



## **LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT**

### **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Wednesday 10 December 2025 at 6.00 pm**

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

#### **1. Welcome and Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **2. Declarations of interests**

In relation to Agenda Item 3: 25/1069 – Havenwood Garages, Councillor Johnson declared a personal interest as a Ward Councillor of Barnhill, the ward under which the planning application relates and had also received briefings on the scheme from Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH).

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

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

#### **3. 25/1069 – Havenwood Garages opposite 1-9, Havenwood, Garages at Davy House, Einstein House, Faraday House, Car Parks next to Darwin House and Harvey House and Electricity Sub Station next to Currie House, Darwin House, Kingsgate, Wembley**

##### **PROPOSAL**

Demolition of existing garages and redevelopment of the site to provide 5x residential blocks (Use Class C3) and relocation of the existing substation, together with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the completion of a legal agreement capturing the planning obligations as detailed within the committee report, and the conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the

demolition and redevelopment of the existing garages within the site to provide 5 residential blocks, comprising 61 new homes. Each new unit would be social rent in tenure. The scheme would also include ancillary landscaping, cycle parking and refuse stores. The existing substation would also be moved to the north of Kingsgate, between the proposed Blocks D and C.

Members' attention was then drawn to a minor correction on page 12 of the committee report. Within the Highways and Transportation section, the report stated that the development would provide '113 long-stay cycle spaces'. The correct figure was 115 spaces, which exceeded London Plan standards. It was noted that the correct figure was stated elsewhere in the report.

The Chair thanked Colin Leadbeatter for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Mariana Jalloh (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who objected to the application on the following grounds:

- The speaker, a resident of Einstein House directly affected by the proposed Block E, stated that the height and position of Block E, located approximately 12 metres from Einstein House, had significantly reduced the daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms, reaching bedrooms and living areas. It was emphasised that this proximity and scale would result in unacceptable overshadowing.
- The objector reported that, at a separation distance of only 12 metres, balconies and windows within Block E would directly overlook bedrooms and living rooms in Einstein House. This distance was noted as being below the typical 18-21 metres separation standard. Mariana Jalloh further observed that no mitigation measures, such as screening, angled windows, or obscure glazing, had been proposed. It was highlighted that the existing single-storey garage on the site would be replaced by a three-storey structure, thereby intensifying the degree of overlooking.
- It was further stated that the proposal would remove the secure gated area and introduce a public footpath immediately adjacent to ground-floor bedrooms, raising specific concerns in relation to noise and disturbance, particularly during evening and night-time hours; increased safety risks and potential for anti-social behaviour; and light pollution from pathway lighting shining into ground-floor bedrooms. Mariana Jalloh requested that these matters be fully considered.
- The speaker asserted that the positioning of Block E would cause disproportionate harm to existing residents. While the wider scheme included green space, Block E had been located in the area that created the greatest adverse impact, whereas other blocks within the development did not create comparable intrusion.
- The objector referred to the proposed car-free nature of the development and stated that it was unclear how this would be enforced or managed. It was felt that no details had been provided within the committee report regarding the

specific arrangements. It was additionally noted that the Chalkhill area currently experienced significant parking pressures, with widespread use of a free car park and frequent double parking. It was further observed that parking only operated effectively on event days (estimated at 50-60 events per year). It was felt that introducing additional residents without clear parking controls would have a significant impact on local conditions.

- In concluding the response, Mariana Jalloh summarised that the proposal would result in:
  - 1) Loss of light to habitable rooms;
  - 2) Loss of privacy due to direct overlooking at substandard separation distances without mitigation;
  - 3) Safety, noise, and light pollution impacts arising from the introduction of a public footpath;
  - 4) Disproportionate harm caused by the siting of Block E; and
  - 5) Unresolved concerns regarding the enforcement of a car-free development and its impact on existing parking pressures.

On this basis it was therefore requested that the Committee give full consideration to these matters and seek appropriate revisions to mitigate the identified harms.

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

- As an initial query, the Chair asked whether, in considering mitigation, the objector regarded the loss of privacy or the loss of light as the greater concern, noting that measures such as screening and tree planting could address privacy but might further reduce light. In response, Mariana Jalloh advised that the most significant concern was the loss of privacy, as the affected rooms were bedrooms. It was explained that residents currently closed curtains frequently, although the existing garages meant there was no pedestrian movement in that area. It was emphasised that the proposed development would require curtains to remain closed at all times, which was unacceptable. While acknowledging that some mitigation might be possible, it was noted that the loss of light was already an issue and would be substantially worsened. It was reiterated that privacy was the primary concern.
- The Chair referenced concerns raised by the speaker in their presentation to the Committee regarding the car-free nature of the development and explained that most new developments in Brent were car-free to reflect declining car ownership and to encourage sustainable travel. It was noted that funding was included in the report for a feasibility study on introducing a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), which could help manage parking and address existing issues. The Chair asked whether this information altered the objector's view on parking concerns. In response, Mariana Jalloh stated that the area comprised low-income families and expressed concern about the negative financial impact of requiring residents to purchase parking permits should a CPZ be introduced. It was additionally noted that residents already paid for event-day parking permits

and that any additional cost would be burdensome. While acknowledging that parking needed to be managed, the speaker stressed that measures should not disproportionately affect low-income households.

- Following up, the Chair questioned whether the objector opposed any development on the site or whether they would support an alternative scheme. In response, Marianna Jalloh confirmed that she was not opposed to the overall development and recognised the need for housing. It was further stated that her objection related specifically to the impact of Block E on Einstein House. The remainder of the development was considered acceptable and it was noted that other blocks appeared to have taken residents' needs into account. It was felt that Einstein House had been overlooked and Marianna Jalloh requested reconsideration of Block E's positioning to reduce its intrusive effect on existing families.
- Questions were raised around whether the speaker would object to a CPZ if the Council negotiated one year of free parking for existing residents, followed by a paid arrangement thereafter. In response, Mariana Jalloh indicated that one year of free parking or a reduced rate for a longer period would be helpful. It was noted that low-income families budgeted carefully and that a sustainable solution was needed. Mariana Jalloh suggested conducting a survey to identify residents with vehicles before making decisions and expressed a preference for consultation rather than imposing arrangements without engagement. The Chair clarified that the funding referenced in the proposal was for a feasibility study and not for immediate implementation. The study would consider the issues raised before any decision was made.
- Members questioned whether, if the issues of loss of privacy and loss of light were addressed, the objector's view on the application would change. In response, Mariana Jalloh expressed that concerns would remain due to the proposed balconies, which were positioned to overlook bedrooms. It was explained that balconies were social spaces and would allow direct views into bedrooms, even if windows were obscured. It was additionally noted that the current garage provided privacy because access was restricted by a gate, but that the proposed arrangement would remove this safeguard. It was confirmed that Mariana Jalloh would continue to object on the basis of privacy concerns arising from the balconies.
- Members noted that the report acknowledged the issue of overlooking from balconies and confirmed that screening would be considered at the implementation stage. In response, Mariana Jalloh expressed concern that decisions on screening would be deferred until implementation, which created uncertainty. It was feared that inadequate measures might be adopted later. Member assured the speaker that planning officers would be asked to provide clarification on these matters when technical questions were addressed during the later stage of the proceedings.

As there were no further Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider an additional request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Chirag Vora (who had also registered to speak as an objector)

to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Chirag Vora began by stating that the construction of garages at Davy House would directly overlook his garden and bedrooms, resulting in a significant loss of privacy.
- The speaker reported ongoing issues of drug dealing in the area, which had caused considerable nuisance to residents and noted that the police had attended the area daily in response to these incidents, although the problem persisted. The speaker expressed concern that the proposed development, particularly its social housing element, could exacerbate these issues depending on future occupants.
- The objector stated that he also opposed the construction on the grounds of increased littering, which he considered detrimental to the local environment.
- In concluding the response, Chirag Vora reiterated his objection to the proposal based on the combined impact of loss of privacy, anti-social behaviour, and litter.

The Chair thanked Chirag Vora 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 observed that the objector had referred to existing issues, including parking difficulties, anti-social behaviour and litter. The Chair stated that the introduction of a car-free development, if properly managed and supported by a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), could address parking problems rather than exacerbate them, as it would involve investment that would not otherwise be available. The Chair further noted that the speaker had raised concerns about anti-social behaviour and litter and suggested that these issues might be linked to the presence of existing garages, which were underused and created dark spaces that attracted such behaviour. The Chair stated that replacing garages with housing would create a more open and overlooked environment, which could reduce anti-social behaviour. The Chair asked the speaker for his view on these points. In response, Chirag Vora stated that he hoped the development would have a positive effect but expressed doubt that littering would improve. It was explained that refuse bins were already full under current conditions and considered that additional housing would worsen the situation.
- The Chair cited the speaker's earlier comments in their presentation to the Committee regarding anti-social behaviour and questioned whether it was felt that his concerns about social housing were prejudiced against those living in such accommodation. In response, Chirag Vora asserted that his comments were not prejudiced and that he understood the importance of social housing. It was further explained that his concern related to uncertainty about future occupants, noting that there were existing residents who caused significant nuisance. He reported that the police had been called on numerous occasions without resolution. The objector emphasised that he was not opposed to social

housing itself but was concerned about individuals who did not behave responsibly.

- Members questioned whether the objector had used the reporting app to raise concerns about litter. In response, Chirag Vora noted that the area was managed by Metropolitan Housing and that residents had reported issues repeatedly. It was explained that promised action had not been taken, resulting in rat infestations. It was additionally stated that residents had been obliged to arrange pest control measures, including traps, to prevent rodents entering properties. The Chair noted that the issues described were existing problems and commented that such matters were common across Brent and other areas. The Chair highlighted that these concerns did not directly relate to whether the proposed development would worsen or improve the situation. The objector then reiterated his earlier concerns regarding the construction at Davy House and its potential to overlook his boundary wall, garden and bedrooms.

As there were no further Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Councillor Fraser (who had registered to speak as a Ward Councillor) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Councillor Fraser began by advising that she had lived, worked and represented the Chalkhill community for 20 years prior to being elected as Barnhill Ward Councillor 3 years ago. It was emphasised that Chalkhill was her community and that decisions taken at the meeting were not abstract but directly affected the streets, estates and families she knew personally.
- Councillor Fraser acknowledged the significant benefit of the proposal, namely the provision of 61 homes for social rent, which represented a substantial and welcome contribution towards meeting Brent's acute housing need. She recognised the work undertaken to bring forward a scheme that delivered genuinely affordable homes for local people and stated that, from her own casework, she was acutely aware of the urgent need for such housing. It was additionally noted that this was not merely a matter of aspiration but of dignity, security and stability for the most vulnerable residents in Brent. However, the Ward Councillor explained that she was speaking on behalf of existing residents living around the 5 proposed sites. She reported that a petition signed by over 100 people had been submitted to Metropolitan Housing, in addition to the objections before the Committee. It was stated that the issue was one of balance. While many residents accepted the need for new homes, they were understandably concerned about the day-to-day disruption the development would cause and outlined the following concerns:
  - 1) Residents feared that they would be placed further down the list for replacement kitchens and bathrooms and that repairs would be delayed.
  - 2) There were concerns about dust during construction, particularly as the area already experienced the second worst air quality in the borough.
  - 3) Homes built in garage spaces or at the ends of blocks would reduce access to fresh air.

- 4) Residents worried about the removal of parking spaces, which could leave some housebound, and about the lack of consideration for medical conditions that made access to parking essential.
  - 5) Existing car parks were poorly managed and overrun by abandoned vehicles and car businesses, with no enforcement action taken.
  - 6) Concerns were raised about the siting of a children's play area adjacent to a car park, despite objections.
  - 7) Residents feared the imposition of a parking scheme that would impose additional financial burdens on low-income families.
  - 8) Safety concerns were highlighted in relation to the provision of 61 new dwellings, many of which were 1 bedroom units, with no apparent consideration for integration measures, local support for mental health needs or access to already overstretched GP surgeries.
- Councillor Fraser stressed that these concerns were genuine and deeply felt by the Chalkhill community. It was clarified that the Chalkhill Community Trust Fund was a grant-making body and entirely separate from Chalkhill Community Centre Limited, which operated as a venue for hire rather than a community resource with concern also raised about the lack of local presence and engagement from Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing.
  - The Ward Councillor urged the applicant to consider the perspective of residents and to recognise that disruption was not a minor inconvenience but something that directly affected wellbeing and quality of life. She called for clear and consistent communication and highlighted that residents perceived a lack of coordination within Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing.
  - Councillor Fraser emphasised that residents were not seeking to halt progress but wished to be treated with respect throughout the process. She placed on record her expectation that every possible mitigation measure would be implemented and that conditions would be enforced robustly, including strong site management. It was further stated that while the new homes could deliver long-term benefits for the borough, the manner in which the development was delivered was critical. It was additionally requested that the Council work closely with the applicant at every stage and that residents be treated as partners rather than as an afterthought.
  - Councillor Fraser concluded by stating that should the Committee resolve to approve the application, it was essential to ensure that both the homes and the process of delivery were managed correctly. Hope was expressed that the scheme would become a source of pride for the community for decades to come, rather than something residents were forced to endure.

The Chair thanked Councillor Fraser for addressing the Committee. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a further request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Dominique Mirepoix (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- The applicant's representative began by stating that the application sought to redevelop underutilised and largely unoccupied garages to deliver new, high-quality affordable homes. It was explained that the scheme would address safety risks posed by the existing structures and formed part of Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing's ongoing commitment to optimise its assets.
- The representative reported that the proposal for the Chalkhill Estate reflected extensive engagement with residents and the wider public since 2023. This included detailed pre-application discussions with Council officers, a review by the Quality Review Panel, and collaboration with Secured by Design officers and the local community. Engagement activities had involved liaison with the Chalkhill Residents' Association, Chalkhill Community Trust Fund, Chalkhill Community Action Group and Chalkhill Primary School. Additional measures included newsletters, drop-in sessions, door-knocking, exhibitions, design workshops, a dedicated website and briefings for local Ward Councillors.
- It was confirmed that all 61 homes proposed would be genuinely affordable and provided at Social Rent, thereby delivering 100% affordable housing. It was further noted that 25% of the homes would be family-sized, meeting an identified need within the borough.
- The representative further stated that the design was landscape-led and community-focused, comprising 5 separate buildings ranging from 3 to a modest 5 storeys, which he considered appropriate to the local context. It was explained that high-quality materials had been selected to respond to the existing architecture of the estate and that the design had been thoroughly reviewed by the Quality Review Panel to achieve an appropriate balance between built form and public realm. It was further added that the applicant had responded to feedback from residents by reducing the number of homes originally proposed and addressing concerns about overdevelopment, while continuing to meet the critical need for affordable housing.
- Dominique Mirepoix highlighted that the proposal had been designed in accordance with the Brent Design Guide to protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. It was stated that a specialist daylight and sunlight report had been submitted and demonstrated acceptable results.
- The applicant's representative also reported that existing car parking provision had been reconfigured in response to resident feedback. It was confirmed that the new homes would be car-free and that future occupiers would not be eligible for parking permits within the estate. It was additionally stated that the proposal included cycle parking provision comprising 115 long-stay spaces and 36 short-stay spaces. To address the loss of informal cycle storage within the garages to be demolished, existing residents who previously stored bicycles in garages would be granted access to the new cycle storage facilities.
- The representative further noted that all homes would have access to private amenity space in the form of balconies, terraces or gardens. It was also explained that the detailed landscape strategy had been informed by resident



feedback and included a communal allotment, play spaces, seating areas and 51 new trees, thereby creating improved recreational opportunities for existing and new residents.

- Confirmation was provided that fire safety had been considered from the outset and that a Fire Statement had been submitted in accordance with the London Plan.
- In concluding the response, Dominique Mirepoix summarised that the proposed development to provide 61 new homes was supported by planning policy and would deliver significant benefits for new and existing residents as well as Brent Council. These benefits included enhanced facilities, improved amenity and the delivery of genuinely affordable housing. The representative expressed the hope that members would support the officer recommendation for approval.

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

- As an initial point, members referred to the objections raised by the first speaker concerning privacy and outlook from balconies and windows into ground-floor properties. It was noted that tree planting had been suggested as mitigation but observed that tree canopies were typically high and would not provide adequate screening for residents. Assurances were sought that mitigation measures could be implemented to address these concerns. In response, Dominique Mirepoix (Applicant's representative) stated that the design had incorporated the 30 degree and 45 degree rules set out in the Brent Design Guide. It was confirmed that a planning condition included in the committee report required details of balcony screening for Block E to be submitted at the time of its development.
- Reference was made to sections of the building where windows overlooked neighbouring properties at a distance of approximately 11.9 metres, which was below the usual 18 metre standard. Details were sought as to whether it would be possible to obscure these windows, particularly those on the 12 metre flank of the building, as tree planting would not provide adequate screening for ground floor residents. In response, Mike Martin (Landscape Architect, member of the applicant's team) acknowledged that tree canopies would not provide immediate screening but explained that multi-stem trees could be planted to provide coverage from the base upwards. It was added that hedges and other planting could be maintained to grow to a suitable height for screening. It was confirmed that trees of varying sizes could be introduced, including larger trees in locations where additional screening was required.
- Members noted that the proposed landscaping measures would take time to mature and would require ongoing maintenance. Concern was expressed that residents had raised issues regarding the applicant's management of the site and stated that he sought measures requiring minimal intervention and cost-effective maintenance, such as screening for windows. In response, Audrey

Remery (Architect, member of the applicant's team) confirmed that screening panels could be incorporated into the design to increase privacy.

- In referring to concerns regarding parking and noted that the removal of 105 garages could exacerbate existing problems caused by business use and abandoned vehicles. It was questioned whether a parking strategy would be implemented to address these issues. In response, Dominique Mirepoix (Applicant's representative) confirmed that 105 garages would be demolished, of which 71 or 68% were currently void and unoccupied. It was further added that 47 garages posed potential health and safety risks due to structural issues. It was additionally stated that a transport statement had been submitted, including parking demand surveys. Amin Fouladi (Transport Consultant, member of the applicant's team) further explained that extensive pre-application meetings had taken place with Brent Highways officers. It was stated that surveys had been conducted during several periods, including December 2023, to assess demand when residents were most likely to be at home. It was also confirmed that the design sought to re-provide existing demand without encouraging additional car ownership, in line with the London Plan.
- Members acknowledged the strategy to reduce parking provision but noted that this did not address existing problems caused by abandoned vehicles and business use. Clarification was sought on how the proposed scheme would resolve these issues. In response, Amin Fouladi (Transport Consultant, member of the applicant's team) stated that a robust calculation had been undertaken within the site boundary to assess displaced garages and their impact on public highways and private parking areas. It was confirmed that the proposed scheme accounted for this demand. Andrew Gatehouse (MTVH, Applicant) confirmed that a planning condition required the introduction of a car parking management plan for the northern car park. It was also stated that MTVH intended to appoint one of its existing providers to manage parking on the estate. Following up, members queried whether residents would be consulted prior to the introduction of any parking scheme, to which Andrew Gatehouse (MTVH, Applicant) confirmed that residents would be consulted before implementation.
- Members noted existing issues with refuse collection and sought clarification of how these would be addressed alongside the introduction of 61 new dwellings. In response, Dominique Mirepoix (Applicant's representative) confirmed that 1100 litre bins would be provided within dedicated refuse stores associated with each of the 5 proposed buildings. It was stated that a refuse management plan would be implemented and that tracking diagrams had been prepared to ensure servicing did not adversely affect residents. Amin Fouladi (Transport Consultant, member of the applicant's team) further explained that Brent Highways requirements had been incorporated into the design to ensure operatives could access refuse stores. It was confirmed that a delivery and servicing management plan would be secured by condition to support efficient refuse collection. It was added that consultations had taken place with landscape architects to address litter concerns and that additional bins would be provided for existing residents as part of the proposal.

- Members highlighted concerns raised by the first speaker regarding the management of the estate and noted that there appeared to be a lack of confidence in the ability of Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH) to manage the site effectively, particularly in light of the proposed introduction of 61 new homes. While estate management was not a planning matter, it was suggested that MTVH should improve its performance in this regard.
- Members noted that the scheme provided an opportunity to relieve housing pressures through the lettings plan and questioned whether issues of under-occupation and overcrowding would be taken into account should the scheme be approved. In response, Andrew Gatehouse (MTVH, Applicant) clarified that the intention was for MTVH teams to discuss the potential benefits of a local lettings plan to address under-occupation and overcrowding on the Chalkhill Estate. It was explained that this would need to align with the borough-wide housing applications list and it was confirmed that discussions with officers were intended to take place closer to the time of completion.

The Chair thanked Dominique Mirepoix 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:

- In presenting slides from the drawing pack to illustrate the proposed plans, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) provided confirmation that a privacy screening condition applied specifically to Block E and stated that this could be expanded to include screening to the edges of balconies overlooking Kingsgate. It was further noted that two windows served the living room and kitchen in the corner plot and explained that the window facing Einstein House could be obscure glazed to a certain height to mitigate harm. It was clarified that this was the window closest to Einstein House.
- In highlighting concerns raised regarding lighting and reflections, members questioned whether procedures or mechanisms could be implemented to monitor luminance levels and ensure compliance. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) explained that the scheme was currently at the detailed design stage and not yet implemented. It was confirmed that a number of conditions had been recommended for inclusion within the consent. These included a landscaping condition requiring full details of landscaping and a specific condition relating to lighting. The lighting condition would require submission of details covering luminance levels, operational arrangements and measures to mitigate impacts on residents. These details would be assessed at the condition discharge stage in consultation with relevant colleagues.
- Clarification was sought as to whether responsibility for addressing lighting issues after development completion would rest with MTVH or the Council. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) confirmed that the estate would remain in private ownership and that management of lighting systems would therefore be the responsibility of the

applicant. It was added that if a breach of condition occurred, the Council could investigate and take appropriate action.

- Following up, members further asked what avenues would be available for residents to raise concerns if lighting caused problems and whether such matters were addressed through planning conditions or building control regulations. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) stated that a landscape management plan would be required as part of the landscaping condition and that this document would govern ongoing maintenance. It was confirmed that planning permission required compliance with approved details for the lifetime of the development. The expectation that residents would have a route to raise concerns with the relevant management team responsible for maintenance was expressed.
- Further assurance was then sought by members to ensure that planning conditions would be robustly managed. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) reassured members that conditions were either compliance conditions or dischargeable conditions. Conditions relating to matters such as the car park management plan, lighting strategy and delivery and servicing plan would require submission and assessment through a further application process. It was confirmed that these submissions were rigorously reviewed in consultation with relevant departments. It was further added that planning permission required adherence to approved details for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed and that breaches could be addressed through planning enforcement. It was additionally noted that MTVH was a Registered Provider (RP) with whom the Council maintained regular communication and that informal engagement would be used where possible to resolve issues before formal action was taken. In continuing the response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further explained that some matters were controlled through planning while others fell under separate legislation. It was confirmed that the planning team worked closely with other departments, including Nuisance Control for issues such as excessive noise, out-of-hours working and dust, and with Highways for matters such as mud on roads. It was also stated that the Council would collaborate across departments to identify the most appropriate route for addressing any issues.
- Referring to concerns expressed by the first speaker regarding loss of daylight and sunlight, members sought details around how significant the impact would be. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) explained that daylight and sunlight assessments were undertaken in accordance with BRE guidance, which was advisory rather than mandatory policy. It was noted that the National Planning Policy Framework allowed flexibility in applying this guidance to reflect site-specific constraints and design priorities. It was stated that infill developments were inherently challenging and that the proposal sought to make efficient use of land to deliver affordable homes without causing undue harm to neighbouring amenities. It was confirmed that the report assessed impacts against BRE guidance and identified that a small number of windows and 3 gardens would fall below recommended targets. It was explained that these shortfalls were limited and

largely attributable to existing features such as overhanging balconies and projecting walls. It was reported that 88% of windows tested met or exceeded BRE daylight standards and that most rooms retained good levels of light for an urban setting. All but 3 existing gardens met the BRE overshadowing test and communal open spaces would be well sunlit. It was additionally stated that BRE guidance and national policy supported a flexible approach and that, given overall compliance and mitigating factors, the impact on neighbours was considered acceptable when weighed against the benefits of the scheme. It was confirmed that the main criteria for daylight assessment was the vertical sky component test and that the majority of windows met or exceeded targets, with only a small number falling below. It was concluded that these windows would still have adequate access to daylight.

- Referring to earlier comments made by Councillor Fraser (as Ward Councillor) regarding poor air quality in the area, members sought details on how the proposed scheme would address this issue. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) noted that an Air Quality Assessment had been submitted with the application and that condition 12 required the development to be carried out in full accordance with the mitigation measures set out in that assessment. It was further stated that air quality measures would also apply to non-road mobile machinery during demolition and construction phases. It was additionally stated that the site was not located within an air quality focus area and that the proposal was required to be air quality neutral. It was explained that the assessment indicated no significant residual impacts during construction and that predicted pollutant concentrations for 2026 would fall well below relevant annual air quality objectives. The Chair noted that nitrogen oxide and particulate matter levels were key indicators of air quality and stated that the area was not among the top ten most polluted roads in Brent, although improvements to air quality remained a priority.
- As a further issue highlighted, details were sought on how the protection of species such as bats, birds and insects would be addressed. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) confirmed that the landscaping condition included details of ecological management as part of the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain process. It was stated that a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal had been submitted, identifying habitats within the site as comprising grassland, scattered trees, flats, garages and fencing, all of relatively low biodiversity value. It was further noted that buildings were assessed as having moderate potential for roosting bats due to proximity to mature trees and gardens and that further surveys would be required by condition to ensure no bats were present.
- Further details were then requested regarding the contribution for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) confirmed that the contribution would fund consultation and subsequent implementation if supported by residents.
- Members further queried whether reduced CPZ fees could be considered for residents if consultation indicated support. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) explained that by law contributions could

not be secured through a Section 106 agreement to reduce CPZ permit costs. Any reduction would need to be addressed through the Council's parking policies. Following up, members questioned whether the Registered Provider could contribute voluntarily to reduce CPZ costs. In response, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) confirmed that the Registered Provider could do so voluntarily but could not be required to. John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) further stated that off-street parking would be privately managed and that a car parking management plan would be signed off by the Council. It was additionally confirmed that parity between on-street and off-street charges would be sought to avoid displacement of parking.

- Further details were sought on emergency access arrangements and it was questioned whether the lack of a turning head for fire appliances at the eastern end of Block A was acceptable. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) confirmed that the Fire Brigade had reviewed the arrangements and was satisfied that they were acceptable. Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) further explained that dry risers would be installed towards the eastern end to enable emergency vehicles to reverse while maintaining access.
- Clarification was sought by members regarding blue badge parking spaces and electric vehicle charging points, and how these would be managed. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) confirmed that disabled parking spaces would be located within the private off-street area and that electric vehicle charging points would also be provided in private areas. It was also stated that residents requiring on-street provision could apply for bays and that the Council would manage on-street electric vehicle charging.
- Questions were raised around how the allocation of wheelchair parking bays would operate if wheelchair-accessible units were unoccupied and a resident in a non-wheelchair unit became eligible for a blue badge. It was queried whether bays would be tied to wheelchair units and what would happen if the occupant of a wheelchair unit did not require a vehicle. Clarification was sought on whether the policy would restrict flexibility or whether this matter remained subject to further exploration. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) confirmed that the intention was to avoid permanently allocated spaces tied to specific properties. It was stated that spaces should remain flexible and reviewed at least annually to ensure they were available for those who required them, thereby preventing unused spaces from being locked to units.
- Returning to the highlighted concerns raised by the first speaker regarding dust and site traffic, members questioned whether measures such as dampening vehicles, using covers and watering down during demolition could be required at this stage or whether these would be addressed solely through the Construction Management Plan. It was also questioned whether guidance could be provided to ensure these measures were incorporated when the plan was prepared. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management

Area Manager) confirmed that condition 14 required a Construction Logistics Plan, which was detailed on page 51 of committee report. It was stated that this condition, together with an additional requirement for a Construction Method Statement, would capture measures to manage construction impacts on highways and control dust and noise. It was further added that secondary legislation under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 also applied and that construction hours would be controlled through planning conditions and environmental health powers.

- Members noted that the Considerate Contractor Scheme (CCS) was not a requirement and sought details around whether the applicant intended to join such a scheme or had its own equivalent policies as some developers often presented such commitments to the Committee. In response, Colin Leadbeater (Development Management Area Manager) suggested that this question was best directed to the applicant but expressed the view that the conditions attached to the draft decision notice provided sufficient control over environmental issues arising during construction, including vehicle movements. It was also noted that the applicant was present and could consider the suggestion.

## DECISION

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

- (1) The completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations as detailed within the committee report.
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report, together with:
  - A revision to the privacy condition for Block E (condition 19) to also require privacy screening to the south-eastern edge of the balcony for flat 05 on the first and second floor of Block E (denoted as flat E-01-05 within drawing HKG-BPTW-B04-ZZ-DR-A-1015 Rev C02) and to require the south-east facing window of the Living/Kitchen/Dining room of this flat to be obscure glazed and non-opening (up to a height of 1.7 m) in order to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy of the neighbouring properties.
  - A recommendation for the developers to engage and collaborate closely with ward councillors and resident associations to manage construction impacts.

(Voting on the above decision was unanimous)

## 4. Any Other Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 7.26 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair