

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

20 April, 2022
05
21/3248

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	24 August, 2021
WARD	Kenton
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Kingsbury & Kenton
LOCATION	Lidding Road Garages, Lidding Road, Harrow
PROPOSAL	Demolition of the existing garages and redevelopment to provide 3 self-contained flats and 5 dwellinghouses; with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping
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_156704</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.uk2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "21/3248" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box3. Click on "View Documents" tab

INTRODUCTION

Members will be aware that the application was first reported to Committee at the meeting on 15 December 2021 where the committee agreed to defer a decision on the application in order to:

1. seek further details and assurance from Thames Water in relation to the impact of the proposed development on drainage and the maintenance of the sewerage infrastructure and how these would be mitigated;
2. seek further details on the location of the flooding incidents identified within the Flood Risk Assessment; and
3. seek further details on the proposals to alleviate concerns regarding the access of construction traffic to the site via Gooseacre Lane as part of the Construction Method Statement and Logistics Plan to be secured via condition.

Impact of the proposed development on drainage and the maintenance of the sewerage infrastructure and how these would be mitigated

In the Committee members raised concerns regarding flood risk impacts on the site. Specific concerns were raised regarding the potential for the voids under the houses to be blocked by residents; the ability for Thames Water to access and service the pipes where necessary. Additionally members raised concerns over the potential impact of the development on pollution in the Wealdstone Brook and further details were requested regarding any projects to clean the Brook.

Since the application was deferred, further comments were received from Thames Water regarding impacts of the development. It should be noted that these comments relate only to flooding that may rise from foul or surface water flooding. Flooding from other sources (such as the Brook) fall outside the statutory responsibility of Thames Water.

They consider that there is sufficient capacity and that the flow expected from the development would be exceptionally small. They have specified that they have no concerns over the risk of foul water flooding as part of the development. Additionally, they consider that the development would not result in an increase to the pollution of the Wealdstone Brook.

With regard to the concerns raised by residents about the sewers, Thames Water have specified the following:

We acknowledge concerns raised by residents about the performance of the foul sewers in this area. These have not been caused by the capacity of the sewers but by sewer blockages. Sewers are only designed to take water from toilets, sinks, baths and showers along with human waste and toilet tissue. Everything else should be put in the bin.

Sewer blockages in this area are predominantly due to fats, oils and grease being inappropriately put down the sewer. This then clogs the pipes, which causes the foul water to back up and eventually flood out of the sewer.

Sewer capacity is when the pipe is too small to accommodate flow and it can eventually back up and eventually cause flooding. Increased flow to the foul sewer from new developments has the potential to increase the risk of flooding due to sewer capacity. From our knowledge of the current flow in the sewer in question and the expected increase due to this development we are confident that the receiving sewer has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed flows. If we had concerns that capacity did not exist to serve this development, it would initiate Thames Water funded modelling investigations. Our initial assessment of this site shows this is not necessary.

They also note that with regards to surface water flooding there would be an overall reduction in flood risk due to the increased flow rates identified in the drainage strategy.

With regards to access to the sewers, Thames Water have confirmed that the applicants have engaged with them during the course of the development and a build-over agreement has been proposed. Thames Water raise no objections or concerns in regards to this and note that such matters are usually dealt with post-approval via Building Regulations.

The applicant has also advised that they already have details of the existing line, level and condition of the

existing sewers within the development boundary prior to development, from undertaking drainage CCTV condition and utilities surveys in 2020. The flood risk consultant has therefore suggested that a post-construction drainage CCTV and conditions survey is undertaken of the Thames Water assets within the redline boundary to confirm that there has been no damage to the existing sewers during construction. Any damaged and/or blocked pipes could then be reported to Thames Water for repair. Such details could be conditioned to any forthcoming consent.

With regards to pollution in the Wealdstone Brook, colleagues in the Parks team have provided further information on the existing circumstances. They note that most of the pollutants in the water would have originated upstream and flowed down into Brent towards the River Brent.

Brent Parks Service are working on an early-stage scheme to improve the structural and wildlife diversity and amenity section of the Brook through woodcock Park. Additionally, the catchment area of the brook is mainly located in Harrow and Harrow Council has ongoing projects to improve the brook.

Thames Water have an on-going programme looking at addressing the issues with water quality in the Wealdstone Brook, and have specified the following:

We recognise that there is a significant issue with water quality in the Wealdstone Brook. We host a "Friends of the Wealdstone Brook" quarterly meeting where residents, the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flooding Authorities are other interested stakeholders can meet and engage on the issue. This allows us to share water quality data for the watercourse, our operational activity and longer-term investment plans with interested stakeholders. The group is attended by the NERC funded CAMELLIA project (Community Water Management for a Liveable London) consisting of many academic partners including Imperial College, British Geological Survey, and Oxford University. We completed an extensive Catchment Study on the Wealdstone Brook in 2016/17 that assessed the root cause of poor water quality and flood risk in the area. Following that study, we have a long-term list of improvements we propose to make to the sewer system. As water quality and flood risk are intrinsically linked, we have to start by creating capacity in the river system. We are in discussions with Harrow Council about a potential scheme to do that. Once details are available, we will share them. We hope to promote a similar scheme with Brent Council in the future.

Thames Water conclude their further advice by confirming that they have adequately assessed the impact that the proposed development will have on the sewer system and that they are confident that the development will not cause a deterioration to the level of service residents receive at present.

Location of the flooding incidents identified within the Flood Risk Assessment

In the committee members noted that the flood risk assessment identified 66 flooding events at postcode 'HA3 0'. It should be noted that this postcode zone encompasses a larger area stretching from Kingsbury to Northwick Park and including the area between Kenton Road and Preston Road.

In response to the above, the applicants have requested a Sewer Flooding History Enquiry from Thames Water. This has selected 1 Lidding Road as the centre point but encompasses a wider area around this address. The report notes that there have been no recorded flooding events in the area as a result of surcharging public sewers.

With regards to the potential for the voids to be blocked, the applicants have agreed that a planning condition can be attached requiring a verification report to confirm that the relevant measures have been implemented on site. This is intended to include a drainage maintenance schedule which can incorporate checks to the void structure.

Notwithstanding that, the voids are closed in by 'hit-and-miss' brickwork leaving several small gaps for water to escape. The gaps are considered small enough to avoid large objects from being inserted into the void space. Additionally, these voids would be located under all plots 1-6. As such, officers consider that the likelihood of the voids to be fully blocked and therefore resulting in undue flooding impacts is low and suitably addressed by the suggested condition.

Construction Vehicle Impacts

In the committee members raised concerns over the potential impact of construction vehicles accessing the site with regards to restricting parking in the area. In particular concerns were raised regarding the potential impacts of vehicles accessing the site via Goosacre Lane. Members requested a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) to be submitted.

The applicants have confirmed that a full CLP is not feasible at this stage as many of the details in a CLP are only finalised when a contractor has been retained for the development and this will not happen until after permission is granted. This is a common situation for most developments, and therefore full details of CLPs are often conditioned to planning consents.

However, as members concerns related only to the access of vehicles to the site, the applicant has provided tracking diagrams. These diagrams indicate the routes of typically sized construction vehicles to the site (including a small tipper, 10m rigid, small artic). The drawings submitted, show that the site itself is wide enough to accommodate construction vehicles into the site so that they can enter and leave in a forward gear..

With regards to vehicles accessing the site from further away, the drawings show that access would be possible via Goosacre Lane or via Hillview Avenue. These drawings have been assessed by Transport Officers who note that construction vehicles are able to access the site from both Gooseacre Lane and Hillview Avenue without the need for parking suspensions.

Furthermore no parking suspensions would be required for construction vehicles egressing the site via Hillview Avenue although they are likely to be required on the northbound carriageway of Gooseacre Lane. For these reasons it is recommended that vehicles access is via Gooseacre Lane whilst egress is via Hillview Avenue.

It should be noted that if construction vehicles are required to access Lidding Road itself then some traffic management would be required to enable vehicles to turn right onto Gooseacre Lane.

A full CLP would be required by condition. As part of the CLP condition a requirement for vehicles access via Gooseacre Lane whilst egress is via Hillview Avenue could be included.

Equalities

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). An analysis of equalities impact has been provided within the main committee report.

Recommendation: Officers continue to recommend that permission is granted subject to the conditions set out within the original report (which is set out below), update to condition and additional condition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

Conditions

1. Three year commencement rule
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Restriction of PD rights to change to C4 HMO use
4. Obscure Glazing
5. Restriction of PD rights for dwellinghouses
6. Unit Mix
7. Affordable Housing
8. Flood Mitigation

9. Tree Protection measures
10. Construction Method Statement and Construction Logistics Plan
11. Ecology measures
12. Construction Environmental Management Plan
13. External Materials
14. Landscaping
15. Highway works
16. Lighting
17. Cycle Parking
18. Parking Management Plan
19. Noise


Informatives

1. CIL liability
2. Party Wall Act
3. Asbestos
4. Fire Statements
5. Flood Risk Activity Permit
6. Noisy Works

1. That the Head of Planning 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 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.

2. 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.

SITE MAP

	Planning Committee Map Site address: Lidding Road Garages, Lidding Road, Harrow © Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260
---	---



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The application proposes the demolition of the existing garages and redevelopment to provide 3 self-contained flats and 5 dwellinghouses; with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping.

EXISTING

The application site is a 0.32 Hectare plot of land at the rear of 1 to 31 (odd) Lidding Road, and to the south of Lidding Road adjacent to the Wealdstone Brook, and includes the alleyway and 27 detached garages accessed from Gooseacre Lane.

The site is partly in Flood Zone 3a and 3b, and partly within the Grade II Wealdstone Brook Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and wildlife corridor, alongside the Wealdstone Brook. The site also contains some land that is liable to local surface water flooding, and is within an Air Quality Management Area. It has PTAL Rating of 1b (poor).

AMENDMENTS SINCE SUBMISSION

The following amendments were made to the plans during the application:

- Updated plans and documents to correct redline boundary
- Urban Greening details provided

Preliminary Bat Survey and Ecology Appraisal updated to include a subsequent walkover of previously inaccessible areas within the site.

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: Representations were received from the owners/occupiers of neighbouring properties in response to the consultation. These are set out above and discussed in the report.

Principle of Development: The site is within a residential area and the general principle of residential development to provide additional new Affordable homes is supported in this location.

Highway impacts: The level of car parking considered sufficient to mitigate the potential for over-spill parking. Servicing for the dwellings is to be undertaken within the site and from Lidding Road. The proposed access arrangements within the site are considered to be acceptable. A new turning head and parking arrangement on Lidding Road will improve parking and servicing manoeuvrability for existing vehicles.

Residential amenity: The proposal would not result in a significant impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, daylight and sunlight or overlooking.

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

Trees, landscaping and ecology: Landscaping has been provided with a practical layout with beneficial soft landscaping which respects the nearby SINC. Replacement trees are to be secured on the site to mitigate the loss of existing trees. The submission demonstrates that the potential impacts of the proposal on ecology and protected species can be mitigated through measures which are secured through condition.

Flood Risk: The proposal would result in a betterment in terms of drainage rates at the site and has effectively mitigated impacts of flooding events on the future residential units. There are no objections from

the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Environment Agency.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
14/0712	Prior approval application for demolition of the Former Royal British Legion Hall building	Raise No Objection	31/03/2014

CONSULTATIONS

77 Neighbours Consulted were consulted by post on the 1st of September 2021

18 objections were received from 17 individual addresses and the Friends of Woodcock Park. These are summarised as follows:

Objection	Response
Residential amenity concerns	
Concerns over loss of daylight/overshadowing	Discussed in paragraphs 23-26
Loss of privacy	Discussed in paragraphs 27-29
The new builds would be close to neighbouring boundaries	Discussed in paragraphs 9-19 and 21-22
Impact of new street lighting and light pollution	Discussed in paragraphs 37-38
Potential anti-social behaviour and security concerns	Discussed in paragraphs 34-36
Potential for increase in fly tipping	Discussed in paragraphs 34-36
Will there be enough lighting and CCTV	Discussed in paragraphs 36-38
Impact on neighbouring gardens	Discussed in paragraphs 20-29
Objection to loss of green space for turning head	Discussed in paragraphs 30-33
Design concerns	
Out of character with the local area	Discussed in paragraphs 9-19
New homes are oriented in a different way to other houses	Discussed in paragraphs 9-19
Highways concerns	
Concerns over parking impacts	Discussed in paragraphs 60-72
How will construction vehicles access the site	Discussed in paragraphs 75
Will the road be a public road/accessible to everyone	No barriers are proposed within the road to prevent public access.

Noise from new cars	Discussed in paragraphs 74
Existing parking problems in the area that need to be resolved	Discussed in paragraphs 68 to 72
Impact on SINC/Wildlife	
Impact on wildlife	Discussed in paragraphs 97-111
Concerns over impact on the SINC	Discussed in paragraphs 97-111
Impact on trees	Discussed in paragraphs 88-96
Potential impact of light pollution on bats	Discussed in paragraphs 37-38 and 107
Flood Risk	
Thames Water require access to the site to deal with blockages. The area already experiences issues from sewer.	Discussed in paragraphs 64 and 84 to 87
Concerns over flood risk to site and neighbouring properties	Discussed in paragraphs 76-87
New builds would impede water drainage	Discussed in paragraphs 76-87
Will Brent Council cover costs of insurance for flood risk/ pay for liability in flood events	This is not a planning matter. However all of the units are proposed to be delivered and managed by Brent Council and as such they would be responsible for obtaining the necessary insurance.
Other Issues	
Maintenance of green space (to be lost) is included in service charge. Will this be reduced once greenspace is lost	This is not a material planning consideration
The site is not a brownfield site	Discussed in paragraphs 6
The submitted plans include land outside ownership of the site	The originally submitted plans contained an error in the redline boundary which included part of neighbouring land in error. No development was ever intended on this land. Updated documents have been submitted which no longer include this land.
Lack of opportunity for local residents to object to the proposal	Consultation letters were sent out to properties in proximity of the application site on 1 st September 2021, with a consultation period of 21 days. As noted above, objections have been received from 17 individual addresses and the Friends of Woodcock Park. Concerns have been raised that as some residents are unable to email or send in their

	comments on line, objections should be considered by letter. In response, officers can confirm that objections can be considered by letter as well as on line or via email.
--	---

Internal Consultees

Local Lead Flood Authority – No objections

Environmental Health – No objections subject to conditions

External Consultees

The Environment Agency – No objections to the proposal.

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 Core Strategy 2010

Brent Development Management Policies 2016.

London Plan (2021)

Key policies include:

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 housing

D12 – Fire Safety

G5 – Urban greening

G6 – Biodiversity and access to nature

G7 – Trees and woodlands

H1 – Increasing housing supply

H2 – Small sites

H4 – Delivering affordable housing

S4 – Play and informal recreation
H6 – Affordable housing tenure
SI 1 Improving air quality
SI 12 Flood risk management
SI 13 – Sustainable drainage
T2 – Healthy Streets
T4 – Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
T5 – Cycling
T6 - Car parking

Core Strategy (2010)

CP 2 Population and Housing Growth
CP 17 Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent
CP18 Protection and Enhancement of Open Space, Sports and Biodiversity
CP21 A Balanced Housing Stock

Development Management Policy (2016)

DMP1: General Policy
DMP12: Parking
DMP19: Residential Amenity Space

Other material considerations include:

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Supplementary Planning Document 1 “Brent’s Design Guide” 2018,

The Council is at an advanced stage in reviewing its Local Plan. The draft Brent Local Plan was subject to examination in public during September and October 2020. Planning Inspectors appointed on behalf of the Secretary of State have considered the draft Plan and have requested that the Council undertake consultation on a number of Main Modifications which is taking place between 8 July and 19 August 2021. Therefore, having regard to the tests set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF, it is considered that greater weight can now be applied to policies contained within the draft Brent Local Plan.

The draft Local Plan carries significant weight in the assessment of planning applications given the progress through the statutory plan-making processes.

General Policies:

DMP1 – Development Management General Policy

Design Policies:

BD1 – Leading the way in good design

Housing:

BH1 – Increasing Housing Supply

BH2 – Priority Areas for Additional Housing Provision within Brent
BH4 – Small Sites and Small Housing Developments in Brent
BH5 – Affordable Housing
BH6 – Housing Size Mix
BH13 – Residential Amenity Space

Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment:

BGI1 – Green and Blue Infrastructure in Brent
BGI2 – Trees and Woodland

Sustainable Infrastructure:

BSUI1 – Creating a Resilient and Efficient Brent
BSUI2 – Air Quality
BSUI3 – Managing Flood Risk
BSUI4 – On-site Water Management and Surface Water Attenuation

Transport:

BT1 – Sustainable Travel Choice
BT2 – Parking and Car Free Development
BT4 – Forming an Access on to a Road

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

1. Policy CP2 of the Brent Core Strategy sets out a target for delivering 22,000 new homes over the 2007-2026 period, including a target of 25% family sized accommodation. Brent's Housing targets have significantly increased as part of London Plan 2021, with the target increasing to 2,325 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. Emerging local plan policy BH1 reflects this target.
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 draft Local Plan, the Council has set out priority areas for new housing under policy BH2. This policy identifies that new housing will 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 draft Local Plan. This policy relates to small housing sites 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). Outside of 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.
5. The site is not within a priority location as noted above. However, the site currently houses 27 garages which are disused and in a poor state of repair. There are no objections to the loss of these garages (as outlined in the Transport section of this report) and part of the proposal would sit on the site of the former Legion Hall. The proposal forms part of the Council's Development Programme to deliver 1000 council homes by 2024 as part of its Housing Strategy. The programme aims to make the best use of existing land and under-utilised/vacant garage sites across the site. This scheme forms part of phase 3 of the programme. The redevelopment of the site to provide 8 new homes within a residential area would contribute to the borough's housing stock and is considered acceptable in principle, subject to other material planning considerations as discussed below.

6. An objector has commented that the site is not a brownfield site. The majority of the site was occupied by garages or the former British Royal Legion Hall and these elements of the site therefore are previously developed land. The element of the site at the end of Lidding Road comprised the access to the former British Legion Hall together with grassed areas adjacent to this access and landscaped areas adjacent to the Brook. This area is not considered to be a brownfield part of the site. However, the three flats proposed in this location sit within a street frontage and are considered to appropriately terminate Lidding Road.

Affordable Housing

7. The application is not classified as a Major Development (i.e. at it does not propose 10 or more homes) and as such there is no policy requirement for affordable units to be provided on site, as it does not meet the threshold for on site affordable housing as set out in policy H4 of London Plan 2021 and policy DMP15 of Brent's Development Management Policies . Policy BH5 of the emerging Local Plan seeks a contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing for developments of between 5 to 9 new dwellings.
8. In this case, the proposal would be 100% affordable units at London Affordable Rent which would be a significant benefit of the scheme. Brent Council would be responsible for the maintenance and management of the properties. A condition is recommended to secure the homes as affordable housing as noted above.

Layout, Design and Appearance

9. Policy BD1 of the Draft Local Plan sets out that all new development must be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. Innovative contemporary design will be supported where it respects and complements historic character 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 London Plan design policies and the Brent Design Guide SPD1.
10. Policy CP17 seeks to ensure that the development in suburban areas should be of a scale and character that respects the suburban character of Brent.
11. The scheme would be designed with three groups of buildings to accommodate eight new homes. Plot 1 would be located to the south of Lidding Road and would accommodate three flats. Plots 4 to 6 would be located to the east of plot 1 and would accommodate three new houses. Plots 7 and 8 would be located to the rear of 5 to 7 Brookfield Crescent and would accommodate two new houses. Each of the buildings would be designed at two storeys with pitched roofs. The external materials would consist of brickwork for the walls and clay tiles for the roofs.
12. The proposed units would be of a more contemporary design than the surrounding traditional suburban housing nearby. However, given the type of accommodation proposed, and the limitations of the site, it is considered that contemporary designs would be more appropriate at this site.
13. The proposals are based on site-specific design principles that have been developed through comprehensive research and site analysis; these have been successfully translated into a scheme that carefully balances the site constraints against an ambition for good quality housing and amenity space.
14. Each building has its own distinct character, yet all are easily read as part of a unified scheme within the area. Each gives definition to a different part of the site and its surroundings helping to reintegrate it into the suburban fabric.
15. A strong approach to materiality has been set out in the submission drawings and includes typical construction details to illustrate the design intent for key elements of the building envelope. Consequently, this gives confidence that the scheme will deliver high quality and robust buildings
16. Notwithstanding the above, approval of final materials and key construction details is sought via planning condition.
17. The proposal includes some larger areas of hardsurfacing to allow vehicles to turn within the access road. While there may be some opportunities to reduce the size of these slightly, given the nature of the access road and relationship with the adjoining buildings, it is considered that these will contribute positively to the shared surface environment providing good quality materials are used.

18. The scheme has been assessed by the Council's Urban Design Officer who considers the scheme to be an exemplar infill scheme in terms of design.
19. It is acknowledged that objections have been received regarding the design of the proposal which differs from that of the surrounding houses. However, the design of the homes and gardens responds to the shape of the site and makes effective and efficient use of the land whilst minimising potential impacts to the amenity of neighbours. In this instance a more contemporary design is considered to be an appropriate response to the site specific context and the proposal is considered to represent a high standard of design.

Neighbouring Residential Amenity

20. Policy DMP1 of the local plan both emphasise that new development should not result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. SPD1 provides further guidance on the layout of new development to avoid such impacts.

Outlook

21. SPD1 states that the building envelope of new development 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.
22. Sectional drawings have been provided with the application which demonstrate that these requirements would be complied with, both in terms of 30 and 45 degree lines when measured from the properties on Brookfield Crescent and Lidding Road.

Daylight

23. The application includes a Daylight/Sunlight report which sets out the impacts of the proposal on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties and gardens
24. The report uses the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test which measures the amount of visible sky outside a property. Guidance states that an undue impact is considered to be where the VSC levels drop below 27% or are reduced to 0.8 times their existing value.
25. For the assessment of Sunlight the report uses the APSH test which calculates the percentage of statistically probable hours of sunlight received by each window in both summer and winter months represented as APSH (Average Probable Sunlight Hours) and WPSH (Winter Probable Sunlight Hours). BRE guidelines suggest that main living rooms should achieve at least 25% of annual sunlight hours with 5% in the winter period.
26. The submission identifies properties 10-16 and 25-31 Lidding Road as closest to the proposal and as such most likely to be impacted. The results of the report indicate that VSC would remain well above the 27 benchmark in all locations and as such would satisfy BRE guidance.

Privacy

27. SPD1 requires a minimum distance of 9m from habitable room window to neighbouring private external amenity spaces and a minimum distance of 18m between directly facing habitable room windows. The proposal does not directly face the rear windows of adjoining properties.
28. Plot 8 would feature windows which directly face those on the rear elevation of properties on Brookfield Crescent. However, the distance between these windows would be 32.6m, exceeding the above guidance and in any case would be a secondary window which can be obscure glazed to avoid privacy impact. Clear glazed windows on this plot would face south towards the private rear garden of No. 8 Brookfield Close. However this distance would be 9m, meeting the above requirement.
29. Plots 4, 5 and 6 would be located less than 9m from the rear gardens of properties on Lidding Road. However, at first floor, the windows facing this garden would be secondary windows serving stairwells and would be obscure-glazed. As such, there would be no undue impact on neighbouring privacy from

the proposed units into the garden areas for the maisonettes within Lidding Road.

Other Concerns

30. Objectors have raised concerns over the loss of some of the green space from the southern side of the site adjacent to the Wealdstone Brook.
31. It is acknowledged that it is possible that some residents may be currently using some of the grassed area for recreational functions despite the proximity to Woodcock Park, and that this may have some local value despite not falling within the boundaries of a designated public open space. Policy CP18 seeks to protect open space of local value from inappropriate development. The policy seeks to preserve open spaces for the benefit, enjoyment, health and wellbeing of Brent's residents, visitors and wildlife. Support will be given to the enhancement and management of open space for recreational, sporting and amenity use and the improvement of both open space and the built environment for biodiversity and nature conservation. Where the loss of open space is proposed, this would be required to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal.
32. The proposal would result in part of the wide grassed verge area to the south of Lidding Road to accommodate the new parking turning area off Lidding Road and the building footprint, pathways and parking for the three flats within plots 1 to 3. However, no buildings are proposed within the SNIC and wildlife corridor. This element of the proposal would improve the existing parking arrangement (increasing the aisle width between the parking spaces) and would provide a turning head for servicing vehicles. This is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms as the three homes that would be serviced from this location would be accessed via a road from which homes are already serviced (Lidding Road). However, the proposed works represent a benefit for the servicing of both existing and future residents.
33. Notwithstanding that, there would be some loss of soft landscaped publicly accessible area as a result of the proposal. While the loss of the grassed verge area is acknowledged, this improvement is considered to outweigh the harm, particularly given the proximity to Woodcock Park which provides a large area of open space in very close proximity and access to this park would remain unrestricted for nearby residents. On balance, the loss of this grassed area is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme as a whole, including the delivery of eight affordable homes and the improvements to the parking and servicing arrangements as discussed above.
34. Objectors note that historically the rear access to the garages suffered from anti-social and criminal behaviour including fly-tipping which was mitigated by the installation of a security fence/gate where the road adjoins Gooseacre Lane. Concerns have been raised that the loss of this gate would result in an increase in anti-social behaviour as a result.
35. These comments are acknowledged. However, the route to the garages at present is a dilapidated and unused route which lacks any natural surveillance and is poorly overlooked. As a result of the redevelopment, the route would become a more open and accessible road which would benefit from surveillance from the proposed units and from pedestrian and car traffic from users of the site. It is acknowledged that the gate/fence provides security benefits for the site as it exists at present but it is considered that this would no longer be necessary once the site is developed.
36. Objectors have questioned whether the development would include CCTV. As noted above, the application site would experience a significant improvement in terms of natural surveillance as a result of the development compared to the existing situation and it is not considered necessary or reasonable to require the development to also provide a CCTV system.
37. Objectors have questioned whether any proposed lighting may result in impacts on neighbouring properties. Lighting will need to be considered in terms of impacts on local ecology, residential amenity and safety (including transportation safety). The application submission confirms that the lighting can be provided to the access road and homes while mitigates potential impacts on ecology and protected species.
38. The Ecologist recommends several methods such as the use of low UV bulbs and low level lighting which can be used in a potential scheme. The use of low level lighting would also minimise the level of potential impact on surrounding properties. A condition is therefore attached requiring details of any lighting to be submitted and approved before implementation.

Mix of Units and Standard of Accommodation

39. Policy CP2 seeks an overall target of 25% of new homes within the Borough to be family sized (three bedrooms or more).
40. Emerging policy BH6 of Brent's Draft Local Plan seeks for 1 in 4 homes to be family sized. In this case, the proposal exceeds these requirements and the proposal is considered to be compliance with policy CP2.
41. The proposal would provide eight new homes comprising of three flats (1x1 bedroom, 1x2 bedroom and 1x3 bedroom) and five houses (1x2 bedroom and 4x3 bedroom). Therefore 5 of the 8 proposed homes would have 3 bedrooms (accounting for 62.5%) and would therefore exceed the above policy requirement.
42. So as to ensure that these flats are not re-purposed to become homes in multiple occupation (HMOs), resulting in the further loss of single family homes to meet an identified need, and to ensure a satisfactory standard of accommodation, a condition is attached to restrict the use of the flats as single family dwellinghouses (C3 use class) and prevent the conversion of the use of the flats to homes in multiple occupation (C4 use class).

Standard of Accommodation

43. Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) requires new housing to be of high quality design and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiate between tenures.

Unit	Size	Proposed GIA	Minimum GIA*
Plot 1	3B5P (Flat)	96.7sqm	86sqm
Plot 2	2B3P (Flat)	70sqm	61sqm
Plot 3	1B2P (Flat)	65.3sqm	50sqm
Plot 4	2B4P (House)	88.5sqm	79sqm
Plot 5	3B5P (House)	104.1sqm	93sqm
Plot 6	3B5P (House)	96.4sqm	93sqm
Plot 7	3B5P (House)	105.1sqm	93sqm
Plot 8	3B5P (House)	99.5sqm	93sqm

44. All of the proposed units would meet or exceed the minimum space standards as required by the London Plan and all units would be provided with purpose built internal storage. All of the habitable rooms would meet the minimum sizes and widths required and all would have external windows providing good levels of daylight and outlook. Floor to ceiling heights would meet the minimum 2.5m across 75% of the GIA of all units.
45. In addition, the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report identifies that all of the proposed units would achieve acceptable levels of internal daylight with the exception of 2 habitable rooms which would fall slightly below BRE targets. However, the shortfalls would be relatively minor with the kitchen/dining room of Plot 8 having a ADF score of 1.79 compared to a target of 2 and the kitchen/dining of plot 5 having an ADF score of 1.89 compared to a target of 2. All homes have at least two aspects. The overall quality of the units is considered to be acceptable.
46. The private amenity spaces would likewise receive good levels of daylight, particularly in the summer months.

Accessible homes

47. Policy D7 of London Plan seeks for at least 10% of new dwellings to be designed to M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' and the remainder to be designed to M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. Therefore in this case, policy D7 seeks for all eight homes to be designed to M4(2) requirements.

48. Plot 1, 7 to 8 have been designed with step free access from street level to meet policy M4(2) requirements. However plots 2, 3, 4 to 6 do not have stepped access from street level. Plots 2 and 3 are located above plot 1 and only have stepped access to the first floor. No lift would be proposed to allow step free access to these flats. However, policy D7 recognises that there are exceptional circumstances where the provision of a lift to a dwelling entrance may not be achievable. This would only apply for buildings that are four storeys or less. Additionally a clear width of 1.35m would be maintained at the bottom of these stairs allowing sufficient space for the implementation of a chair-lift as per M4(2).
49. Plots 4 to 6 are raised above ground level as a result of needing to raise ground levels to avoid flood risk. However, the front gardens of plots 4-6 have been designed to allow sufficient space for a wheelchair ramp to be installed if necessary in the future, which in turn would not compromise the wider flood impacts on the site.
50. Overall, the layout of the units is considered to be of good standard and would be acceptable.

External Amenity Space

51. Policy DMP19 establish 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 will normally be expected to be 20 sqm studio, one or two-bedroom home and 50 sqm for family housing (homes with 3 or more bedrooms). Policy BH13 of Brent's Draft Local Plan also requires 20sqm for all studio, one and two-bedroom homes, but only requires 50sqm for three bedroom homes at ground floor only. Therefore any three bedroom homes above ground floor level, would requires 20sqm.
52. The policy requirement in relation to external private amenity space is for it to be of a "sufficient size and type", which may be achieve even when the "normal expectation" of 20 / 50 sqm of private space is not achieved. The supporting text to the policy clarifies that where "sufficient private amenity space cannot be achieved to meet the full requirement of the policy, the remainder should be applied in the form of communal amenity space". Proximity and accessibility to nearby public open spaces may also be considered when weighing a shortfall against the normal expectation.
53. With regard to quality of the space, the supporting text to policy DMP19 specifies that private amenity should be accessible from a main living room without level changes and planned within a building to take a maximum advantage of daylight and sunlight, whilst Brent SPD1 specifies that the minimum depth and width of the space should be 1.5 m.
54. London Plan policy D6 specifies that where there is no higher local standard, a minimum of 5 sqm of private amenity space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1 sqm should be provided for each additional occupant. The minimum depth and 1.5 m is reconfirmed in the emerging policy.

Unit	Unit Size	Proposed Amenity Space	DMP19 Requirements
Plot 1	3B5P	52.1sqm	50sqm
Plot 2	2B3P	6.1sqm	20sqm
Plot 3	1B2P	5.2sqm	20sqm
Plot 4	2B4P	70.1sqm	20sqm
Plot 5	3B5P	50.6sqm	50sqm
Plot 6	3B5P	57.6sqm	50sqm
Plot 7	3B5P	54.1sqm	50sqm
Plot 8	3B5P	146.8sqm	50sqm

55. The proposed units would all have access to private gardens or balconies, all of which would meet the minimum depths and sizes required by London Plan policy D6. Plots 2 and 3 would fall below the 20sqm target for private amenity space within DMP19, with a total shortfall of 29 sqm. However, these two flats are adjacent to the landscaped area within the site which is accessible to residents (and the general public) and is considerably larger than the level of shortfall. While it also serves an ecological function, it will also provide space that is usable by residents. The flats would be sited in close proximity to Woodcock Park which is a large open space.

56. As such, although two flats within the proposal fall below the numerical target for private external amenity space expressed within policy DMP19, having regard to the proximity to nearby open spaces and the quality and quantity of on-site provision, would nonetheless provide external space that is sufficient in size and type to satisfy the needs of future residents and it is therefore considered to accord with DMP19.

Fire Safety

57. Policy D12a of The London Plan (2021) requires all new development to take account of fire safety in design. The applicant has submitted a Fire Statement which identifies the potential fire risks and sets out passive and active safety measures and identifies escape routes and access for emergency vehicles.

Highways and Parking, Refuse, Cycle Parking

58. The access road to the garage is from Hillview Avenue in between its junctions with Brookfields Avenue and Gooseacre Lane. According to 2013 parking surveys, Hillview Avenue and Gooseacre Lane are not considered to be heavily parked. However Brookfields Avenue and Lidding Road are considered to be heavily parked due to their narrow widths.

59. The site has poor access to public transport (PTAL 1b).

Car Parking and access road into the site

60. The maximum car parking allowance for the eight proposed dwellings is 10.5 car parking spaces. The proposal would include 10 car parking spaces for the proposed development and so is within these maximum allowances.

61. Plots 1 to 3 would have their main entrance fronting Lidding Road and the proposal includes the provision of two car parking spaces accessed from Lidding Road itself on either side of the block, set behind a new footway.

62. Plots 4-8 are all proposed to be accessed from the garage access road, with parking provided for the units from this access and a further turning head provided at the end of the access road for service and emergency vehicles.

63. With some larger areas of hardstanding proposed for turning and vehicle access, there is a risk that some of the areas within the site may be used for further car parking unless measures to prevent this are put in place. As such, a parking management plan is recommended to be secured through condition. While on-site management would not be feasible due to the small scale of the development, other measures could be introduced to reduce the potential for parking outside of the designated parking bays.

64. The technical drawings include tracking diagrams, which demonstrate that refuse and fire service vehicles can access the site and turn around, which would be acceptable. Objectors have commented that Thames Water may require access to the site to deal with blockages. The service road is accessible for a range of vehicles and there is no reason to believe that Thames Water could not maintain any of their sewers as a result of this proposal.

65. A number of highway works are proposed to improve the junction between the garage access road and Hillview Avenue, providing radius kerbs and tactile paving. As part of these highway works a suitable worded condition is recommended to secure the following: Amendments to the junction of the garage access road with Hillview Avenue to include the provision of new radius kerbs, tactile paving and a raised entry table

External lighting

66. It should be noted that all routes to the proposed dwellings, including the existing garage access road

and any footpaths, would need to be well lit so that they can be useable and safe for pedestrians throughout the day and year.

67. As noted previously, any lighting scheme will need to be sensitively designed so as to not impact local wildlife or local amenity, with recommendations for the lighting scheme discussed within the ecology section above.

Wider highway improvements on Lidding Road

68. Lidding Road is an existing adopted highway with a carriageway width of 4.1m, which widens out to approximately 13m at its southern end for a length of approximately 18m to allow perpendicular car parking and a turning area. However, the turning area is routinely obstructed, particularly as cars park at 90 degrees on both sides of the turning area, despite its limited width.
69. The proposals include revisions to this arrangement by widening the northern part of the Lidding Road carriageway to 4.8m to enable cars to park parallel to it and widening the southern part of Lidding Road to 16m in order to provide perpendicular parking on both sides. This extent of the highway works lie outside the red edge site plan of the application site. The road is also to be extended southwards within the existing area of grassland to provide a turning head clear of the parking bays.
70. Lidding Road has a capacity for 10 on-street car parking spaces, but surveys carried out in September 2020 identified 18 cars parked on Lidding Road (6 in the northern stretch and 12 in area designed for 10 cars plus a turning head). The results of this survey are similar to overnight parking surveys carried out in 2013, which is why Lidding Road is noted as being a heavily parked street. Cars parked on the northern 4.1m stretch obstruct larger vehicles such as emergency and service vehicles, so provision of extra space to accommodate parking and the safe passage of larger vehicles is supported in principle.
71. The total number of on-street car parking spaces proposed is 20, which is slightly more than the demand identified in either the latest survey or the 2013 survey, although this does now include two spaces for the new dwellings, although it should be noted that these would not be able to be allocated.
72. As part of any forthcoming application the following highway works would need to be secured through a suitably worded condition:
- Construction and adoption of the proposed new turning head at the southern end of Lidding Road with associated parking restrictions;
 - Widening of the carriageway of Lidding Road to the front of nos. 7-23 to 5.5m in order to accommodate parallel on-street parking bays with associated waiting restrictions on the western side of the street.

Cycle parking

73. The proposals require a minimum of 15.5 cycle parking spaces located in secure undercover lockable storage areas. Sheds are shown for each of the dwellings and details of the sheds would be conditioned to any forthcoming consent.

Noise and construction management

74. Regulatory services have highlighted that the site is within a residential area, but noted the presence on non-residential uses nearby. In order to ensure an acceptable standard of accommodation, they have recommended that a condition is attached requiring details of the sound insulation measures for the new homes. Objectors have raised concern regarding noise from cars accessing the homes. The previous use of the site was garages, which would have resulted in noise. However, it is understood that the garages have not been used for some time. The level of noise associated with the homes is considered likely to be low given the small number of cars that would park within the site. Similarly, the frequency of servicing vehicles (e.g. refuse trucks or delivery vans) is also not likely to be at a level that would result in significant noise disturbance.
75. Conditions requiring a Construction Management Plan and a Construction Logistics Plan are also recommended to ensure that the impacts of the development in terms of noise and dust are effectively controlled throughout development to protect neighbouring amenity.

Flood Risk and Drainage

76. Policy SI 12 of The London Plan requires development to ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated. Similarly Policy DMP 9A states that proposals should demonstrate that they will be resilient to all surfaces of flooding and should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This is re-iterated in draft policy BSUI3.
77. The proposal site includes land within Floodzone 3a for fluvial flooding, and along the edge of the Wealdstone Brook within floodzone 3b for fluvial flooding. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment which sets out the identified risks of flooding on the site and surrounding locations.
78. Plots 1 to 3 and 7 to 8 are located outside of Floodzone 3a and 3b. Plots 4 to 6 are located within flood zone 3a. No buildings are proposed within floodzone 3b, nor would there be any hardstanding within floodzone 3b. The Environment Agency originally objected to the proposal on the grounds that it was located within functional flood zone 3b. However, they since confirmed that the site is not in the 1 in 20 flood extent, nor is the site designed Flood Zone 3b. They have confirmed that they wish to remove their objection.
79. The submitted details indicate that the proposal would result in a significant betterment to the current brownfield discharge rates, which equates to the following improvements: 73% in a 1 in 1, 89% in a 1 in 30, 92% in a 1 in 100. The discharge rates demonstrate that the proposal would offer a significant betterment to the current development in place which in turn will improve the flood risk locally.
80. The flood risk assessment clearly demonstrates mitigation through Flood Resistance Measures which is proposed to include, for Plots 1 to 6, a flood resistant damp proofing into the construction of the ground floor. Surface Water Flood Routing As shown in the EA Flood Risk from Surface Water mapping, a surface water flow path crosses the site from north to south, into Wealdstone Brook which mitigates the flood risk to the proposed Plots 1 to 6 and ensures that flood risk is not increased outside of the site boundary.
81. In the event of a flood at the site the residents within the properties will not be at risk due to the flood levels within the site for a 1-in-100-year flood event + 35% allowance for climate change shows a level of 37.75m AOD. The development proposes to raise the Plots 1 to 6 by 300mm above that flood level, making it 38.05m AOD. The proposed FFLs are above this flood level and therefore acceptable.
82. The assessment demonstrates the finished floor level is raised 300mm in 1 in 100 event with a 70% allowance scenario and therefore is safe for the residents at the first floor level.
83. The flood risk assessment and its mitigation measures have been assessed by the Local Lead Flood Risk Authority who consider that flood risks have been effectively mitigated and that the development offers an overall betterment to drainage on the site.
84. Objectors have commented that the site currently suffers from flooding due to the local sewer pipes that run through the site and this has been confirmed by the Council's drainage team. Concerns have been raised that the development would be impacted by an increase in these issues.
85. The local sewers are owned and maintained by Thames Water and as such Thames Water is responsible for the maintenance of this system.
86. The submitted drainage strategy provides a significant betterment in terms of surface water discharge to the sewer. Additionally, the details submitted show confirmation from Thames Water that the network has sufficient capacity to cope with the new development, both in terms of surface water and foul water.
87. Overall, it is therefore considered that the development would result in an improvement in terms of surface water drainage when compared to existing circumstances and that it is acceptable in terms of flood risk and potential impact on the local sewerage system.

Trees and Landscaping

88. Policy G7 states that existing trees of value should be retained where possible and that adequate replacements should be sought where loss of trees is acceptable. This is reinforced in Policy BGI2 of the Draft Local Plan.
89. The application has been accompanied by an arboricultural assessment and arboricultural impact assessment. These reports note that the application site contains 34 individual trees, 8 groups of trees

and 3 hedgerows. The development would require the removal of 15 individual trees, 5 groups of trees, 2 further groups of trees to be partially removed, 1 hedgerow to be removed and 1 further hedgerow to be partially removed. The supplied Tree Survey identifies that all of the individual trees are either Category C of low quality or Category U and would be unsuitable for retention beyond 10 years. In particular it is noted that several of the groups of trees are located in poor environments with hard standing in the root zones and contain dead trees. The submitted Arboricultural assessment indicates that 6 of the 7 groups are classified as providing 'limited contribution' to the area. This has been assessed by the Council's Tree Officer who agrees with the conclusions.

90. A tree replacement scheme has been submitted and would result in 38 new trees being planted at the site and are of a species and type considered to be acceptable by the Council's Tree Officer.
91. In order to ensure that retained trees are protected throughout development, a condition is recommended requiring an Arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection plans to ensure that all retained trees are adequately protected throughout the duration of the construction works.
92. Most of the existing soft landscaping at the southern side of the site would remain left in its natural state with two new pathways on the western end to provide a link to the neighbouring park.
93. Permeable hard landscaping would be provided at the front of plots 4-6 to provide parking spaces for future residents. Improvements to the access route to Gooseacre Lane would include the use of soft landscaping and new trees lining this route to create a more welcoming pedestrian environment.
94. As noted previously, there would be some loss of green space as a result of the proposal. However, the part of the site where new building works would take place is not designated as space of high ecological importance. A buffer zone would be maintained from the development to the nearby SINC and there would be the aforementioned increase in number of trees. A condition has been added requiring a detailed landscaping plan to be submitted to ensure that the type and mix of plants proposed maximise ecological benefits to the site.
95. Overall, the proposed landscaping is considered to improve elements of the site which are at present of a poor and unwelcoming environment whilst minimising impacts on nearby ecology assets. The landscaping is considered to be acceptable.
96. Policy G5 of The London Plan and Policy BGI1 of the Draft Local Plan require developments to contribute to Urban Greening and a target Urban Greening Factor (UGF) of 0.4 is recommended. The applicants have submitted details which demonstrate that the proposal would have a UGF score of 0.42 which would accord with this policy requirement.

Ecology and impacts on the SINC

97. The land adjacent to Wealdstone Brook is a designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Policy G6 of The London Plan states that SINCs should be protected. It goes to state the following under part B:

Where harm to a SINC is unavoidable, and where the benefits of the development proposal clearly outweigh the impacts on biodiversity, the following mitigation hierarchy should be applied to minimise development impacts:

- 1) *avoid damaging the significant ecological features of the site*
- 2) *minimise the overall spatial impact and mitigate it by improving the quality or management of the rest of the site*
- 3) *deliver off-site compensation of better biodiversity value.*

98. Part D sets out that development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain. This should be informed by the best available ecological information and addressed from the start of the development process.
99. The applicant has provided an Ecological Appraisal which included a desk study and walkover survey. The appraisal identified that the following habitats within the site and their value in ecological terms:
 - Amenity grassland in the south west of the site, scrub within the eastern portion of the site and introduced scrub beneath the trees in the western portion of the site - these habitats are well represented locally, have low species diversity and can be easily recreated post development. Any

- loss of these habitats would be considered to have minimal impact on the ecology of the local area.
- Species poor intact hedgerow located in the south west of the site within the area of amenity grassland -the hedgerow lacks species diversity and can easily be replaced if lost. Furthermore, the hedgerow is not classed as a Habitat of Principal Importance.
- Garage buildings and hardstanding - low or negligible species diversity and can be easily recreated post development.
- Scattered Trees - The mature and semi-mature trees on site are of intrinsic value as they cannot be easily replaced in the short to medium term. Therefore any losses should be compensated for in line with the mitigation hierarchy. Retained trees could be adversely impacted during construction, and protection measures are recommended.
- Semi-natural broadleaved woodland - The woodland on site meets the criterion to be classified as a Habitat of Principal Importance and, although it is limited in extent, the woodland has intrinsic value due to the maturity of the trees and as it provides connectivity to the wider landscape. This habitat type cannot be easily replicated if lost and, therefore, should be retained and protected where possible. If loss of this habitat cannot be avoided, then appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will need to be implemented.

100. As noted within the "Trees and Landscaping" sub section above, a number of trees would be removed within the site to facilitate the development. The ecology report identifies that trees should be retained where possible, and if retention is not possible, appropriate replacement planting should be incorporated into the soft landscape scheme in accordance with the ecological mitigation hierarchy. It advises that only native and/or wildlife attracting species should be planted.
101. The report goes on to advise that biodiversity enhancement measures should be incorporated into the landscape scheme to work towards delivering net gains for biodiversity. Such planting should be of value to wildlife.
102. The ecology report has also considered the impact of the proposal upon protected species.
- Badger, otter and water vole, and amphibians - not a notable consideration in relation to the proposed development with no badger records or evidence of badgers observed during the site visit and no further recommendations are made.
 - Hedgehogs - notable consideration in relation to the proposed development, and to prevent harm to this species during construction works, a recommendation regarding the protection of foraging terrestrial mammals is made during construction works .
 - Reptiles - site has suitable refuge and foraging habits for reptiles, and whilst the risk of causing adverse impacts to reptiles to low, some suitable terrestrial habitat will be cleared by the proposed development, recommendations are made within the ecology report.
 - Birds - Numerous other notable bird species were also identified within the desk study, as well as various bird species being observed on site at the time of survey. The woodland, scattered trees and dense scrub provide suitable habitat for nesting birds within the survey area. If works are undertaken in the bird nesting season, there is potential to impact on nesting birds and recommendations are made within the ecology report. .
103. The ecology report has also considered the potential impacts on bats and this is further considered within a preliminary bat roost assessment. The reports highlight that the desk study provided records of at least three species of bat, the closest of which was of an unidentified bat located 80 m west.
104. The garage buildings presented no value to roosting bats and no evidence of roosting bats was recorded. However, a number of the trees provide suitable opportunities for roosting bats, containing features such as cavities and woodpecker holes. The trees with a high suitability for bats included T22 and T8. Three further trees, T19, T20 and T32 were identified as having low bat roosting potential due to the age of the trees and the presence of light ivy cover.
105. As T22 is proposed to be removed and has high bat roosting potential, further surveys are required in the form of dusk emergence and dawn re-entry surveys. In the event that a roost is discovered, a Natural England licence application may be required.
106. The woodland, scattered trees and dense and scattered scrub provide suitable foraging and commuting opportunities for bats which is well connected to areas of suitable habitat within the wider landscape, including the vegetated corridor of Wealdstone Brook located adjacent to the southern site boundary and the habitats within Woodcock Park to the west.

107. Recommendations have therefore be made in relation to external lighting to be designed to minimise potential disturbance including avoiding the installation of new lighting in proximity to key ecological features, such as the boundaries adjacent to Woodcock Park North and the Wealdstone Brook. Lighting for the road has been discussed above, including the ecological recommendation such as the use of low UV bulbs and low level lighting.
108. In the interests of enhancing the net gain in biodiversity within the site, the report recommends the use of hedgehog passes under fence lines, nest boxed for bird species such as house sparrow, dense scrub for species such as song thrush, and bat boxes for species such as pipistrelle. The creation of deadwood habitat for stag beetles is also recommended.
109. The report has identified species and habitats that may be vulnerable to the impacts of the development and further identifies methodology that can be used to mitigate impact of the development on native species.
110. Although adjacent to the SINC, the proposal would not involve development within the SINC area which is also an identified flood zone. Nonetheless the Appraisal identifies that some vegetation would be lost adjacent to the SINC and indirect impacts are possible. The appraisal therefore recommends that a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP) should be compiled for the site. A condition has been added to require this is submitted prior to the commencement of works.
111. All mitigation measures are to be secured through condition.

Equalities

112. 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

113. 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.
114. The proposal will bring forward the provision of eight new affordable homes including 5 family sized homes within a disused site.
115. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in this report.

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



Brent

DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: 21/3248

To: C/O Agent
JLL
30 Warwick Street
London
W1B 5NH

I refer to your application dated **24/08/2021** proposing the following:

Demolition of the existing garages and redevelopment to provide 3 self-contained flats and 5 dwellinghouses; with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:
See Condition 2

at **Lidding Road Garages, Lidding Road, Harrow**

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: 08/04/2022

Signature:

Gerry Ansell
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 material accordance with the:-
 - London Plan 2021
 - Brent Core Strategy 2010
 - Brent Development Management Policies 2016
 - Emerging Local Plan
 - National Planning Policy Framework 2021

- 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 drawing(s) and/or document(s):
 - 1843 P-01 D – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - 1843 P-02 D – Proposed First Floor Plan and Sections
 - 1843_P-03 – Proposed Floor Plans
 - 1843_P-05_REV A – Visualisations
 - 1843 P-10 E – Proposed Site Plan
 - 1843 P-11 A – Existing Site Plan
 - 1843_P-20 REV A – Proposed Elevations
 - 1843_P-25 REV B – Detail Elevations Sections and Materials
 - 1843_SLP-01_A – Site Location Plan
 - C154334-03-01_REVA – Tree Survey Plan
 - GW - BR035 - P- 100 REV D – Hard Landscaping
 - GW - BR035 - P- 200 REV E – Trees Removed/Retained
 - GW - BR035 - P- 300 REV E – Tree Planting Plan
 - GW - BR035 - P-302 – Planting Plan Sheet 2
 - GW - BR035 - P- 303 REV CA – Planting Plan Sheet 3
 - GW - BR035 - P-304 – Planting Plan Sheet 4
 - GW - BR035 - P-305 – Planting Plan Sheet 5
 - GW - BR035 - P-306 – Planting Plan Sheet 6
 - GW - BR035 - P-307 – Planting Plan Sheet 7

Supporting Documents: -

RT-MME-154334-03 Rev B - Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment (Dated August 2021)

RT-MME-154334-04 Rev A – Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Dates August 2021)

RT-MME-154334-01 Rev B – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Dated October 2021)

RT-MME-154334-02 Rev B – Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Dated October 2021)

Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Dated 12 November 2021)

- 3 The residential units hereby approved shall at no time be converted from C3 residential to a C4 small HMO, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 3 Class L of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) without express planning permission having first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate standard of accommodation is maintained in all of the residential units and in view of the restricted space in the front garden to accommodate additional bin or cycle storage.

- 4 The windows in the first floor bathrooms, hallways and landing on the northern elevation of plots 4 to 6, the eastern elevation of plot 7 and the north eastern elevation of plot 8 shall be constructed of obscure-glazing which is un-openable below 1.7m above the internal finished floor levels.

These shall be retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council

Reason: To minimise any direct overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

- 5 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 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(s):

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.

- 6 The development shall provide 8 self-contained residential units (1 X 1bed, 2 x 2bed and 5 x 3bed) to be used as residential units (Use Class C3) as shown on the approved plans, unless otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt

- 7 The 8 residential dwellings hereby approved shall be provided as affordable housing in perpetuity, and shall be delivered as London Affordable Rented units with rents set as follows;

- (a) Up to 80% of the local Open Market Rent (including Service Charges where applicable); and
- (b) Excluding Service Charges, no higher than the benchmark rents published by the GLA annually in accordance with the Mayor's Funding Guidance.

The London Borough of Brent will have 100% nomination rights in perpetuity. In addition, the Owner shall enter into a Nomination Agreement with the London Borough of Brent prior to occupation of the affordable housing units.

Reason: To ensure the delivery of affordable housing within the development and to comply with Policy DMP15.

- 8 The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Dated 12 November 2021) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council

Reason: To ensure that risks from flooding are effectively mitigated

- 9 Prior to the commencement of works (excluding site clearance and hoarding), an Arboricultural Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. This shall include details of site supervision and tree protection measures to be carried out at all stages where development takes place in proximity to the root protection areas or crown spreads of retained trees and hedges throughout the duration of the development.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details throughout the construction phases.

Reason: To ensure that retained trees are protected throughout development.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Construction impacts can arise at any time from the commencement of works, and adequate controls need to be in place from this time.

- 10 Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Method Statement and Construction Logistics Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise, construction traffic and other environmental impacts of the development. As part of the Construction Logistics Plan measures shall be included to require construction vehicles to access the site via Gooseacre Lane and egress the site via Hillview Avenue. The approved details shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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: Construction impacts can arise at any time from the commencement of works, and adequate controls need to be in place from this time.

- 11 The measures and recommendations set out in the 'RT-MME-154334-01 Rev B – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Dated October 2021)' and RT-MME-154334-02 Rev B - Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Dated December 2021) shall be implemented in full throughout the development.

Reason: In order to ensure that any potential effects on protected species are adequately mitigated.

- 12 Prior to commencement of development a Construction Ecological Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The approved measures shall be

implemented in full.

Reason: In order to ensure that any potential effects on protected species are adequately mitigated.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Construction impacts can arise at any time from the commencement of works, and adequate controls need to be in place from this time.

- 13 Prior to the commencement of works (excluding demolition, site clearance, laying of foundations or any other below ground work) details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing:

- (a) materials to be used in the external appearance of the development including samples to be pre-arranged to viewed by the Local Planning Authority
- (b) details of window reveals, head and cill details and eaves details to be provided at scale 1:10

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

Reason: To ensure that the proposals would have an acceptable appearance.

- 14 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 the provision of a minimum of 33 replacement trees within the site, with the use of native and/or wildlife attracting species as per the recommendations made within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated October 2021 Rev B
- (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) details of surfacing materials to be used for hardstanding, together with any delineation of car parking spaces or pedestrian pathways
- (iv) details of wildlife enhancements within the site as per the recommendation sets out within Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated October 2021 Rev B, including the use of hedgehog passes under fence lines, nest boxes for bird species such as house sparrow, dense scrub for species such as song thrush, bat boxes for species such as pipistrelle and the creation of deadwood habitat for stag beetles

The hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to the use of the dwellings hereby approved, unless alternative timescales have been submitted to and approved to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved timescales .

Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season and all planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species and in the same positions, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the proposed development and ensure that it enhances the visual amenity of the area.

- 15 Within three months of commencement of the development, the developer shall enter into an agreement with the Local Highways Authority to carry out the following works:

- 1. construction and adoption of the proposed new turning head at the southern end of Lidding Road with associated parking restrictions.

2. widening of the carriageway of Lidding Road to the front of nos. 7-23 to 5.5m in order to accommodate parallel on-street parking bays with associated waiting restrictions on the western side of the street;
3. Amendments to the junction of the garage access road with Hillview Avenue to include the provision of new radius kerbs, tactile paving and a raised entry table;

The development shall not be occupied until evidence that the abovementioned highway works have been implemented in full and certified as completed to an acceptable standard by the Local Highways Authority has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development provides a safe and functional highway environment to connect the development with its surroundings.

- 16 Details of external lighting including the height, type, position, angle and spread of any external lighting to minimise light spillage and glare outside the designated area, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The external lighting shall be erected and maintained in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To protect the amenity of existing and future residents, in the interest of highway safety and ecology (including protected species).

- 17 Prior to first occupation of the site details of proposed cycle storage for the dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council which shall demonstrate that cycle parking shall be provided to meet London Plan standards through the provision of secure, weatherproof cycle storage facilities. The development will be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained and retained

Reason: To encourage sustainable methods of transport

- 18 Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, a car park management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority setting out details of measures to prevent car parking on land not identified for car parking for the 8 units hereby approved, and thereafter implemented in accordance with the full details throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- 19 All residential premises shall be designed in accordance with BS8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings' to attain the following noise levels:

Time	Area	Maximum noise level
Daytime Noise 07:00 – 23:00	Living rooms and bedrooms	35 dB LAeq (16hr)
Night time noise 23:00 – 07:00	Bedrooms	30 dB LAeq (8hr) 45 dB LAmx

A test shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved to show that the required noise levels have been met and the results submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future residents.

- 20 Prior to first occupation of the approved units, a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDs) Verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

This report shall include details of:

- a) Confirmation that SuDs measures have been implemented on site
- b) Details of proposed drainage and void structure maintenance schedules

The details shall be implemented on site unless otherwise approved in writing by the Council.

Reason: To ensure that surface water impacts are properly mitigated against, and to reduce the risk of flooding.

- 21 'Prior to occupation of the proposed development a drainage CCTV conditions survey is to be undertaken and a verification report produced to confirm the condition of the drainage within the development boundary'.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at www.brent.gov.uk/CIL.
- 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 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.
- 4 The submission/approval of the Fire Safety Statement does not replace the need for building regulation approval in relation to fire safety, nor does it convey or imply any approval under those regulations.
- 5 The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:
 - on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
 - on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal)
 - on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
 - involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.

For further guidance please visit

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03702 422 549 or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk. The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

6 Construction/refurbishment and demolition works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary shall be carried only between the hours of:

Monday to Fridays 08:00 to 18:00
Saturday 08:00 to 13:00
At no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Liam McFadden, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 3299