



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 13 January 2021 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Kelcher (Chair), Johnson (Vice-Chair), S Butt, Chappell, Dixon, Kennelly, Maurice and J Mitchell Murray

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Georgiou.

1. **Declarations of interests**

None.

2. **Minutes of the previous meetings - 26 Nov 2020**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26th November 2020 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

2. **Minutes of previous meeting held on 9th December 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th December 2020 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **20/1683 416 Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 1JQ**

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of the site to deliver a building of between three and seven storeys in height comprising residential homes and flexible commercial space, with associated outdoor communal amenity space at courtyard and roof levels, widened pavement along Ealing Road and Alperton Lane to accommodate new outdoor public space, car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, hard and soft landscaping and plant.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

GRANT planning permission subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions,

informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

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

Mr Denis Toomey (Planning Officer) introduced the report, set out the key issues as amplified within the report and answered Members’ questions. With reference to the supplementary report, Mr Toomey reported that a detailed analysis of the Urban Greening Factor (UGF) rating provided by the applicant showed that the development would achieve a UGF of 0.22 compared to an emerging London Plan target of 0.4. While the UGF is below the emerging target, the proposal would represent a very significant improvement over the existing site, and the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the shortfall against this target. He also confirmed that objections received against the application totalled 14.

Ms Madeleine Shea objected to the application mainly on grounds of parking and reduction in light to her property and answered Members’ questions. She considered that the provision of 15 car parking spaces would be inadequate as well as resulting in parking overspill in the Burns Road area.

Ms Alina Lopitas (Secretary, Burns Road and Cromwell Road Residents) objected to the proposed development for several reasons including the following;
The development would result in change of character of the area.
The development would aggravate the existing parking situation in the area.
Lack of infrastructure to support the impact of the development.
The development would give rise to construction traffic noise nuisance.

Mr Max Plotnek (agent) addressed the Committee, highlighting the following and answered Members’ questions:

- The application to redevelop an underutilised brownfield site would provide replacement retail floorspace, a community space for local residents to use for community events, and 132 new homes, just marginally over the capacity envisaged by the site allocation.
- The scale of the development was appropriate and the design quality optimised to deliver as much affordable housing whilst ensuring any possible impact was within acceptable limits.
- The taller elements of the scheme would be located as far away as possible from the nearest residential properties on Burns Road to minimise impacts.
- Whilst the affordable housing provision fell short against the target specified in the Local Plan, the Council’s independent viability consultants had confirmed that the offer was more than the maximum reasonable amount of

affordable housing that the scheme can viably provide, following a rigorous assessment the development appraisal.

- The applicant has agreed to a clawback mechanism within the section 106 so that any surplus generated through improvements to values or savings in build cost can be captured as an addition of affordable housing contribution following construction.

During question time, Members raised issues relating the privacy, overlooking, affordable housing, traffic, amenity and open space to which officers submitted the following:

- As the scheme would maintain an adequate separation distance in excess of the Council's guidance, it would not result in loss of privacy or overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- The amount of affordable housing all at London Affordable Rent levels provided would be above requirements for a scheme that would be in financial deficit of £5.9m as confirmed by the Council's independent financial viability assessment that robustly examined the applicant's figures. In addition an appropriate post-completion review mechanism would be secured within the legal agreement to capture an additional contribution to affordable housing should the viability of the scheme improve.
- The level of parking spaces proposed is within the maximum parking standards and in order to address mitigation from overspill parking, a contribution of £70,000 towards the consultation and implementation of a controlled parking zone within the vicinity of the site would be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. The removal of parking permits for future residents would also be secured within the Section 106 Agreement.
- The minimal shortfall in amenity space provisions would be supplemented with public realm improvements and sporting recreational facilities nearby.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended in the main report. (Voting on the decision was as follows: For 5; Against 3; Abstention 0).

4. 20/2164 79-83 ODDS, Kenton Road, Harrow, HA3 0AH

PROPOSAL:

Erection of a part three part four storey building comprising self-contained flats with associated basement car and cycle parking spaces accessed via new crossover off Rushout Avenue, bin stores, fencing and landscaping.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and referral to the Mayor of London.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above to secure the obligations set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

That, if by 3 months of the Committee date the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

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

Mr R Liam McFadden (Planning Officer) introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He then referenced the supplementary report that provided an update on Urban Greening Factor (UGF) and the applicant's inability to implement the sedum roof. As such Mr McFadden recommended that condition 26 (sedum roof) be deleted and condition 18 (landscaping) amended as amplified within the supplementary report.

Ms Liz Alexander and Mr Nick Wilson (agent and architect, respectively) addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions. Members heard that the principle and much of the detail of the proposed development had already been established firstly through an application for 39 flats, accessed off Rushout Avenue (17/3717 granted in 2018) and 19/4473 – basement enlargement, relocated cycle storage and rear fire escape stairs. She outlined the minor differences between this and the consented applications and in addressing the concerns about overlooking added that the changes made complied with policy guidelines in relation to scale, size and density of the structure. Mr Wilson clarified that the provision of the 10% family homes was the most efficient option in order to limit the overall massing and volume of the scheme.

In response to members' questions, officers stated that the number of car parking spaces provided would be adequate to meet parking demand without necessarily causing parking overspill to nearby streets that were not even controlled.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and

asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by unanimous decision to approve the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended in the main report with the amendment to condition 18 and the removal of condition 26 as set out in the supplementary report.

(Voting on the amended recommendation was as follows: For 8; Against 0)

5. 18/3498 Land at 370 High Road and 54-68 Dudden Hill Lane, London, NW10

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 5 mixed use blocks ranging from 4 to 10 storeys plus basement levels, comprising; 245 residential units at 1st to 9th floors, and light industrial floorspace (Class B1c), food retail floorspace (supermarket) (Class A1), gym (Class D2), nursery (Class D1), commercial units (units 7 and 9) (flexible use for Class A1, A2, A3, D1 and/or B1c) and HA office (Class B1a) at basement, ground and part 1st floors, together with associated vehicular access, car and cycle parking spaces, bin stores, plant room, substations, landscaping and amenity space (Amended description).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

To refuse planning permission for the reasons stated within the Committee report and set out within the draft decision notice and subject to stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the decision notice and impose informatives pursuant to the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add informatives or to vary the reason for the refusal) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

Members heard that since the publication of the report, the applicant had proposed the following; a payment of £1.5 million to be used toward the provision of off-site affordable housing to mitigate the under-provision of London Affordable Rented (LAR) homes and a revised retail parking arrangements. As officers needed to evaluate the new proposals, the applicant decided to withdraw the application.

DECISION: The application was withdrawn.

6. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 8.26 pm

COUNCILLOR M. KELCHER
Chair

Note: At 8.00pm the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes.