



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Monday 4 August 2025 at 6.00 pm

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Long (for item 7).

1. Apologies for Absence and Clarification of Alternative Members

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of interests

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

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED:-

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on Wednesday 11 June 2025, be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. Order of Business

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

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

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

PROPOSAL

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The prior completion of a s106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the main committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as detailed in the committee report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair thanked Mark Pender and his team for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

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

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

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

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

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

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

DECISION

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

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

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

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

PROPOSAL

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair thanked Peter Lee for responding to the Committee's queries and then moved on to offer the Committee the opportunity to ask the officers any remaining questions or points of clarity in relation to the application, with the following being noted:

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

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

DECISION

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSAL

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DECISION

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

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

8. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8.51 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER
Chair