasons and having regard to the detailed and balanced assessment presented within the officer report, the Agent confirmed support for the recommendation and requested that the Committee grant planning permission.

The Chair thanked Murtaza Poptani 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:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- As an initial query, the Chair questioned why the proposal included 2 parking spaces for what had been defined as a modest garden development, and why only 2 spaces had been provided rather than 1. In response, Murtaza Poptani explained that 1 parking space had been allocated to the existing dwelling and 1 parking space had been allocated to the proposed dwelling.
- The Chair then queried what consideration had been given within the design to the turning area and the refuse store. In response, Murtaza Poptani stated that the refuse store had been positioned in its proposed location because it was required to be within a specified distance of the highway. It was explained that, in relation to the previous application, it had been determined that the refuse store must be situated in that location in order to allow for collection by refuse operatives. It was confirmed that the design had therefore deliberately placed the refuse store in that position.

As there were no further Committee questions raised at this point, and following the resolution of the technical difficulties, the Chair returned to the request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Tim Waters (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Tim Waters began by noting that the application followed 2 previous applications that had been refused by the Council, including one that had been dismissed on appeal in March 2024. It was also noted that, in dismissing that appeal, the Inspector had concluded that a dwelling of a similar size would not relate positively to the existing context and character of the area and would therefore be contrary to planning policy. It was stated that the current proposal was no better and contained multiple shortcomings that equally justified refusal.
- That there appeared to be no legal mechanism proposed to secure the dwelling as a self-build development, despite appeal precedent and case law determining that such a mechanism was necessary. It was noted that the applicant was a company specialising in the letting of owned or leased real estate, including the operation of No. 7 Randall Avenue as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), and therefore the claim that the dwelling would be occupied by the company owner appeared unlikely. It was highlighted that officers were recommending the imposition of a condition to secure the self-build and occupancy restriction on what the objector described as the spurious basis that it would be too costly for the applicant to enter into a section 106 agreement. The speaker further maintained that the use of a condition was wholly inappropriate, could not be legally enforced, and would not prevent the property from being sold to an unrelated individual within the defined self-build period. The objector considered this completely unacceptable and contrary to the primary purpose of the legislation relating to self-build housing.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- Tim Waters stated that without a legally enforceable self-build mechanism, the development could not be exempt from the mandatory requirement for a 10% biodiversity net gain, contrary to the applicant's claim.
- It was further highlighted that the proposal incorporated a 60sqm basement, comprising nearly 40% of the overall gross internal area of the dwelling, which had been predominantly allocated as an entertainment and games room. The objector contended that the Basement Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant was wholly inadequate. It was noted that it had not been prepared by a certified or qualified engineer and failed to assess likely impacts on groundwater, surface water run off and land or structural stability, all of which should properly be assessed as part of the application.
- In addition, the proposed means of access to the new dwelling was felt to be entirely inadequate, including for construction purposes. It was noted that the access was only 2.8 metres wide and was shared with No. 9. which it was felt created an obvious risk of pedestrian and vehicular conflict, which the application and the officer report had failed to address.
- Tim Waters observed that no urban greening factor calculation had been undertaken, contrary to planning policy.
- Concern was also expressed that the proposal included an additional parking space intended to serve the adjoining House in Multiple Occupation at No. 7 Randall Avenue. It was felt that this raised clear privacy concerns and indicated that the new dwelling may similarly be operated as a House in Multiple Occupation.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Tim Waters respectfully requested that the Committee refuse planning permission.

The Chair thanked Tim Waters for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

- Members questioned, with reference to the supplementary report, whether confidence could be maintained in the wider construction method and associated mitigation measures, given the identification of an error in the Basement Impact Assessment. It was further queried whether the proposed drainage arrangements remained sound in light of this error. In response, Sarah Dilley (Principal Planning Officer) highlighted that, in respect of drainage, the site was located within Flood Zone 1, which was categorised as being at low risk of flooding. It was confirmed that, taking into account the scale of the proposed development and the extent of landscaping, officers were satisfied that the arrangements were acceptable and that there was no requirement for a drainage condition. In relation to the Basement Impact

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

Assessment, members were advised that matters concerning structural integrity would also be addressed through compliance with Building Regulations.

- The Chair then sought clarification regarding the proposed driveway, which measured 2.9 metres in width. The Chair noted that vehicle sizes were increasing on average and added that refuse bins were occasionally brought along the side of the property. The Chair expressed concern that pedestrians would also be required to use this access route, including during hours of darkness, and queried whether the arrangement provided a safe means of access to the dwelling. The Chair questioned what assessment had been undertaken and whether restrictions on parking could be considered in order to reduce risk. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader Development Control) noted that the dwelling would be served by a driveway measuring slightly under 3 metres in width, which currently provided access to garages at the rear of No. 7 and No. 9 Randall Avenue. It was confirmed that this would be the sole point of access for the new dwelling. Members were further advised that the width aligned with British Standards for a driveway serving a single house, and this was the basis upon which officers had assessed its suitability. It was explained that a separate footway would not normally be expected for access to a single dwelling and that the driveway was intended solely for cars. It was emphasised that refuse vehicles would not use the driveway and confirmed that the proposed bin store was situated within 20 metres of the highway, which complied with the standards for refuse collection. It was also noted that the applicant proposed improvements to the surface and lighting of the driveway, which would enhance safety.
- Turning to the question of whether a reduction in parking provision could be considered, John Fletcher (Team Leader Development Control) stated that this was challenging because the proposal concerned a family dwelling, where car ownership was typically higher, particularly for households with children. He noted that the site had a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 2, which indicated relatively limited transport accessibility. He further observed that the surrounding street already experienced high parking demand, had little spare capacity, and was not subject to a Controlled Parking Zone. For these reasons, he considered that off-street parking was necessary to avoid additional parking pressures on the street.
- Clarification was sought by members on whether it was appropriate for concerns regarding alleged issues of fly tipping or antisocial behaviour associated with the current landlord to influence the Committee's judgement in the determination of the planning application. In response, the Chair explained in general terms, when an application was presented to the Committee, it was considered neutrally irrespective of the identity of the applicant. The Chair stated that members were required to assess the planning merits of the proposal itself rather than any allegations relating to individuals. The Chair advised that the relevant question was whether the proposed development would be likely to create or exacerbate such issues due to its design, rather than any matters associated with the applicant.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

- Details were sought on what other changes, aside from the reduction in height, had been made to render the proposal acceptable when compared with previous schemes. In response, Sarah Dilley directed members to paragraph 38 of the committee report, which contained a table outlining the principal changes. It was explained that the planning history included an appeal scheme from 2023, as well as an earlier outline planning permission with reserved matters that had lapsed before implementation. It was stated that the table provided a useful comparison between the outline consent and the current proposal. It was noted that the height had been reduced by approximately 55cm. It was confirmed that the dwelling remained broadly within the same position as the outline scheme in terms of site layout, parking arrangements and roof form. It was also noted that, unlike the outline scheme, the current proposal included a basement. It was explained that the footprint of the dwelling was marginally larger, and that excluding the lightwells, the subterranean element increased by less than 4sqm, while the overall height had been reduced.
- In response to further queries relating to the drawing pack, officers presented slides illustrating what had been approved under the outline consent, the proposed site plan, and the layout of Bedroom 3, including the southwest facing dormer and the window to the first-floor ensuite.

DECISION

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

- (1) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the main committee report, removal of the conditions as set out within the supplementary report and additional requirement for a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following Heads of Terms:
 - A requirement to submit the Statutory Biodiversity Metric to identify the pre-development biodiversity value of the site prior to commencement of development.
 - In the event that the house was not constructed as a self-build in line with the legal definition of Self Build and Custom Build Housing or subsequently sold or occupied for persons other than the applicant within 3 years after the house was completed to notify the Council in writing. The owner would then be required to secure off site BNG units either through registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits to secure the 10% net gain in biodiversity, with such evidence submitted to the Council.

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous).

7. Any Other Urgent Business

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8:48pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

Introduction

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

Material planning considerations

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

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

Provision of infrastructure

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

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

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

Further information

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

Public speaking

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

Recommendation

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

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

3 June, 2026
04
25/2875

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	10 October, 2025
WARD	Preston
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Wembley
LOCATION	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
PLAN NO'S	See condition 2.
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_175243</p> <p><u>When viewing this as a Hard Copy</u></p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk 2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "25/2875" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box 3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person 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 building
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. Wild life and biodiversity enhancement strategies
10. Hard and soft-landscaping scheme

Informatives

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

That the Head of Planning and Development Services 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

	Planning Committee Map
Brent	Site address: Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9
	© 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 development is designed with a pitched roof, with a ridge height of c.8.15m.

The proposal also includes 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 comprise 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.

This application follows the refusal of application (ref: 25/1246) on design and appearance grounds that was subsequently upheld and dismissed at appeal (ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375873) on 19th January 2026. The key difference with this scheme relates 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. In contrast to the previous scheme, which proposed a predominantly white-coloured external finish to the dwelling, the revised proposal incorporates red brickwork, red clay roof tiles, white render, and PPC matte white aluminium framed windows and doors.

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.

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, nor does it contain any listed buildings.

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: Objections have been received from eighteen individuals (some of which submitted multiple objections). The objections predominantly relate to the design and siting of the development, with concerns that it would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, erode the spatial openness of the plot, and represent an over-intensification to the use of the site. Other matters raised include the potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity, pressure on on-street parking, pedestrian and highway safety, loss of biodiversity, drainage concerns, and the lack of public engagement.

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 dwelling has been designed to respond to the character and appearance of Preston Road and act as a transition point between different architectural styles when considered in the context of the wider area.

The footprint and building line of the dwelling respects the established rhythm of development along the street. The scale and massing have been carefully considered so that the pitched roof sits below the ridge of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No.125 Preston Road and when considered in combination with the shadow gap, this reduces the perception of bulk and reads as a distinct dwelling rather than an extension to the existing dwelling.

The building is carefully composed to respond to the character of the adjoining semi-detached pair while making use of the constrained lot. The front elevation incorporates a recessed entrance and windows aligned to key datum points from the fenestration of No. 125 Preston Road, helping to maintain the visual rhythm of the pair. The proposed materials establish continuity with the adjoining semi-detached pair. These considerations are considered to address the previous reason for refusal that was upheld at appeal.

Neighbour Impact: Having regard to the distances between the proposed dwelling and surrounding buildings and spaces, 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: The proposed development would be car-free which would meet policy standards which establish maximum levels of off street parking. Parking surveys that were submitted for the approved residential development at the junction of Pellatt Road and Walton Gardens (LPA 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 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 landscaping of the site 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, noting that biodiversity gains provided within private residential gardens do improve local biodiversity but cannot contribute towards the mandatory requirement.

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

Planning application (ref: 25/1246) was **refused on 11th September 2025** following the resolution to refuse the planning application at the planning committee on 10th September 2025. The refusal reason reads as follows-

'The proposed development, by reason of the design and appearance of the proposed house, would result in a building that is out of keeping with and detrimental to the established character of the area and the streetscene. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies BD1 and DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041.'

The ground for refusal for the above application was subsequently **upheld and dismissed at appeal (ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375873)** on 19th January 2026. In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector acknowledged that

a contemporary design approach may not always be inappropriate, particularly given the varied architectural styles within the wider area. However, the limitations of the plot, formed by a roadside verge, and the substantially different design of the proposed dwelling compared to the existing pair of semi-detached houses at Nos. 123 and 125 Preston Road, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector further concluded that this harm was not outweighed by the provision of family-sized dwellings or sustainability benefits.

Planning permission (**ref: 24/2139**) was **granted** on 17th June 2025 for the construction of a five-storey residential block comprising 13 flats on the grass verge to the west of the roundabout junction of Pellatt Road with Walton Gardens and Chamberlayne Avenue. This development is located c.50m from the application site and proposes four off-street parking spaces.

CONSULTATIONS

24 nearby neighbours were initially consulted by post on 24/10/2025.

A number of amended plans have been received during the course of the application and were subsequently re-consulted upon. The amendments included:

- The roof form has been revised from a mono-pitch to a pitched roof;
- The first-floor front-facing window has been repositioned and altered in size and design;
- The first-floor flank window has been repositioned and altered in size and design;
- External finishes have been updated to include red brick, red clay tiles, white render, and windows and doors with PPC matte white aluminium frames.

A further round of consultation (21 days) was undertaken from 10th February 2026 in relation to the above amendments.

Objections have been received from eighteen individuals (some of which submitted multiple objections).

A summary of the total objections received are set out below:

Reasons for Objection	Officers Comments
Design	
<p>Objections have been raised in relation to the siting, massing and design of the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing plot provides visual relief and a sense of openness on this corner site. Objectors consider that the proposed development would interrupt the established rhythm of the street and remove this sense of openness. • The proposal would be attached to a semi-detached pair with a different roof form, detailing and overall massing. Given the prominent location, and that it would be adjoined to the semi-detached pair, objectors consider the siting to be inappropriate and the development to not accord with the character and appearance of the wider area. • The proposed materials would not accord with the prevailing character of the surrounding area. Several objectors note that the addition of vertical bars would not reflect the existing Tudorbethan architectural style present locally. <p>Reference has also been made to the previous appeal decision (ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375873), with objectors stating that the current resubmission does not adequately address or overcome the Inspector’s findings.</p>	<p>The proposed layout and design have been carefully considered in the context of the site and surrounding area, including the Inspector’s findings from the previous appeal. A full assessment of the proposal’s layout, design, massing, and materials is provided in the ‘Layout and Design’ section of this report.</p>

<p>The proposal would result in overdevelopment to a constrained plot. Reference is also made to two planning applications at 125 Preston Road (ref: 03/0161) and (ref: 03/2470) both of which were refused owing to its overdominance to the corner plot. Should application be granted to the current application, this would be conflicting to previous decisions and set a poor precedent.</p>	<p>These two applications related to extensions to the existing dwelling at No.125 Preston Road and were considered under a different policy context. As detailed in the 'Layout and Design' section of this report, the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond to the character and appearance of the wider area, with its footprint and building line respecting the established rhythm of the street.</p>
<p>Impact on Residential Amenities</p>	
<p>Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would adversely affect the daylight, open outlook, and sense of space enjoyed from the side-facing office window at No. 125 Preston Road and would dominate views of the rear garden. The objector considers that the proposal fails to comply with the 45-degree guidance set out in Brent's SPD1, resulting in a loss of amenity and an increased sense of enclosure. Additionally, it is noted that no Daylight/Sunlight Assessment has been submitted in accordance with BRE Guidelines or London Plan Policy D6, limiting the ability to fully assess these impacts.</p>	<p>As discussed in detail in the 'Impact on Residential Amenity' section of the assessment below, the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable relationship with the amenities of the neighbour at No.125 Preston Road. The 45-degree rule is only applicable where the proposed development adjoins private amenity space/garden area and not to the flank windows in this instance.</p>
<p>Concerns have been raised regarding the potential impacts of the proposed development on the health, wellbeing, and safety of children at No. 125 Preston Road. The objection highlights cumulative effects including: loss of light to rooms used for play, study, and rest; disturbances during the construction phase; reduction in the quality of outdoor space through overshadowing and enclosure; and increased danger for child pedestrians. The Council has statutory duties to safeguard children under Section 11 of the Children Act 2004, alongside obligations under the wider planning framework.</p>	<p>These concerns are noted. Section 11 of the Children Act 2004 places a general duty on public authorities, including the Council to have regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children when carrying out their statutory functions. In the context of planning, this duty is discharged through the application of local and national planning policies in decision making.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the proposal have been carefully considered as part of the planning assessment, as discussed in detail in the 'Impact on Residential Amenity' section of the assessment below.</p> <p>With regard to construction disturbance, some disturbance and disruption is inevitable where works are undertaken, whether that involves extensions and alterations to one's house or the construction of new development. Safeguards are in place through the Control of Pollution Act which looks to prevent excessive working hours or excessive impacts from other nuisances.</p> <p>In relation to highway safety the development does not introduce new parking arrangements and all works would be contained within the applicant's red line boundary.</p>
<p>The objection highlights that no Equality Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application, to consider the risk to the health of a disabled resident at the adjoining property. This is therefore contrary to the Equality Act 2010.</p>	<p>The Council is subject to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 when exercising its functions. This duty is discharged through the application of local and national planning policies in decision making.</p>

	<p>There is no statutory requirement within national or local policies for an application to submit a Equality Impact Assessment as part of their planning application. Compliance with this part of the act is instead achieved through the consideration on the impacts of the proposal, including the quality of living accommodation that would be created and the impacts on the neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>As discussed in detail in the assessment below, the proposal is considered to be in line with policies, the Council has therefore satisfied its duties under this part of the act.</p>
--	---

Biodiversity	
<p>The proposed development would result in a biodiversity net loss of 46.39% which would fail to deliver the 10% net gain required under the Environmental Act 2021. The only mitigation measure to the loss of biodiversity is the provision of green roof which is insufficient.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) acknowledges that no development drawings were available at the time of conducting the survey.</p>	<p>Where the 10% requirement cannot be delivered on-site, Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows for acceptable development proposals to achieve this requirement through 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.</p> <p>The recommendations set out within the PEA to enhance biodiversity and to support habitat creation will also be secured through a pre-commencement condition.</p>

Highway Matters	
<p>Concerns have been raised that no off-street car parking is proposed for the new development, which would increase competition for on-street parking and exacerbate parking stress in the area, particularly on Wembley Stadium event days. Additional concerns relate to cumulative impacts on parking and traffic arising from the recently approved residential development at Land Opposite GEC Pavilion (ref: 24/2139), which will provide further flats and associated parking demand.</p>	<p>As discussed in the 'Transport Considerations' -sub section 'Car Parking' of the report, a car-free agreement would be entered into to remove the parking permits of the residents of the new dwelling on Wembley Stadium Event Days. Notwithstanding, surveys undertaken confirms that there is capacity to accommodate for overspill parking.</p>
<p>The entrance is sited to a busy corner and crossing point which would pose as a risk to pedestrian and vehicular safety.</p>	<p>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.</p>

Drainage/ Structural Matters	
<p>The occupier of No. 125 Preston Road has raised concerns that the property contains a rainwater downpipe serving its roof drainage system. It is highlighted that the proposed dwelling, shown built flush against the flank wall, would remove access for inspection, maintenance, and repair of this essential drainage infrastructure. It would also result in damp and structural issues.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the repair, maintenance, and access to the neighbouring property's drainage infrastructure are not material planning considerations but a civil matter. All proposed works are proposed within the applicant's own red line boundary and would be subject to the provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996, which provides a legal framework for</p>

	neighbours to address matters such as access, work near a boundary, and the protection of existing structures.
Concerns have been raised that the proposed pitched roof would direct rainwater towards the shared boundary with No.125 Preston Road, and that no mitigation measures have been demonstrated in the submission to address this issue.	As set out above, all proposed works are proposed within the applicant's own red line boundary and would be subject to the provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996, which provides a legal framework for neighbours to address matters such as access, work near a boundary, and the protection of existing structures. In addition the scheme would be subject to building control regulations which would look at the drainage strategy in more detail.
No CMS or drainage strategy has been submitted to address drainage concerns.	As discussed in the 'Flood Risk and Drainage' section of the assessment below, the site is not located within an area at risk of flooding. In combination with the proposed landscaping strategy, the development is considered acceptable in terms of managing surface water, and a formal drainage strategy is not considered necessary in this instance.
Other Matters	
Concerns were raised that notification of the application to neighbouring residents was limited and that the consultation process had not been carried out in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (DMPO) and Brent's Statement of Community Involvement, with regard to ensuring adequacy and fairness.	The consultation process has been undertaken in full accordance with the statutory requirements of Article 15(4)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Notification letters were sent to the immediately adjoining neighbours and, in addition, to properties on the northern side of Pellatt Road (within Walton Gardens), those on the opposite side of Preston Road, and to properties to the rear on Chamberlayne Avenue. The application details were also made available on the Council's website. Following receipt of the amended plans, the application was re-consulted to ensure all interested parties had a further opportunity to comment.
The submitted information is considered insufficient to allow a full assessment of the character and appearance of the area, as it lacks contextual street views, coloured elevations, and photo montages. This is contrary to the relevant local planning policies.	The submission meets with both the local and national validation checklist. Rendered views of the proposed development have been provided within pages 14 and 25 of the Design and Access Statement. On this basis, sufficient information has been submitted to allow a full assessment to be made.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

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

The 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
- G7 Trees and woodlands
- SI5 Water infrastructure
- SI 13 Sustainable drainage
- 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
- 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 2025
 Planning Practice Guidance
 London Plan Guidance Housing Design Standards 2023

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 green space 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 therefore continues to be acceptable with the previous scheme. 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 compliments 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. As set out in the relevant planning history section above, the previous application was refused on design and appearance grounds, and this decision was subsequently upheld at appeal (ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375873). In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that the proposed dwelling, due to its substantially differing roof form, detailing, and massing, would create a sharp contrast with the adjoining semi-detached pair at Nos. 123 and 125 Preston Road. Furthermore, given the prominent corner location of the site, the development was found to form a visually uncomfortable development which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This harm was not outweighed by the provision of family-sized dwellings or the inclusion of sustainable measures in the design of the dwelling.
13. Preston Road is predominantly comprised of two-storey semi-detached and detached dwellings, typically set back from the road behind front forecourts with low brick boundary walls or open driveways, and generally benefiting from spacious rear gardens. The dwellings reflect a mix of architectural styles, including Metro-land and Mock Tudor, and are commonly characterised by hipped roofs with front gables. Black half-timbering, white render, and red brickwork form the predominant materials and colour palette along the street.
14. The wider area has a varied architectural character with buildings of different forms and periods. To the

north of the site, Walton Gardens comprises mid-century residential blocks, while to the west along Chamberlayne Avenue there are early 20th-century three-storey terraced houses. A recent application (ref: 25/2139) also approved a modern residential block on the grass verge to the west of the roundabout junction with Pellatt Road which would be finished in white/light colour brickwork arranged in vertical and horizontal arrangements.

15. Against this varied backdrop, Officers consider that the site could lend itself to a more ambitious architectural approach, as the site occupies a transition point between different architectural styles in the surrounding area. This is consistent with the Inspector's findings (paragraph. 6 of the appeal decision) that 'a contemporary design approach would [not] always be inappropriate' in this context.
16. The footprint of the dwelling remains unchanged as the previous application and would be similar to the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings at No.123 and No.125 Preston Road. The front elevation and 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. A pitched roof is proposed, set 0.60 m below the ridge of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. In combination with the inclusion of a shadow gap, this design reduces the perception of bulk with the dwelling at No.125 Preston Road and ensures that the new building reads as a distinct dwelling rather than an extension. This approach also aligns with Principle 4.4 of SPD1, which recognises that a pastiche design would not necessarily achieve a contextual response. Replicating the cat-slide roof of the adjoining pair could result in an awkward or contrived appearance, whereas the pitched roof provides a measured visual transition that responds to the street hierarchy and prominence of the site along the junction.
18. The building is carefully composed, with considered detailing including a recessed entrance and windows aligned to key datum points from the fenestration of No. 125 Preston Road, maintaining the visual rhythm and symmetry of the adjoining pair. The motif of the Tudorbethan framing is carried across the front-facing upper floor through recessed white render, while materials including red brickwork, white render, and red clay tiles establish continuity with the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings. Considering that the footprint of the proposed development remains unchanged as the previous application, and amendments have been made to the massing, fenestration and materials, the proposal is considered to have addressed the previous reason for refusal.
19. A pre-commencement condition is proposed for material samples to be provided upfront for review by the LPA, to ensure that the materials used are high quality.
20. In summary, the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond to the character and appearance of Preston Road and to act as a transition point between different architectural styles in the wider area. The footprint and building line respect the established rhythm of the street. The pitched roof is set below the ridge of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, and in combination with the shadow gap, reduces the perception of bulk with the existing dwelling, and reads as a distinct dwelling rather than an extension to the existing dwelling. The proposed materials establish continuity with the adjoining semi-detached pair. On balance, the development is considered to make a positive contribution to the local character and streetscape, aligning with the objectives of Policy BD1 and the guidance set out in SPD1.

Quality of Accommodation

21. 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 gross internal area (GIA) of 93.0sqm would meet policy standards for a 3-bed 5-person dwelling. The proposed bedroom types -2x double beds and 1x single bed also complies with policy standards.
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.

Outlook and Daylight and Ventilation

24. The dwellinghouse would be triple 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 3.5 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 requirements for external amenity space provision is further supplemented by Brent's Residential Amenity Space and Place SPD 2023 and principle 5.2 of Brent's SPD 1.
29. The proposal shows that 57.0sqm of external amenity space would be provided in the rear garden, complying with standards in numerical terms. Access arrangements through the main dwelling and door located on the boundary wall with Pellatt Road is considered to be acceptable.
30. Principle 5.2 of SPD 1 sets out that communal amenity spaces are expected to create both a usable and attractive environment which includes tree planting and landscaping.
31. Of the total external amenity space provided, c.37.78sqm would be planted with new trees and the area between the patio and the canopy cover measures c.19.22sqm. The design of the space creates shaded areas for relaxation, and other activities, while supporting also supporting the need for urban greening and biodiversity enhancement.

Impact on Residential Amenity

32. 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.
33. The distance from the rear-facing first floor bedroom window to the rear boundary is c.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.
34. 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.

35. All rear extensions and alterations must not have a significant impact on the outlook or amenity of any neighbouring properties, and this is guided 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.
36. 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).
37. This neighbour has raised concerns regarding a side facing window that serves an office (habitable room). Site observations confirm that a c.2.0m high boundary fence is already built against the ground floor window and a previous planning application (ref: 12/2722) suggests that this window serves a WC. In addition, the first floor flank window was observed during the site visit to be obscure glazed. Furthermore, as the proposed dwelling would not extend beyond the rear building line of this neighbour at first floor level, there would be no material loss of light to this window in this regard. Notwithstanding, the footprint of the proposed development remains unchanged from the previous scheme, and no concerns regarding impacts to neighbouring amenities were raised in relation to the refused scheme or subsequent appeal.
38. The rear window and patio doors to the ground floor rear extension appears to serve a dining room and kitchen area -both of which are habitable rooms.
39. 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.
40. 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 rear habitable room windows of this neighbour in this respect.
41. It is considered reasonable, given the scale of the proposed development and the restricted nature of the site, that a condition restricting permitted development is secured so that the impact to neighbouring amenity can be appropriately considered.
42. 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 unduly detrimental impacts of overshadowing to the rear habitable rooms or the amenity of the rear garden enjoyed by this neighbour. The submission of a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment is therefore not required in this instance.

Transport Considerations

Car Parking

43. Preston Road is a local distributor road and therefore, on-street parking is restricted, especially on Event Days. 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.
44. 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 be car-free, which would therefore fall within maximum car parking standards.
45. 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.' The car parking surveys that has been

approved with the development for a residential development on the grass verge of Pellatt Road with Walton Gardens and Chamberlayne Avenue (see ref: 24/2139) confirms that there is 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.

Cycle Parking

46. 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.
47. 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.
48. In design terms, the combined store would be finished in matte red and feature a sedum roof. While no material photo samples have been provided, these details can be secured through a pre-commencement condition alongside the landscaping details to ensure that the store would form an acceptable appearance.
49. A compliance condition would also be imposed for the combined store to be kept free from obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

Bin Storage

50. Brent's Waste and Recycling Storage and Collection Guidance for Residential Properties sets out that a household should have 1x 140L wheeled bin for residual waste, 1x 240L wheeled bin for dry recycling and 1x 23L kerbside container for food waste.
51. Section 3.11 of the DAS confirms that this requirement would be met. In addition, the design and 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. A condition is proposed to secure these details.

Sustainability

Trees and Landscaping

52. 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.
53. 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 (PEA) 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.
54. 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.
55. 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.

56. 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.
57. 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 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

58. Local Plan policy BH4 has set a minimum UGF requirement of 0.4 for minor developments, to make up for the loss of green infrastructure or support its re-introduction.
59. The proposed UGF Plan and calculations in section 3.80 of the DAS confirms that a UGF of 0.4 would be met. This will be secured by condition.

Habitat and Species

60. A 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.
61. The PEA sets out that 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.
62. 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

63. 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.
64. 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. The proposal includes a number of biodiversity improvements including biodiverse roofs, pollinator perennial planting, trees and lawn. However, in terms of BNG, they are not enforceable and are only recognised as "vegetated garden" of low ecological value.
65. 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

66. 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.
67. Section 3.9 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 be connected to the rainwater pipes from the roof 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

68. Policy BSUI4 of the Local Plan requires minor developments to incorporate sustainable drainage measures wherever feasible and to provide adequate management of surface water run-off.
69. The site is not located within a flood zone. The proposed development would provide c.57.39 sqm (i.e., 68.1%) of soft landscaping to the front forecourt, exceeding the 50% threshold set out in local policy for surface water attenuation. Additional landscaping would be provided in the rear garden, and permeable paving would be installed throughout the site. Collectively, these measures are considered sufficient to manage surface water, and a formal SUDs strategy is not required in this instance

Environmental Health

Land Contamination

70. 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

71. 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:
 - identify suitably positioned unobstructed outside space: a) for fire appliances to be positioned on b) appropriate for use as an evacuation assembly point
 - 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
 - are constructed in an appropriate way to minimise the risk of fire spread
 - provide suitable and convenient means of escape, and associated evacuation strategy for all building users
 - develop a robust strategy for evacuation which can be periodically updated and published, and which all building users can have confidence in
 - provide suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development.
72. Section 3.6 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 from external ground level, 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. 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.
73. 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.

74. This strategy can be further developed in detail in the event of planning consent and would be subject to approval through Building Regulations.

Equalities

75. 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

76. Overall, the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond to the character and appearance of Preston Road and to act as a transition point between different architectural styles in the area. The scale, massing, and materials have been considered to reduce the perception of bulk and ensure that the dwelling reads as a distinct property rather than an extension. These design considerations are considered to adequately address the previous reason for refusal and the Inspector's findings upheld at appeal, overcoming concerns regarding visual impact and harm to the streetscape. While the development would result in the loss of part of the existing grass verge, the benefits of delivering a well-designed, high-quality, family-sized dwelling that contributes to the borough's housing targets are considered to outweigh this loss.



Application No: **25/2875**

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

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

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

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

at **Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9**

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: 26/05/2026

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
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:

Drawings

- 125PR_00_P1 SITE LOCATION PLAN
- 125PR_05_P1 EXISTING ELEVATIONS
- 125PR_01_P1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
- 125PR_02_P4 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- 125PR_03_P2 SITE SECTION AA EXISTING & PROPOSED
- 125PR_04_P4 PROPOSED PLANS
- 125PR_06_P3 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
- 125PR_07_P3 PROPOSED SECTION BB
- 125PR_08_P2 PROPOSED URBAN GREENING FACTOR PLAN

Supporting documents

- LAND TO THE NORTH OF 125 PRESTON ROAD DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT P5 dated February 2026
- Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment by arbtech issue 1.0 dated 23rd April 2025
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by arbtech dated 03rd April 2025
- Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool

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

- 3 No access shall be provided to the roof of the building by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the building 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_P4 -PROPOSED SITE PLAN and 125PR_06_P3 -PROPOSED ELEVATIONS prior to first occupation of the dwelling, unless an alternative arrangement has been subsequently submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented.

The cycle and refuse storage shall be maintained and retained and 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 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 in accordance with Section 3.8 of the Design and Access Statement submitted with this application in order to achieve a minimum urban greening factor (UGF) of 0.4 unless alternative proposals to achieve this UGF rating are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in full.

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:
- i. materials to be used in the external appearance of the development including samples which shall be made available in a pre-arranged location for viewed by the Local Planning Authority
 - ii. 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 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.

These shall include:

- i. 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;
- ii. 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;
- iii. Installation of at least 1 bird box;
- iv. Creation of brash piles or installation of hedgehog houses in shady areas;
- v. Installation of gaps under boundary fencing to enable hedgehogs to move freely through the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the

development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

- 10 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:
- i. A planting plan, including a scaled plan to show the vegetation being retained and the details of proposed planting which shall include 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;
 - ii. Details of garden wall, fences or other form of boundary treatment to be provided within the site (including details of external materials and heights);
 - iii. Cross-section of the green roof to the ground floor rear extension;
 - iv. Details of surfacing materials to be used for any areas of hard standing;
 - v. Details of the materials to be used for the combined cycle and refuse store.

The hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved unless an alternative timescale has 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.

INFORMATIVES

1 - 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.

2 - You are 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.

3 - 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

4 - 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.

5 - 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

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

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

3 June, 2026
05
25/2230

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	31 July, 2025
WARD	Cricklewood & Mapesbury
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Kilburn
LOCATION	Garages rear of 60, Olive Road, London
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.
PLAN NO'S	Please refer to condition 2
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_174511</p> <p><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy</u> .</p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk 2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "25/2230" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box 3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

B. That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and attach the following informatives in relation to the following matters:

Conditions

Compliance:

1. Three year commencement rule
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Restriction of PD rights for dwellinghouses
4. Water Consumption
5. Reinstatement of Crossover
6. Cycle and Bins compliance
7. Privacy screens

Submission and Compliance


8. Construction Method Statement
9. External materials
10. Hard and Soft Landscape Details
11. Wildlife and nesting features and Statement of Conformity

Informative

1. Biodiversity Gain Condition
2. Party Wall Act
3. CIL Liability
4. Cross Over
5. Building Near Boundary
6. Asbestos
7. Contaminated Land Watching Brief Informative
8. CPZ map amendment
9. Approval in Principle (AIP) with Highways

C. That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised persons 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 auctioned, provided that the Head of Planning or other duly authorised persons 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

	Planning Committee Map
Brent	Site address: Garages rear of 60, Olive Road, London
	© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

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.

EXISTING

The application site is currently occupied by four garages that the applicant advises are used as lock up storage garages with an area of hardstanding to the rear. The site is accessed from Wren Avenue and lies to the rear the gardens of Nos. 60 and 62 Olive Road.

The site is not located within a conservation area nor does it contain any listed buildings.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key planning issues for Members to consider are set out below. Members will need to balance all of the planning issues and the objectives of relevant planning policies when making a decision on the application.

Representations received: 12 objections have been received expressing concerns about privacy, light, noise, and design impacts from the proposed development. There is also concern over the loss of existing garages and their impact on local businesses, alongside concerns relating to traffic and parking issues. The objections have been considered and are summarised in more detail below and discussed in the report.

Principle: The London Plan and Brent's Local Plan recognise the role of small sites in the delivery of new homes that are needed in the borough. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3 and is therefore within a priority area for new homes. The general principle of residential development is supported in this location, contributing towards the Council's housing targets.

Standard of Accommodation and External Amenity Space: The proposal would provide well proportioned, well-lit dual aspect habitable rooms and generous internal dimensions for the new homes. Each unit would benefit from private external amenity spaces, laid out in a manner that is functional and compliant with Brent's standards, having regard to the site's constrained nature.

Design and Appearance: The proposal is considered to represent a good standard of contemporary design and is of an appropriate scale and form within the infill site and would not result in harmful impact on the character and appearance of the local area

Residential Amenity: The proposal would not result in a harmful impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, daylight and sunlight or overlooking to any immediate adjoining residential neighbours having regard to the provisions in SPD1.

Highway Impact: The proposed involves the removal of four garages, which the applicant advises were used for storage and are currently empty. The loss of the garages is unlikely to displace existing parking. The development would provide two dwellings with no off-street parking, complying with maximum parking standards. The reinstatement of the existing vehicular crossover would enable the creation of up to three on-street parking spaces, which is considered sufficient to accommodate the parking demand arising from the two dwellings. The submitted plans also indicate provision for two cycle parking spaces per dwelling and on-site refuse storage. A condition would be attached requiring the reinstatement of the crossover, together with the provision of the secure cycle storage and refuse storage, to be completed prior to occupation.

Urban Greening, Biodiversity, Ecology and Trees: The development would deliver a measurable improvement in urban greening through the incorporation of green roofs, planting areas and permeable surfaces. While the Urban Greening Factor falls below the target of 0.4 as set out within policy BH4, this is considered acceptable given the site's highly constrained size and existing hardstanding character. There are no existing trees on site, and due to the limited space available, there is no practical scope for on-site tree planting.

In terms of biodiversity net gain, the proposal would be subject to the mandatory biodiversity gain condition to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity which would be achieved through off site habitat units. In addition,

through the provision of green roofs and planting areas, there would be opportunities for a net increase on site for biodiversity enhancements.

Flood Risk: The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding. The proposed development introduces measures to improve surface water management, including green roofs and permeable surfaces, representing an improvement over the existing entirely hardstanding condition. The proposal would not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

An enforcement notice was served on 28 October 2005 in relation to the material change of use of the premises to a buildings yard which came into effect on 7 December 2005 (LPA Ref: E/05/0153). The enforcement notice was subsequently complied with.

CONSULTATIONS

24 neighbouring properties and NorthWestTWO Residents' Association were initially notified by letter of this proposal on 05/08/ 2025 for a 21 day period. The application was re-consulted on 19/11/2025 due to a correction to the red line site boundary. A further consultation was carried out on 13th of March 2026 due to updated Biodiversity technical submission.

In total objections were received from 10 individuals (some of which submitted multiple comments) and two ward councillors (Councillors Dar and Grahl). A summary of the objections are set out below:

Objection	Officer response
The proposed dwellings would not be provided as affordable or social rent housing and may not meet an identified local need.	Based on London Plan Policy H5 (Threshold Approach to Applications) and Brent Local Plan Policy BH5, the proposal constitutes minor development below the relevant thresholds. As such, there is no policy requirement to provide on site affordable housing or an affordable housing contribution.
Residents state the proposal is out of keeping with the established character of the area, which is defined by two-storey dwellings with consistent building lines, traditional red brick materials and pitched roofs. The proposed form, scale and use of contrasting materials are considered incongruous and harmful to the coherence of the streetscape.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Character and Design '
The proposal is considered an overdevelopment of the site, introducing two dwellings and basement development in place of low-intensity garages, resulting in excessive scale, massing and limited provision for amenity space and landscaping.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Residential Intensification', 'Character and Design ', 'Standard of Accommodation' and 'Impact to Neighbouring Amenity '
Residents raise concerns regarding loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties and rear gardens, particularly during afternoon and evening periods. The accuracy of the submitted assessment is also questioned.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Impact to Neighbouring Amenity '
The scale, height and proximity of the development to boundaries are considered likely to create an overbearing impact and an unacceptable sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties.	This issue is discussed under 'Impact to Neighbouring Amenity '

Concerns are raised that side-facing windows and the overall layout would result in overlooking of neighbouring living rooms and bedrooms, leading to loss of privacy.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Impact to Neighbouring Amenity '
Residents raise concerns regarding basement excavation, citing risks associated with London Clay, including ground movement, subsidence and potential structural damage to neighbouring properties. The Basement Impact Assessment is considered insufficiently robust.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Construction Impacts'
Concerns are raised regarding construction-related impacts including noise, dust, vibration and disruption, and the absence of detailed construction management information at application stage.	A Construction Method Statement would be secured by condition, requiring details of working hours, dust suppression, noise control, and construction logistics. These measures will ensure impacts are appropriately mitigated.
The scheme is considered to lack sufficient green space, soft landscaping and biodiversity enhancements, with limited opportunity for meaningful planting due to the extent of development. No maintenance plan, structural verification, or long-term stewardship for the proposed green roof.	This issue has been considered and discussed under 'Green Infrastructure'. A condition would be secured in relation to the landscape works and would include details of maintenance.
Concerns are raised that the application does not clearly define occupancy levels, raising potential issues of overcrowding and pressure on local infrastructure.	The dwellings have been designed to comply with the requirements of policy D6 of London Plan. which takes into account occupation of a dwelling based on the number and size of bedrooms. This is discussed in detail under 'Standard of Accommodation '.
Some residents accept redevelopment in principle but argue that a smaller scheme (e.g. a single dwelling) would be more appropriate and less harmful.	In determining the application, the Local Planning Authority is required to assess the proposal as submitted, having regard to relevant material planning considerations.
It is argued that basement accommodation would result in poor living conditions, including limited daylight and outlook.	The quality of accommodation has been assessed in line with policy D6 of London Plan. This is discussed in detail under 'Standard of Accommodation '.
Concerns have been raised that excavation works could exacerbate the spread of Japanese knotweed.	The application is accompanied by an ecology technical note prepared by AJC Ecology who did not identify Japanese knotweed during their site walkover.
Residents raise concerns regarding potential impacts on shared boundaries and neighbouring structures during excavation and construction works.	Matters relating to party walls and structural impacts are governed by separate legislation, including the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, and are not material planning considerations. These issues are addressed outside of the planning process.
The proposed development would result in a narrowing of the pavement at the south east corner of the site to facilitate the proposed boundary wall.	Brent's Highways Team, who have confirmed the extent of the adopted public highway along Wren Avenue and Olive Road. Plans provided by the Highways Team clearly show the adopted highway land, and the proposed boundary treatment as shown in this application sits wholly within the applicant's ownership and does not encroach onto the public footway or compromise pedestrian safety.

Lack of consultation	The consultation process has been undertaken in full accordance with the statutory requirements of Article 15(4)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
Limited parking provision will increase pressure on on-street parking and lead to congestion and access issues for emergency and service vehicles.	This issue is discussed under 'Transport Consideration.'

Internal consultation

Environmental health and Nuisance Control team: no objection subject to conditions. Comments discussed in main body of report.

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

Key policies include:

London Plan 2021

D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
D4 Delivering Good Design
D6 Housing quality and standard
D7 Accessible housing
D12a Fire Safety
H1 Increasing housing supply
H2 Small sites
G5 Urban greening
G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
G7 Trees and woodlands
T5 Cycling
T6 Car Parking
T6.1 Residential parking
T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction

Brent Local Plan 2019-2041

DMP1 Development Management General Policy
BD1 Leading the Way in Good Urban Design
BH1 Increasing Housing Supply in Brent
BH2 Priority Areas for Additional Housing Provision within Brent
BH4 Small Sites and Small Housing Developments in Brent
BH13 Residential Amenity Space
BGI1 Green and Blue Infrastructure
BGI2 Trees and Woodlands
BSUI4 On Site Water Management and Surface Water Attenuation
BT1 Sustainable Travel Choice
BT2 Parking & Car Free Development

Other material considerations:

The following are also relevant material considerations:
National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

London Plan Guidance - Housing Design Standards June 2023
SPD1 Brent Design Guide 2018
Residential Amenity Space & Place Quality SPD 2023
Brent Waste Planning Guide 2013
Sustainable Environment & Development – SPD – 2023

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

Residential Intensification

1. Brent's Housing targets have significantly increased as part of London Plan 2021, with the target increasing to 23,250 dwellings per annum for the period 2019/20-2028/29 in Policy H1 of the London Plan recognising the increasing demand for delivery of new homes across London. Brent's local plan policy BH1 reflects this target as well.
2. Policy D3 of London Plan 2021 required developments to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of the site, with development that is the most appropriate form and land use for the site, with the policy recognising that small sites make a significant contribution towards increasing housing supply within London. This is also set out in policy H2 of London Plan 2021.
3. In response to the strategic policy position above, within Brent's Local Plan, the Council has set out priority areas for new housing under policy BH2. This policy identifies that new housing would be prioritised for growth areas, site allocations, town centres, edge of town centre sites, areas with higher levels of public transport accessibility and intensification corridors.
4. The above position is reinforced in policy BH4 of Brent's Local Plan. This policy relates to small housing sites in Brent (below 0.25 hectares or 25 dwellings) and recognises that such sites can assist in delivering a net addition of self-contained dwellings through the more intensive and efficient use of sites. Such proposals will be considered where consistent with other policies in the development plan and within priority locations (i.e. PTAL 3-6, intensification corridors, or a town centre boundary) through:
 - a) the infill of vacant or underused brownfield sites,
 - b) residential conversions, redevelopment, extensions of dwellings, or infill within the curtilage of a dwelling
 - c) the redevelopment of flats, non-residential buildings and residential garages,
 - d) upward extensions of flats and non-residential buildings
5. 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 easy accessible on foot when determining the intensity of development appropriate. The application site is within PTAL of 3 and is therefore within a priority location for the delivery of new homes. The principle of optimising the site for residential use is supported subject to meeting material policy considerations as discussed below.

Loss of Garages

6. The proposed involves the removal of four garages, which the applicant advises were used for storage and are currently empty. The loss of the garages is unlikely to displace existing parking. There are no concerns arising from the loss of the garage provision.

Character and Design

7. The NPPF seeks developments of high quality design that will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, responding to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings while not discouraging appropriate innovation, establishing or maintaining a strong sense of place, and optimising the potential of the site to accommodate an appropriate amount and mix of development. London Plan Policies D3 and D4 sets out a design-led approach to new development that responds positively to local context and optimises the site's capacity for growth, supporting higher densities in

well-connected locations.

8. Brent's Policy DMP1 and the Brent Design Guide SPD1, provide further guidance on principles of good design. Local Plan Policy BD1 seeks the highest quality of architectural and urban design, including innovative contemporary design that respects and complements historic character.
9. The surrounding area features a variety of architectural styles. The neighbourhood predominantly consists of detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses.
10. The proposal is considered acceptable in urban design terms and would enhance the character and quality of the surrounding environment, whilst making more efficient use of the site.
11. In terms of height and massing, the development is appropriate given the site's context, level of public transport accessibility, and capacity to support the delivery of new homes on land that is currently underutilised. The building is well composed and responds appropriately to the constraints of the site, including considerations of overlooking and massing.
12. The scheme demonstrates a good level of articulation through the use of setbacks and projections within the built form, alongside variation in brickwork textures and material selection. This contributes to a high-quality and robust architectural character.
13. The proposed material palette is considered acceptable and appropriate within the local context. The surrounding area is characterised by a varied mix of rendered finishes in muted tones, including whites, creams and sand colours, as well as brickwork treated in lighter shades, rather than a clear predominance of traditional red brick. In this context, the proposed yellow multistock brick is a neutral and sympathetic choice that complements the pale grey fenestration and darker roof materials. The Design and Access Statement sets out a clear and restrained palette, providing confidence in a high quality outcome, and the detailed including sample, specification, finish and colour of all external materials would be secured by condition.
14. An objection has been received in relation to Principle 3.2 of Brent's SPD 1 design guide, which seeks active frontages with doors and windows at ground floor level. Given the constrained nature of the site and the limited development footprint, the main built form is appropriately set back from the street, which avoids a cramped or overbearing appearance and allows space to be used efficiently for lightwells and private amenity areas. The proposed front boundary treatment would comprise a head height wall incorporating a permeable 'hit and miss' (honeycomb) brick design, which would read as a continuation of the garden boundary treatment already present at No. 60 Olive Road and represents an improvement over the existing low quality garage doors and more visually dominant boundary walls. This would be proposed in front of the sunken terraces and bedroom windows at basement level to provide privacy to the occupants of the new dwellings. The height of the pedestrian access gates has been reduced in height to maintain a sense of openness, and provide a visual break in the boundary treatment. Overall, the proposed design approach has the potential to deliver a positive relationship with the street, subject to the careful execution of materials and detailed construction. In particular, the boundary treatment, including the proposed hit and miss brick detailing, would play an important role in providing visual permeability between the street and the development, helping to create an active frontage and supporting good levels of outlook and daylight to the lower ground floor accommodation and supporting good levels of outlook and daylight to the lower ground floor accommodation.
15. Details of external materials and key construction details would be secured by a condition.
16. The submission proposes a well-designed development on a relatively constrained site and responds sensitively to the surrounding environment. While the contemporary homes would contrast the existing locality, the approach to materials is positive and the form is simple and well executed. The development creates two spacious and functional homes and considered to accord with Policy BD1 of the Brent Local Plan and represents a high-quality design response.

Quality of accommodation

17. Local Plan Policy DMP1 states that new development must provide high levels of internal and external amenity. The size of dwellings and rooms should be consistent with London Plan Policy D6 specifically Table 3.1 'Minimum internal space standards for new dwellings'. Housing development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings.

18. London Plan Policy D6 also requires at least 75% of the GIA of each flat to have an internal floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5m. This exceeds the national standard of 2.3m as higher housing and the urban heat island effect are more prevalent in London, and a higher standard is required to ensure adequate quality in terms of daylight penetration, ventilation and cooling, and sense of space.
19. The proposed development includes the construction of two dwellinghouses arranged over three floors (basement, ground and first floor levels), each designed to accommodate two bedroom four persons. Unit 1 has a total area of 94.06 sqm, while Unit 2 measures 94.98 sqm. Both homes feature living room on the ground floor, with open plan kitchen/dining and double bedroom in the basement. The first floor of each home offers one further double bedrooms.
20. Policy D6 of London Plan does not set a specific minimum gross internal area for a two bedroom, four person dwelling arranged over three storeys. For comparison, the minimum standard for a two bedroom, four person dwelling over two storeys is 79sqm, while the minimum standard for a three bedroom, four person dwelling over three storeys is 90sqm. The proposed dwellings each provides approximately 94sqm of gross internal floorspace and therefore exceeds the relevant comparable space standards, delivering a generous level of internal accommodation consistent with the objectives of the London Plan. The bedrooms are particularly spacious, each achieving over 11.5sqm in size.
21. Both homes are dual aspect with main orientation towards the east across the Wren Avenue. The principal living room at ground floor level is dual aspect, with outlook eastwards towards Wren Avenue and outlook westwards towards the rear terrace, allowing good levels of daylight and cross ventilation; the presence of a 1.7 metre high boundary wall with honeycomb (“hit and miss”) brick detailing is considered acceptable in this context. The lower ground floor kitchen/dining areas and double bedrooms benefit from a terrace, which provides a generous lightwell, while the first floor double bedroom enjoys an open outlook towards Wren Avenue. The arrangement ensures a good overall standard of outlook to all habitable rooms.
22. Both dwellings achieve an internal floor to ceiling height of 2.5m at basement, ground and first floor levels.

Water Consumption

23. 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. Such details would be secured by condition.

External Amenity Space

24. London Plan Policy D6 states where there are no higher local standards, a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings with an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. The space must achieve a minimum depth and width of 1.5m.
25. Policy BH13 establishes that all new dwellings are required to have external private amenity space of a sufficient size and type to satisfy its proposed residents' needs. This is normally expected to be 50sqm per home for family housing (3 bedrooms or more) situated at ground floor level and 20 sqm for all other housing.
26. Private amenity space should be accessible to all dwellings from a main living room, ideally without level changes. It should also be planned to take maximum advantage of daylight and sunlight. Where sufficient private amenity space cannot achieve the full requirement of the policy, the remainder should be provided in the form of communal amenity space. Moreover, the Council adopted the Brent Residential Amenity Space and Place Quality Supplementary Planning Document on 12th of June 2023. The SPD provides guidance on planning matters related to the provision of residential amenity space and public realm within developments.
27. Unit 01 is provided with a ground floor rear terrace measuring 15.3sqm, a basement level terrace of 14.2sqm and a balcony of 5sqm, resulting in a total of 34.5sqm of private external amenity space, all of which is accessible directly from the dwelling. Unit 02 benefits from a ground floor rear terrace of 16.65sqm, a basement level terrace of 11.7sqm and a balcony of 5sqm, providing a total of 33.35sqm of private external amenity space, also with level access from the dwelling. In both cases, the provision exceeds the minimum requirement of 20sqm for a two bedroom dwelling set out in Policy BH13, and overall the approach to amenity provision is well considered, offering ample opportunities for a range of

activities in accordance with Policy BH13 and the SPD.

Accessible Housing

28. Policy D7 requires at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' and all other dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.
29. In this case, both of the new dwellinghouses are designed in accordance with M4(2) requirements. The proposal provides step free access from the street to the dwelling entrance, a WC at entrance level, generous circulation space, a living area with step free access to private external amenity space, and bedrooms which exceed minimum space standards.

Daylight and sunlight to the proposed dwellings

30. The quality of daylight and sunlight to the proposed dwellings has been assessed in accordance with the BRE guidance Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BR 209, 2022). The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has tested all principal habitable rooms within the proposed dwellings at basement, ground and first floor levels using recognised BRE methodologies, including daylight factor, interior illuminance (Spatial Daylight Autonomy) and sunlight exposure assessments.
31. The daylight factor assessment confirms that all eight habitable rooms tested (100%) achieve or exceed the BRE recommended target values for their respective room uses, including kitchens/kitchen dining areas, living rooms and bedrooms. In each case, the target daylight factor is met across more than 50% of the room area, demonstrating that the rooms would benefit from good levels of diffuse daylight and an appropriate distribution of light within the space.
32. The interior illuminance (sDA) assessment further demonstrates that all habitable rooms achieve the BRE recommended illuminance levels for their respective uses, with the required lux levels met across at least 50% of each room for at least half of the daylight hours in a typical year. This confirms that the proposed accommodation would provide a consistently good standard of daylight throughout the year, including at basement level where rooms are served by terraces and lightwells.
33. In terms of sunlight exposure, the assessment confirms that the principal living rooms within both dwellings would receive approximately 3.9 hours of direct sunlight on 21 March, significantly exceeding the BRE minimum recommendation of 1.5 hours. In addition, the majority of habitable rooms assessed achieve at least the minimum BRE sunlight criterion, including kitchen/dining areas at basement level. While one basement bedroom would receive less than 1.5 hours of sunlight on the assessment date, this room nevertheless meets both the daylight factor and interior illuminance targets and is therefore considered to provide a good standard of internal daylight.
34. Overall, the BRE assessment demonstrates that the proposed dwellings would benefit from good levels of daylight and sunlight across all habitable spaces. Having regard to the scale of the development, the use of terraces and lightwells to serve lower ground floor accommodation, and the BRE compliant results of the submitted assessment, the proposed homes are considered to provide a high standard of residential accommodation in accordance with London Plan and local policy objectives.

Impact to neighbouring amenity

Privacy

35. The Council's SPD1 guidance advises that a minimum separation distance of 18 metres should be maintained between directly facing habitable room windows, and that a distance of at least 9 metres should be maintained between habitable rooms and the boundaries of private gardens. These standards are in place to safeguard privacy both within new developments and in relation to neighbouring properties.
36. The two new dwellings have been designed with no flank or rear facing windows at first floor level to prevent overlooking into neighbouring gardens. At ground floor level there are rear facing windows that face onto the rear garden of No. 64 Olive Road and located within 9m of the boundary, but views into the neighbouring garden would be restricted by existing boundary treatments. The first floor terrace closest

to No. 60A and B Olive Road is screened by a privacy screen at 1.7m high to prevent overlooking into the rear garden. The first floor terrace closest to No. 28 Wren Avenue would be sited within 9m of the boundary but would overlook the front garden of No. 28 Wren Avenue.

37. The layout, orientation and fenestration of the proposed dwellings have been carefully designed to prevent any harmful overlooking or loss of privacy. The development is therefore considered to comply fully with the Council's SPD1 guidance in respect of privacy.

Overbearing appearance

38. To ensure that the plots are not visually overbearing to the neighbouring properties, SPD1 advises that the building envelope should be set below a line of 30 degrees from the nearest rear habitable room window of adjoining existing property, measured from height of two metres above floor level. Where proposed development adjoins private amenity / garden areas then the height of new development should normally be set below a line of 45 degrees at the garden edge, measured from a height of two metres.
39. A number of sections have been provided to illustrate the relationship with adjoining properties. It is considered that there is sufficient detail within the application to enable a judgement as to whether the massing of the development would sit below the 30 and 45-degree lines of the adjoining properties.
40. The proposed building envelope would not breach the 30 degree line in relation to any of the rear habitable room windows to the properties at 60 to 64 Olive Road.
41. In assessing the proposal against the 45 degree guideline, breaches occur in relation to the rear garden of Nos. 60A and B, 62 A, B and C and 64 Olive Road. The flank wall of the proposed development is adjacent to the boundaries of Nos. 60 and 62. At the closest point the ground floor is approximately 3.5 m high and situated 0.4 m from the boundary whilst the first floor is approx. 5.7 m high and 1.3 m from the boundary. As such, the ground floor is 1.1 m above the 45 degree line while the first floor is approx. 2.3 m above the 45 degree line. In the case of No. 60 Olive Road, the main footprint of the proposed dwellings is largely positioned adjacent to the existing outbuilding located within the rear garden of No. 60 A and B Olive Road. There is an outbuilding in the garden of No. 62 A to C Olive Road, with the proposed building situated adjacent to this outbuilding. The presence of these outbuildings reduced the impact to a certain extent, but the proposal will nevertheless result in a degree of impact to parts of the rear gardens of the adjoining properties, affecting the light and outlook of those gardens. This must be weighed against the wider benefits of the proposal which provide two new homes for which there is an identified need within the Borough.
42. The proposed new homes also breaches the 45 degree line when taken from the rear garden of No. 64 Olive Road. However, this breach is only minor, with the parapet projecting approximately 0.17 metres. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant impact to the amenities of the adjoining occupier of No. 64, having regard to the Council's adopted guidance.
43. Neither 30 or 45 degree guidance would be applicable in relation to No. 28 Wren Avenue. The main built footprint is positioned close to the southern boundary with No. 28 Wren Avenue; however, this relationship is to the front garden forecourt and side access area of that property.

Daylight and Sunlight

44. The potential impact of the proposed development on sunlight and overshadowing to neighbouring gardens has also been submitted in accordance with the BRE guidance Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BR 209, 2022). The BRE guidance advises that, in order for an amenity area such as a garden to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least 50% of the garden should receive a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight on 21 March (the equinox). Furthermore, where development results in a reduction in sunlight, any loss is generally considered acceptable provided that the area capable of receiving two hours of sunlight is not reduced by more than 20% of its former value.
45. A detailed overshadowing assessment has been carried out using industry standard 3D modelling and shadow path analysis, considering existing baseline conditions and the proposed development on an hour-by-hour basis between 8am and 6pm on 21 March. The rear gardens assessed include Nos. 60, 62, 64 and 66 Olive Road, together with No. 28 Wren Avenue which would be discussed below.

46. This assessment confirms that the rear gardens of Nos. 60, 62 and 64 Olive Road, as well as No. 28 Wren Avenue, would all retain well in excess of the BRE benchmark requiring at least 50% of the garden to receive two hours of sunlight on 21 March. Specifically, the garden of (No. 62 Olive Road) would retain approximately 94% of its existing sunlight levels, with Nos. 60 and 64 Olive Road retaining approximately 99% and 98% respectively, and no reduction identified at No. 28 Wren Avenue.
47. The daylight and sunlight assessment has not assessed the impact of the proposal upon daylight to neighbouring properties. This is because the proposed development is located at an approximate distance of 13 metres from the rear elevations of the properties on Olive Road. At this separation, the development sits within the BRE 25 degree rule, which indicates that where the angle between the centre of a neighbouring window and the top of a new development is less than 25 degrees, the impact on daylight is unlikely to be noticeable, and the BRE guidance sets out that no further testing is required.
48. The bulk of the proposed development is not positioned directly in front of these windows, but instead relates primarily to the front forecourt and access area of the property. Furthermore, having regard to the southerly orientation of the site and the path of the sun, these windows would not experience a material reduction in daylight or sunlight as a result of the proposal. In this context, the relationship does not give rise to a sensitive window to window scenario that would warrant detailed BRE window testing.
49. It is concluded that there would be no material loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring habitable room windows along Olive Road

Transport Considerations

50. The site is currently occupied by four garages that the applicant advises are used as lock up garages. Land Registry records show it as a separate land parcel to any of the adjoining residential properties. The proposal is therefore unlikely to result in the displacement of parking from within the existing garages.

Car Parking and Access

51. Maximum car parking allowances for Brent are set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan and for residential use, this requires compliance with the standards in Table 10.3 of the London Plan. As the site has moderate access to public transport services, up to 0.75 spaces per 2-bedroom dwelling are allowed. No off-street parking is proposed for the two houses, so maximum standards are complied with.
52. Policy BT2 of the Local Plan also requires consideration to be given to the impact of any overspill parking on parking conditions though. In this respect, data from the 2021 Census suggests that car ownership for houses averages 1.07 cars/household in this area, so two cars can be expected to be owned by future residents. With vehicular access to the site no longer being required, the existing crossover can be removed and this would free up space for three extra on-street parking bays. These can thus absorb any additional parking demand generated by the two proposed houses.
53. A condition would be secured requiring the cost of the reinstatement of the crossover to footway and the provision of the new on-street parking bays to be met by the developer prior to occupation of the dwellings.
54. It should be noted that Brent's CPZ mapping places the site in Zone GM, whereas Wren Avenue is in Zone GA. An amendment to the mapping would therefore need to be made to ensure that this site is moved to Zone GA, where on-street parking availability is much greater. An informative advising the applicant to contact Brent Council prior to a material start to request the amendment to the CPZ map is therefore also attached to the permission.
55. Aside from the access paths, bin and bike stores, the remainder of the front gardens are shown as lightwells to proposed basements. These would extend to the highway boundary, so would require Approval in Principle from Brent's Highways Service to ensure the structure does not damage or weaken the highway structure attached as an informative.

Cycle and Refuse Storage

56. The submitted plans demonstrate that sufficient space is available within the front garden areas to accommodate two cycle parking spaces per dwelling. While the details of sheltered and secure cycle storage are not shown at this stage, this can be appropriately secured by condition. A planning condition

will therefore be imposed requiring the provision of covered and secure cycle lockers prior to occupation, to ensure compliance with London Plan requirements.

57. Bin storage is also accommodated within the front gardens, allowing easy access for collection.

Drainage and Flood Risk

58. Brent Local Plan Policy BSUI4 sets out proposals for minor developments, householder development, and conversions should make use of sustainable drainage measures wherever feasible and must ensure separation of surface and foul water systems. Proposals that would fail to make adequate provision for the control and reduction of surface water run-off will be refused.

59. The application site is a small, landlocked infill plot, formerly used for garage accommodation, and is currently entirely hardstanding. The site is not located within a Critical Drainage Area and lies within Flood Zone 1, where there is a low probability of flooding from rivers, the sea, or surface water. The submitted Basement Impact Assessment confirms that ground conditions comprise London Clay, which is relatively impermeable, and that groundwater is not expected to be encountered. The proposed basement would be constructed as a reinforced concrete box structure incorporating appropriate waterproofing measures, with any local seepage managed during construction, with detailed matters to be addressed under Building Regulations.

60. Notwithstanding the constrained nature of the site, the proposed development has maximised opportunities for sustainable drainage and surface water management through the introduction of a high factor intensive green roof, dedicated planting areas, and permeable terraces. These measures would improve the site's drainage performance when compared to the existing situation and would not increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in drainage and flood risk terms.

Green Infrastructure

Urban Greening Factor

61. Policy BH4 sets out the need for all minor residential developments (less than 10 dwellings) are required to deliver an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 on site.

62. The proposed development would deliver a meaningful improvement in the level of urban greening on the site, achieving an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) score of 0.22. While this falls below the requirement of 0.4 set out within policy BH6, the site's particular characteristics and constraints are material considerations in this instance.

63. The application site is a small, landlocked infill plot, formerly occupied by garages and characterised by extensive hardstanding. Within these physical and access constraints, the proposal has maximised opportunities for urban greening through the incorporation of an intensive green roof, dedicated planting areas, and permeable paving terraces.

64. Given the heavily constrained nature of the site, the proposed UGF score is considered to represent an appropriate and proportionate response. Furthermore, the planning benefits arising from the delivery of additional residential accommodation in a sustainable location, within a development of high quality design are considered to outweigh the identified shortfall against the UGF target.

65. A landscape plan is recommended by condition which would ensure the hard and soft landscaping of the site. The landscape plan would allow the opportunity to increase ecology within the site in line with policy BGI1.

Biodiversity Net Gain

66. Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

67. This sets out the need (subject to some exceptions) that every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved

through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

68. The development does not meet the de minimis exemption from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, as the submitted ecological assessment identifies more than 25m² of existing vegetated habitat on site, including bramble scrub and areas of ivy on vertical surfaces. These habitats have been mapped in accordance with UKHab and Biodiversity Metric guidance, which assesses habitat extent based on the aerial canopy of vegetation rather than the underlying substrate. In this regard, the submitted report is considered accurate and has mapped the baseline conditions fairly.
69. The site is predominantly hardstanding, however established vegetation has formed through cracks and by natural spread from adjacent land, resulting in areas of bramble and climbers that are recognised habitats for BNG purposes. The ecological report confirms that the habitats present are of limited ecological value and are not classed as “significant” habitats within the Biodiversity Metric.
70. The submission does not include a completed Biodiversity Metric calculation for the proposed development. However, a full metric and Biodiversity Gain Plan are not required at the decision making stage and can be appropriately secured prior to commencement. Depending on the final metric outcome, the proposal may result in a net loss of biodiversity units, in which case off-site biodiversity units would be required in accordance with statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. This would be secured through the mandatory Biodiversity Gain Plan condition.

Environmental Health Considerations

Construction Impacts

71. Given the proximity of the site’s access to neighbouring dwellings a condition is recommended for a Construction Method Statement to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development. This condition would be a pre-commencement condition to ensure that the ground works are managed appropriately.
72. The basement development has the potential to give rise to additional disruption during construction. The applicant has submitted a Basement Impact Assessment which sets out a proposed construction methodology. The report provides information on the topographical flood risk and geographical nature of the site. Environment Health Colleagues have advised the submission of a Construction Method Statement which is considered appropriate given the access to the site and proximity to residential properties.
73. Objections have been received raising concerns regarding basement excavation within London Clay, potential land instability and subsidence, with reference made to London Plan Policy D10 and paragraphs 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These matters have been carefully considered. London Plan Policy D10 does not preclude basement development but requires proposals to demonstrate safe and stable construction without unacceptable impacts on neighbouring buildings, which has been addressed through the submission of a Basement Impact Assessment prepared by suitably qualified engineers. Paragraphs 170–182 of the NPPF form part of the section relating to climate change and flood risk and are primarily concerned with directing development away from areas at higher flood risk; in this case, the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding, and no Sequential or Exception Test is required. The proposal relates to a minor, new build development rather than excavation beneath an existing building or large scale basement works. Detailed matters relating to excavation methodology, ground movement, structural stability and waterproofing are appropriately controlled through the Building Regulations.

Contamination

74. There are no known indications that the site is affected by land contamination. However, given the nature of the proposals, including excavation works to form the basement, there remains a possibility that unforeseen contamination could be encountered. It is therefore recommended that an informative be attached to any planning permission to advise on the appropriate procedure should unexpected contamination be discovered during construction.

Air Quality

75. The application site is located within an Air Quality Management Area. However, as the proposal does

not constitute major development, there is no requirement to submit an Air Quality Neutral Assessment in accordance with Policy BG11 of the Brent Local Plan. Notwithstanding this, given the site's location within an Air Quality Management Area, a condition has been imposed requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement to manage and minimise potential air quality impacts during the construction phase.

Noise

76. Environmental Health have recommended a noise condition; however, it is considered that internal sound insulation can be appropriately addressed through Building Regulations, and a separate planning condition is not required.

Fire Safety

77. Policy D12A of the London Plan 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.

78. A Fire Safety Strategy Statement has been submitted in support of the application and has been prepared by a suitably qualified professional in accordance with Policy D12A of the London Plan. The report confirms that the proposed development would comprise two dwellinghouses arranged over basement, ground and first floor levels.

79. The Fire Safety Strategy sets out that fire appliance access would be achieved from the public highway, with the distance from the point of access to all parts of the development being within 45 metres on a route suitable for laying hose. The height of the buildings would be less than 11 metres, and access for the fire service would be provided via the main entrance doors serving the dwellings. Existing public fire hydrants are located within an appropriate distance to serve the site.

80. The dwellings would be provided with appropriate means of escape, including protected staircases and protected corridors, designed in accordance with relevant guidance. Fire detection and alarm systems would be installed to Grade D1, LD2 standard, with interlinked detectors providing coverage to habitable rooms, circulation spaces, and stairways.

81. The Fire Safety Strategy confirms that the building would incorporate adequate fire resisting construction, including walls, floors, ceilings, and partitions achieving a minimum of 60 minutes fire resistance, with structural elements providing higher levels where required. Fire resisting doorsets would be provided to protected routes, and appropriate compartmentation measures would be implemented to limit fire spread.

82. External walls and roof construction would be designed to meet relevant fire performance standards, including BroofT4 classification for roof coverings. The strategy also addresses fire service facilities, fire-fighting equipment provision, and the management of fire safety information, with further detailed matters to be addressed through Building Regulations.

83. The submitted Fire Safety Strategy is therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy D12A of the London Plan.

Equalities

84. 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

85. Whilst the proposal does not meet the 0.4 target for the Urban Greening Factor as set out within policy BH4, following the above discussion, officers consider that taking the development plan as a whole, the proposal is considered to accord with the development plan, and having regard to all material planning considerations, should be approved subject to conditions as set out within this report. The proposal would deliver two new homes that would contribute the Council's housing targets within a sustainable location, and the limited conflict with policy would be outweighed by the planning benefits.
86. Planning permission is therefore recommended to be granted subject to conditions.



Application No: **25/2230**

To: Mr West
Studio:08 architecture + planning
Crows Nest
240 Stamford Hill
London
N16 6TT

I refer to your application dated **31/07/2025** proposing the following:

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.

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

at **Garages rear of 60, Olive Road, London**

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: 26/05/2026

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
London Plan 2021
Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041

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

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

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

2315.EX.01 Rev A – Existing Site Plan
2315.EX.02 Rev A – Existing Ground Floor Plan
2315.LP.01 – Location Plan
2315.P.01 Rev A – Proposed Site Plan
2315.P.10 Rev A – 2315.P.12 Rev A – Proposed 3D Images
2315.EX.03 Rev A – Existing Front (East) Elevation AA
2315.P.02 Rev C – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
2315.P.03 Rev C – Proposed Basement Floor Plan
2315.P.04 Rev C – Proposed First Floor Plan
2315.P.05 Rev B – Proposed Roof Plan
2315.P.06 Rev F – Proposed Elevation AA – East (Front) / Elevation / Section FF – East (Front)
2315.P.07 Rev F – Proposed Elevation DD – North (Side) / Elevation / Section EE – North (Side)
2315.P.08 Rev D – Proposed Elevation BB – South (Side) / Elevation CC – West (Rear)
2315.P.09 Rev E – Proposed Elevation / Section HH – North (Side) / Elevation / Section GG – West (Rear)

Supporting Documents

5130/SD/JL /17 Feb 2026 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report
250610-RSA-XX-BI-7100 - Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)
BNG Technical Note by ACJ ecology

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

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

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

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

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

- 5 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless the existing crossover has been reinstated to footway with full height kerbs, and the on street parking bays have been laid out and marked by the Local Highway Authority at the developer's expense.

Reason: In the interest of highway and pedestrian safety.

- 6 The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied unless the bin and cycle stores have been completed in full accordance with the approved details. The cycle and refuse storage for each dwelling shall be maintained and retained and kept free from obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of accommodation and promoting sustainable modes of travel.

- 7 The privacy screens to the first floor terraces shall contain solid screening and shall not be less than 1.7 metres in height unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory level of outlook for future residents whilst maintaining a satisfactory levels of privacy for adjoining properties.

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

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

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

- 9 Details of materials for all external building work, including samples which shall be made available for viewing in an agreed location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and laying of foundations). The submitted details shall include, but not be limited to:

- Boundary treatment and gate design;
- Hidden coping details to the standing seam roof where seams are expressed;
- Brick-on-edge coping details to principal brick elements;
- First-floor balcony divider details;
- First-floor window cowl details

The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

- 10 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 details of proposed planting including specifications and cross section of the green roof
- (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;
- (e) Details of the materials to be used for the cycle and refuse store.

The hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved unless an alternative timescale has 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.

- 11 Prior to commencement of development (excluding site clearance, demolition works and laying of foundations) hereby approved, a scheme for wildlife and nesting features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include:

- a) At least 1 of each of the following features on the proposed building/site:
 - i) multi-chamber swift bricks (preferred) or boxes,
 - ii) house sparrow terraces,
 - iii) bat bricks (preferred) or boxes
 - vii) deadwood and sand piles within planting areas (overwintering habitat)
 - viii) larvae food plant species within planting beds (breeding habitat for butterfly species)

The scheme shall include full details (type of feature, location, plan and elevation views, height above ground (if applicable) and nearest external lighting (if likely to have an impact).

- (b) Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a Statement of Conformity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement of Conformity will include photographs of each habitat/feature installed as per the approved details.

The wildlife and nesting features shall thereafter be retained throughout the lifetime of the development unless alternative details are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

INFORMATIVES

1 - The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that 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 in respect of this permission would be Brent Council. Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

- 2** - 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
- 3** - The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at www.brent.gov.uk/CIL.
- 4** - The applicant is advised to apply for the crossover reinstatement works by using the following link:-
<https://www.brent.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/roads-and-streets/vehicle-crossings-and-dropped-kerb>
- 5** - 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.
- 6** - Given the age of the buildings to be demolished it is possible that asbestos may be present. The applicant should be reminded of their duties under the Control of Asbestos Regulations and must ensure that a qualified asbestos contractor is employed to remove all asbestos and asbestos-containing materials and arrange for the appropriate disposal of such materials.
- 7** - 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
- 8** - The applicant is advised that the site is currently shown within Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) GM, while Wren Avenue falls within CPZ GA. The applicant should therefore contact Brent Council prior to the commencement of development to request that the CPZ mapping is amended to ensure the site is correctly aligned with Zone GA.
- 9** - The applicant is advised that the proposed basement lightwells to the front of the site extend up to the adopted highway boundary. As such, Approval in Principle (AIP) will be required from Brent Council's Highways Service to ensure that the proposed structures do not adversely affect the highway. The applicant should therefore contact the Highways Service prior to the commencement of development.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Mahya Fatemi, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 2292

This page is intentionally left blank