

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on

11 February, 2026

Item No

06

Case Number

25/1029

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	3 April, 2025
WARD	Dollis Hill
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Willesden
LOCATION	7 Randall Avenue, London, NW2 7RL
PROPOSAL	Proposed demolition of garage and x3 sheds and, erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, addition of new fence to south side of the site, provision of 2 car parking spaces, cycle and refuse storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue.
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 <u>ALL</u> document associated to case</p> <p><u>https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_172982</u></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 <u>pa.brent.gov.uk</u>2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "25/1029" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

Grant Consent

- A. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission
- B. That the Head of Planning or other duly authorised persons is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatics to secure the following matters

Conditions:

Compliance

- Time; three-year rule
- Approved documents
- Restricted windows for privacy
- Permitted Development Rights Restrictive Condition
- Cycle and Bin Storage Facilities
- Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan
- Compliance with Building Regulations M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable homes' standards
- Reduced water use condition
- Parking spaces to be laid out
- Access and turning spaces to remain clear

Submission and Compliance

Pre-commencement

- Construction Management Plan
- Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)

During Construction (prior to development above ground)

- Landscaping Scheme (including boundary treatments and provision of rain gardens where feasible)
- Materials

Informatics

1. CIL liability
2. Party Wall Act
3. Building near boundary
4. Biodiversity Net Gain Exempt

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

SITE MAP



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

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

EXISTING

The application site includes the curtilage of No. 7 Randall Avenue together with the grassed area to the rear of No.7 and the shared access between Nos. 7 and 9. No. 7 is a semi-detached dwelling that is believed to be in use as a small-scale HMO within Use Class C4.

The application site slopes to the south, and currently forms part of the garden to No.7 Randall Avenue.

The application site has a shared driveway with the adjacent dwelling to the north, No.9 Randall Avenue. Randall Avenue and also Dollis Hill Lane to the south are characterised by two-storey pairs of semi-detached properties. The application site is not within a designated conservation area and does not have any other statutory designation, however it borders the Homestead Park Conservation Area which is to the north east. There are no listed buildings on the site or nearby.

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: Objection comments from 23 individuals (some of which has submitted multiple comments) have been received in response to this application. These comments are summarised within the Consultation section below.

Design, character, appearance and impact to heritage assets: The proposal would involve the construction of a two-storey detached house with the first floor set within the loft space and a basement. A contemporary approach has been taken to the design of the house, with a pitched roof which reduces the appearance of the first floor. The proposal is considered to be of a suitable scale and massing for the backland setting, whilst the design and appearance of the building is considered to be appropriate for the area. The subject site adjoins the Homestead Park Conservation Area (designated heritage asset) to its rear. The development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation nor its setting.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenities: It is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact in terms of neighbouring residential amenities in terms of light, outlook and privacy. **Trees, Landscaping and Green Infrastructure:** The impact to trees is considered acceptable. Subject to a condition to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Planting Plan. A condition is recommended for the submission an approval of a revised detailed landscaping/tree planting plan to secure sufficient green infrastructure and to manage surface water run-off.

Flood Risk and Drainage: Although the application is in Flood Zone 1 – at low risk of flooding. The submitted Basement Impact Assessment has identified that the underlying geology (clayey soil) can impede drainage. As a result a pre-commencement condition is recommended to ensure a Drainage Strategy is submitted to identify any necessary mitigation and to provide details of the mitigation to ensure such details can be mitigated to effectively manage drainage.

Transport: The site has a PTAL of 2 and the provision of the two proposed parking spaces would meet maximum parking standards (which would allow up to 1 space per dwelling) and provide sufficient off-street parking to mitigate the potential for over-spill parking. Electric vehicle charging points are proposed for both spaces. Cycle parking is proposed within the gardens of both the existing and proposed houses. A Construction Logistics Plan would be secured through a condition.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

Relevant Planning History

24/2462: Reserved Matters application (Appearance and Scale) in relation to Outline Planning Permission reference 22/0175 dated 28 March 2022 on matters of Layout and Access, for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a 1.5 storeys detached dwelling with associated access. Application Withdrawn.

25/0267: Reserved Matters relating to condition 3ii (Landscaping) of Outline Planning Permission reference 22/0175 dated 28 March, 2022, for Outline planning permission for demolition of existing garage and erection of a 1.5 storeys detached dwelling with associated access (matters to be determined: Layout, Access) – Application Withdrawn.

23/1875: Demolition of garage and erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, provision of 2 car parking spaces, cycle storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue - Refused and Dismissed on Appeal - 07/03/2024.

22/3689: Demolition of garage and erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, provision of car parking space, cycle storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue - Refused, 08/02/2023.

22/0175: Outline planning permission for demolition of existing garage and erection of a 1.5 storeys detached dwelling with associated access (matters to be determined: Layout, Access) - Granted, 28/03/2022.

CONSULTATIONS

16 properties and Dollis Hill Residents' Association were consulted for a 21-day period commencing 15/07/2025.

Following receipt of additional/amended plans ,re-consultation letters were sent on 24th September 2025.

A total of 23 objections were received (*noting that multiple representations were sent by some individual).

Topic Theme	Objection summarised	Officer comment
Character and appearance	Incompatible design, bulk, scale and mass with surrounding context.	See Character and Appearance/ Heritage Considerations section of the main report which discusses the design of the proposal.
	Garden development not appropriate. Impact to suburban character.	Please see ' Character and Appearance /Heritage Considerations assessment ' which assesses the impact of the impact to existing character.
	Over development of the site	Planning policies require proposals to optimise the capacity of a site.
	Located away from the "priority locations" for small-scale residential developments.	The Principle of Development section of this report refers to Policy BH4, noting that the site is not located in a priority location (as defined by Policy BH4) and that 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.
	Sets precedent for further similar development/degradation and sub-division of gardens.	Each application is assessed on its own merits.
Heritage	Harm to Setting of Homestead Park Conservation Area.	<p>See Character and Appearance/ Heritage Considerations section of the main report.</p> <p>The submitted Planning and Design and Access Statement does include a section relating to 'Local Character and Heritage'. In addition, Brent's Principal Heritage Officer was consulted and raised no concern in terms of impact to the adjacent Conservation Area.</p>
Standard of Accommodation	<p>Concerns regarding standard of accommodation, including space standards.</p> <p>Basement level unsuitable light for habitable room.</p>	<p>Please see Standard of Accommodation section of the main report.</p> <p>Please see Standard of Accommodation section of the main report.</p>
Impact to Residential Amenity	<p>Loss of light, outlook and overshadowing.</p> <p>Failure to comply with 45 degree line set out in SPD1.</p> <p>Loss of privacy including overlooking from rear patio and upper terrace.</p> <p>Noise and disruption to neighbouring outdoor spaces/gardens due to the proposal being too close to other properties and gardens.</p>	<p>See Impact to Residential Amenity section of the main report.</p> <p>See Impact to Residential Amenity section of the main report.</p> <p>See Impact to Residential Amenity section of the main report.</p> <p>The development is for residential use and the noise is commensurate with residential use; it would result in domestic use in this already residential context. The entertainment areas are domestic and as such the scale and use is not considered to give rise to harmful noise and disturbance.</p> <p>The impact during construction is addressed under separate cover, yet the scale of the car park would be small and domestic, it is not considered</p>

		to be excessive or result in adverse harm to neighbouring amenity.
	General noise and disruption during construction works.	Some noise and disturbance are to be expected with most construction projects. Any excessive impacts would be controlled through Environmental Health legislation on a development of this scale and type.
	Loss of rear garden to No. 7 Randall Avenue.	The proposal would retain a rear garden of No. 7 Randall Avenue that complies with policy BH13.
	Concerns pumping Station will generate noise and interfere with privacy and private amenity space.	The pump would be an internal item and is a common addition for a basement development.
	<p>Concerns regarding multiple occupancy at No.7 and HMOs in the area. The impact of the proposed development and unsociable behaviour/noise.</p> <p>Concerns regarding noise and anti-social behaviour at Randall Avenue.</p>	<p>While the application site includes the entire curtilage of No. 7, the proposal would involve the redevelopment of the land to the rear of this property. An investigation in 2022 found that the property was in lawful use as a small-scale HMO within Use Class C4 and the property continues to have an HMO licence. No changes are proposed to the use of No. 7.</p> <p>The reasonable use of the proposed new house within a residential area would not result in excessive noise or anti-social behaviour and should any such behaviour take place, this must be dealt with outside of the planning system.</p>
	Negative impacts such as, vermin/pests, odour/litter, unhygienic environment associated with Industrial bins near property entrance.	The bin storage would be commensurate with one residential dwelling, so would not be of an industrial scale. The scale and provision of bins is not considered to result in the problems listed. There is no evidence as to why this would necessarily be the case.
	Light pollution to neighbouring properties and rear gardens	A condition is recommended for the submission of details regarding external lighting in terms of balancing safe access and impact to residential amenity. Lightspill from

		windows would be of a domestic scale and is not considered adversely harmful or out of context in this residential setting.
	Concerns regarding construction impact; site access and safety as well as nuisance and vibration including due to basement excavation. States that a Construction Management Plan should be submitted up front and not via condition.	It is reasonable for a construction management plan to be agreed by condition. Often the fine details of the plan will be put together by the contractor.
Trees and Ecology	Concern regarding impact to trees and ecology. Threat to ancient trees and wildlife (bats, birds) noted in previous refusals; risk of land slippage. States that trees have been destroyed and that it's a prosecutable offence under Town and Country Planning Act 2015. States trees have been destroyed and will be destroyed and this impacts vistas, character, heritage and wildlife.	This is discussed in the Trees/Ecology and Urban Greening Factor section of the report. An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection plan was submitted. Refer to Trees section of this report.
	No Urban Greening Factor score has been undertaken.	This is discussed in the Trees/Ecology and Urban Greening Factor section of the report.
	Misrepresentation of site, in terms of ecology, self-build and ownership.	See Biodiversity Net Gain section of this report.
Basement Impact	Concerns regarding basement/safety/excavation drainage and flooding. Increased hardstanding raises concerns regarding flood risk and drainage.	The structural safety of the development would be assessed at the building regulations stage of the application. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the development would result in an increase floor risk.
	Concerns regarding subsidence, ground levels and land stability as well as damage to other properties. Not carried out by a suitably qualified engineer, not details of person who published it or Professional Indemnity Insurance. States Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) is inaccurate.	The structural and foundation details of the proposal would be assessed within Building Regulations. The BIA is considered acceptable for a planning assessment.

Transport considerations	Pedestrian and highway safety using the shared access	The access has been assessed by the Council's Transport Officers. Please see Transport Considerations
	Shared access would be too narrow for emergency vehicles or bin lorries	The access has been assessed by the Council's Transport Officers. Please see Transport Considerations
	Concerns regarding parking provision and parking arrangement for Number 7 Randall Avenue	The access has been assessed by the Council's Transport Officers. Please see Transport Considerations
	Increased air pollution	The development is not of a scale that would result in any adverse air quality impacts.
	The proposal would also have an impact on the pollution which would have a serious effect on children and with the parking being busy it will also affect homes opposite the park. The development is in close proximity to local schools and community areas (churches, schools etc).	The development is not of a scale that would result in any adverse pollution impacts.
	Transport impact due to construction machinery/vehicles. Vehicles/machinery would struggle to use the narrow access road.	A condition is recommended to agree a construction logistics plan which would ensure that the construction process are arranged in an appropriate manner.
Fire safety	Stated building does not comply with Building Regulations.	The assessment of Building Regulations falls under separate legislation is separate to the planning application.
	States sprinkler system is insufficient to accommodate a building.	This item would be assessed in detail within at the Building Regulations stage.
	Concerns raised in regard to fire safety and health and safety.	The submission has demonstrated that fire safety has been taken into account

	<p>Concerns raised regarding emergency service access, notes narrow access and utilities in shared access.</p> <p>Reliance on a domestic sprinkler system alone does not satisfy the safety requirements under Policy D12 of the London Plan 2021.</p>	<p>The development will require separate approval under Building Regulations. The use of sprinklers is considered to be acceptable.</p>
	<p>Sets precedent for further similar development/degradation and sub-division of gardens.</p>	<p>Each application must be assessed on its own merits and subdivision of gardens is not unacceptable in principle.</p>
Other matters	<p>Accuracy of plans regarding size of site, red line boundary and topography of site, and lack of detail.</p>	<p>The plans have been checked and are to scale and accurate.</p>
	<p>Change of use not declared.</p>	<p>This application does not involve a change of use class and the development's description is clear.</p>
	<p>Multiple applications submitted</p>	<p>Planning legislation allows the applicant to submit as many applications as they want.</p>
	<p>Permission not been given for use of shared driveway for development.</p>	<p>Permission to use land is separate to the planning process.</p>
	<p>Loss of value to neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>This is not a material planning consideration.</p>
	<p>Lack of public consultation.</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's statutory requirements and with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p>
	<p>Reference made to a petition on change.org. Breaches the Localism Act.</p>	<p>No petition was submitted as a representation to the application.</p>
	<p>Proposal would not address housing shortage.</p>	<p>The proposal would provide a family sized house, which would make a modest but valuable contribution to the Borough's housing targets.</p>
	<p>Increase pressure on local infrastructure.</p>	<p>A development of this scale is not likely to have any noticeable impact on the infrastructure needed in terms</p>

		of power and drainage. The development would be subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy payment to help offset any impact on infrastructure within the Borough.
	<p>Concerns regarding multiple occupancy at No.7 and proposed development and unsociable behaviour/noise.</p> <p>Concerns regarding noise and anti-social behaviour at Randall Avenue.</p>	<p>While the application site includes the entire curtilage of No. 7, the proposal would involve the redevelopment of the land to the rear of this property. An investigation in 2022 found that the property was in lawful use as a small-scale HMO within Use Class C4 and the property continues to have an HMO licence. No changes are proposed to the use of No. 7.</p> <p>The reasonable use of the proposed new house within a residential area would not result in excessive noise or anti-social behaviour and should any such behaviour take place, this must be dealt with outside of the planning system.</p>
	<p>Suggestion of collusion with Brent Council. Allegation that Brent have an interest in the application.</p>	There is no basis for this comment.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of planning applications should be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan comprises:

London Plan 2021; and

Brent Local Plan 2019-2041

Key relevant policies include:

LONDON PLAN 2021

D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth

D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

D4 Delivering good design

D12 Fire safety

H1 Increasing housing supply

H2 Small sites

HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

BRENT LOCAL PLAN 2019-2041

DMP1 Development Management General Policy

BD1 Leading the Way in Good Urban Design

BH1 Increasing Housing Supply in Brent

BH4 Small sites and small housing developments in Brent

BH13 Residential Amenity Space

BHC1 Brent's Heritage Assets

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The following are also relevant material considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Homestead Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

SPD1 Brent Design Guide 2018

Residential Amenity Space and Place Quality SPD (updated December 2024)

Brent Basements SPD

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Background

1. An outline planning application was consented under reference 22/0175 for demolition of existing garage and erection of a 1.5 storeys detached dwelling with associated access (matters to be determined: Layout, Access) in March 2022.
2. This outline permission had reserved matters which were appearance, landscaping and scale. The outline consent has now expired, nevertheless in terms of the policy context, there has not been a new Local Plan since the decision was issued on the outline consent. A number of supplementary guidance documents have been adopted since the issue of this decision.
3. A more recent full planning application was refused under reference 22/3689 in February 2023 for the demolition of garage and erection of dwellinghouse with basement level, provision of car parking space, cycle storage, landscaping and associated access to land rear of 7 Randall Avenue.
4. This application was refused for the following reason:

The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk and design would result in a visually dominant, excessive development that is incongruous to the surrounding suburban locality. This is contrary to policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan.

5. It was appealed and subsequently dismissed by the Inspector.
6. The appeal decision found the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appeal decision acknowledged the outline permission that was granted under reference (22/0175) for the demolition of the garage and erection of a detached dwelling at the appeal site, with matters including appearance and scale reserved for future consideration. Noting that the principle of a dwelling at the site was not disputed. Before outlining some of the differences between dwelling approved at outline stage, including that; it would have a larger footprint and would be taller both to the ridge and eaves height.
8. It noted that even though the proposed dwelling under the appeal scheme would be in a similarly central location within the site to that as per the outline consent, that the overall scale and massing would be noticeably greater than the dwelling previously permitted, resulting in a prominent form of development in an area with an open character.
9. Both the Outline Consent (22/0175) which has now expired as well as the dismissed appeal scheme (23/1875) had a similar layout to the proposed scheme, in that access was from Randall Avenue and the siting of the buildings were broadly central within the site. Further differences are discussed in the Character and Appearance and Heritage considerations section of this report.

Principle of residential intensification

10. London Plan Policy H1 sets out new housing targets, with the target for Brent being 23,250 new homes over the ten-year plan period. Policy D3 requires all developments to make the best use of land by optimising the capacity of sites, and Policy H2 aims to increase the contribution of small sites (below 0.25ha in size) to meet London's housing needs through increased intensity of use of these sites.
11. Brent's Local Plan Policy BH1 responds to this new policy context by proposing plan-led growth concentrated in Growth Areas and site allocations, whilst Policy BH2 identifies town centres, edge of town centre sites and intensification corridors as other priority areas for new housing and Policy BH4 supports the London Plan aim of increasing housing on small sites, in areas with PTAL ratings of 3 or more including development through:
 - the infill of vacant or underused brownfield sites,
 - residential conversions, redevelopment, extensions of dwellings, or infill within the curtilage of a dwelling,
 - the redevelopment of flats, non-residential buildings and residential garages,
 - upward extensions of flats and non-residential buildings
12. The application site is within a PTAL 2 (low). The site is therefore outside of a priority location and therefore 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.
13. While the development, in providing, one dwelling is low density, the character of the area and resulting impact of the design of the proposal will be discussed further below.

Standard of Accommodation

14. Local Plan Policy DMP1 states that new development must provide high levels of internal and external amenity. The size of dwellings and rooms should be consistent with London Plan Policy D6 specifically

Table 3.1 'Minimum internal space standards for new dwellings'.

15. London Plan Policy D6 also requires at least 75% of the GIA of each flat to have an internal floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5m. This exceeds the national standard of 2.3m as higher housing and the urban heat island effect are more prevalent in London, and a higher standard is required to ensure adequate quality in terms of daylight penetration, ventilation and cooling, and sense of space.
16. The proposal would be a three bed 6 person dwelling, over three floors (inclusive of a basement level). Table 3.5 of the London Plan of the London Plan outlines minimum internal space standards for new dwelling and stipulates a minimum internal space standard of 108sqm for this size/type of dwelling. At 155.2 sqm the proposal would exceed the relevant minimum space standard.
17. The London Plan Policy D6 (Housing quality and standards) states that minimum floor to ceiling height must be 2.5m for at least 75 per cent of the Gross Internal Area of each dwelling. The submitted section demonstrated that the floor to ceiling height in the basement and ground floor measure 2.6m. The floor to ceiling height at first floor would be varied due to its location within the roofspace. The floor to ceiling area has been outlined on the revised plans and shows areas measuring at least 2m, 1.7m and 1.5m.
18. The area denoted of the loft Plan does not outline the area that is at least 2.5m in height, however the section drawing has been used in conjunction with the floor plan to assess the floor to ceiling height, layout and quality of this space. The total area measuring at least 2.5m within the loft area is at least 16sqm. Therefore, a total of 30sqm of the dwelling would have a floor to ceiling area less than 2.5m in height, whilst 125.2sqm of the 155.2 sqm would have a floor to ceiling height of at least 2.5m. As such 80% of the total floor would have a that minimum floor to ceiling height must be 2.5m and as such it would comply with the London Plan in regard to minimum floor to ceiling heights.
19. All habitable rooms located at ground and first floor levels would be served by windows with good light and outlook. The basement would experience limited outlook with a terrace and lightwell above to the home office and entertainment/games room. As these are not the primary habitable areas within the dwelling, there is less of an expectation/need for natural light and as such the restricted light and outlook to the basement level is considered acceptable.

External Amenity

20. London Plan Policy D6 states where there are no higher local standards, a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings with an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. The space must achieve a minimum depth and width of 1.5m.
21. Local Plan Policy BH13 establishes that all new dwellings are required to have external private amenity space of a sufficient size and type to satisfy its proposed residents' needs. This is normally expected to be 50sqm per home for family housing (3 bedrooms or more) situated at ground floor level and 20 sqm for all other housing.
22. Private amenity space should be accessible to all dwellings from a main living room, ideally without level changes. It should also be planned to take maximum advantage of daylight and sunlight. Where sufficient private amenity space cannot achieve the full requirement of the policy, the remainder should be provided in the form of communal amenity space.
23. The dwelling would be set within a garden space to the rear and side. These areas would far exceed the 50sqm requirement for a family dwelling, outlined within Policy BH13 (over 80sqm of usable space), the size and shape of the space is considered to lend itself to functional and meaningful good quality amenity space for future occupants.
24. The retained garden for No.7 Randall Avenue would also exceed 50 sqm.

Accessible Homes

25. Policy D7 of the London Plan requires the new dwelling to meet M4(2) of the Building Regulation requirement in order to be accessible and adaptable. This element of the scheme will be secured by

condition.

Water Consumption

26. Policy BSUI4 of the Local Plan requires new developments to achieve the target for mains water consumption of 105L or less per person per day for internal use and 5L for external use in order to protect water supply. These measures would be secured by condition.

Character and Appearance /Heritage Considerations

27. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024) paragraph 135 b) and c) outlines that planning decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character. Paragraph 139 of Framework states 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes'.

28. Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 and the Brent Design Guide SPD1 (2018) provide guidance on principles of good design. Policy DMP1 sets out the need for development proposals to be, amongst other things, (a) of a location, use, concentration, siting, layout, scale, type, density, materials, detailing and design that provides high levels of internal and external amenity and complements the locality; and (f) safe, secure and reduces the potential for crime. Policy BD1 highlights the need for 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.

29. The subject site adjoins the Homestead Conservation Area (HCA) to its rear. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

30. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and seeks to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is appropriate to consider the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness [paragraph 210]. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. NPPF paragraph 215 states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. This approach is echoed by Policy BHC1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041.

31. As identified with the 'Principle of Development' section of this report, the site is not located within a priority location as defined within Policy BH4. As a result greater weight has been 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.

32. The application is for one house and is therefore a low density, low intensity development. The overall footprint of the building and hardstanding is considered to be appropriate for this back-land site. It is considered that the proposed development is not out of character in this residential area.

33. This application proposes a detached two- storey building with the upper floor within the roof space and a basement and two sunken terraces (lightwells). The building would have a modern design with a largely hipped roof but would also feature a partly gabled roof to part of the front and rear. The roof space would feature two dormers on the hipped part of the roof, one to the front and one to the rear, as well as one

rooflight to the front roof slope and one to the rear of roof slope. The external walls are labelled to be acrylic render finish in an off-white colour, the roof would be finished in grey slate roof tiles, whilst the dormer windows would be finished in zinc cladding.

34. A basement is proposed under the full footprint of the building but would also include sunken terraces to the part of the site and part of the rear elevation.
35. The basement lower ground terraces would feature exit ladders, with a balustrade and door visible at ground floor, in relation to both terraces.
36. The maximum roof height, at approximately 6.65m is lower than the outline scheme (7.2m) and the appeal scheme (8.29m).
37. Both the Outline Consent (22/0175) which has now expired (and never implemented) as well as the dismissed appeal scheme (23/1875) had a similar layout to the proposed scheme, in that access was from Randall Avenue and the citing of the buildings were broadly central within the site.
38. The table below provides some key comparison between the schemes in terms of bulk, mass and height.

	Appeal Scheme (23/1875)	Outline Scheme (22/0175)	Current Proposal (25/1029)
Height	Maximum of 8.29m (2 storey with accommodation in the roofspace)	Maximum of 7.2m (1.5 storey with accommodation in the roofspace)	Maximum of 6.65m (1.5 storey with accommodation in the roofspace)
Ground Floor Footprint	64sqm (excluding lightwell) 67sqm (inclusive of lightwell)	62.56sqm	66.4sqm (excluding lightwell) 74.9sqm (including lightwells)
Width	9.39m	9.2m	9.5m
Depth (maximum)	7.02m	6.8m	7.02m
Roof Style	Main roof hipped with a projecting bay and gable roof. Single storey addition proposed a largely crown roof with hipped sides.	Part hipped; part gabled.	Part hipped; part gabled.
Basement	Basement with lightwell.	No basement.	Basement with lower ground terrace, exit ladder. Balustrade and door at ground floor.

39. Although, it is acknowledged that the outline consent has expired and was not implemented, it is worth noting the above comparisons. Namely, that the maximum height is 0.55m lower than the outline scheme and 1.64m lower than the dismissed appeal scheme.
40. The footprint would be 3.84 sqm larger than the outline consent (excluding the footprint of the proposed lightwells, when considering the footprint including the lightwells proposed, the scheme would represent

an increase in footprint of approximately 12.34sqm. Noting that the balustrade screening for the lower ground floor terraces would be limited in height.

41. With a ridge height of 6.65m, the overall height is lower than the 7.2m set out within the indicative measurements as approved in the outline planning permission and would be approximately 1.64m lower than the height of the dismissed appeal scheme.
42. It is noted that properties within the adjoining HCA are predominantly 'tetri-detached' houses in groups of three, characterised by their hipped-end and pitched roofs. The closest properties to the application site are number 1, 3 and 23 do not have the 'tetri-detached' design. Other properties within site vicinity outside of the HCA boundaries are primarily two-storey semi-detached pairs with their original hipped roofs.
43. Paragraph 12 of the appeal decision notice, when referring to the appeal scheme stated that 'It would also be sensitively located and designed to avoid adverse impacts on the setting of the nearby conservation area'.
44. Generally, the overall bulk and scale of the proposal is modest and largely in-keeping with the surrounding context and would not unduly harm of integrity of the streetscene.
45. The roofscape of the proposed building would be key in how the appearance of the development might be interpreted from a distance. The side of the proposed building facing the HCA would feature a hipped roof that gives an overall appearance that integrates better when viewed from vantages within the HCA. The roof plan reflects the indicative design as set within the outline consent.
46. Although it is clear that the proposal would not be identical to the main typology within the adjacent HCA or the common two-storey, semi-detached form found elsewhere in the immediate vicinity, the overall roofscape, bulk, scale and form of the proposed building is not considered to be out-of-place to the detriment of the established character, when it would be viewed from surrounding vantage points. Furthermore, the roof forms of closest building to the application site forming its immediate context have sufficient variations for the proposed roof not to appear out of place or overly prominent. For the same reasons and given the limited views from public vantages and separation distance, the proposal would not result in harm to the setting of the HCA and the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the HCA .
47. In summary, although the footprint would be larger than the outline consent and the dismissed appeal, the increase is not considered significant, particularly given the citing and separation to boundaries. This taken with the revised roof form (similar to the outline scheme) and the reduction in height compared to both the outline and dismissed appeal is such that the proposed development is not considered to result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area.

Impact to Neighbouring Amenity

48. In terms of neighbouring amenities, SPD1 advises that new development should provide adequate privacy and amenity for new residents and protect those of existing ones. The building envelope should be set below a line of 30 degrees from the nearest rear habitable room window of adjoining existing property, measured from height of 2m 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 2m.
49. The subject site is to the rear of neighbouring residential gardens. It is necessary to consider how the bulk and scale of the proposal would have an impact on neighbouring amenity to ensure the development would not adversely impact the living conditions of adjoining occupiers due to being over-dominant or overbearing.
50. A number of sections have been provided to illustrate the relationship with adjoining properties. It is considered that there is sufficient detail within the application to enable a judgement as to whether the massing of the development would sit below the 30 and 45-degree lines of the adjoining properties.

51. SPD1 advises that development should ensure a good level of privacy inside buildings and within private outdoor space. Directly facing habitable room windows will normally require a minimum separation distance of 18m, except where the existing character of the area varies from this. A distance of 9m should be kept between gardens and habitable rooms or balconies.
52. Reduced distances between new frontages may be acceptable subject to consideration of overlooking and privacy as well as high quality design and solutions which can sometimes mitigate impacts and allow for efficient use of land.

1 Homestead Park

53. Number 1 Homestead Park is located to the east of the proposed development site. Officers have used the submitted drawings show that the proposed development would not breach a 45-degree line in relation to the garden of number 1 Homestead Park. The plans also show that the proposed development would not breach a 30-degree angle in relation to number 1 Homestead Park.
54. There are proposed side facing window at ground floor within 18m of the boundary to number 1 Homestead Park. However as this is at ground floor level, boundary treatments are sufficient to ensure that significant overlooking is unlikely and it is noted that the ground level sloped upwards towards number 1 Homestead Park, as such this is not considered to result in harmful overlooking to 1 Homestead Park. There are no side facing windows at first floor level and as such the proposal would not result in harmful overlooking to number 1 Homestead Avenue. The dormer windows within the first floor, given their oblique angle and distance to the boundary are such that they are not considered to give rise to harmful overlooking to number 1 Homestead Park or their garden.

92-102 Dollis Hill Lane

55. These properties and their gardens are located south of the application site. The proposed building envelope would not breach the 45 degree line prescribed within SPD 1 in relation to numbers 92-102 Dollis Hill Lane. Sections have been provided through Nos. 98 and 100. In relation to No. 98, this section shows that the development will be considerably below the 45 degree line. The garden of No. 100 is considerably closer to the proposed dwelling than that of the other Dollis Hill Lane houses. The sections show that the dormer (being the highest point that is close to the boundary with No. 100) is 4.9 m from the boundary and is a maximum of 6.05 m above ground level at the boundary, and therefore is 0.85 m below the 45 degree line from the garden of No. 100. The submission demonstrates that the proposed dwelling will accord with the 45 degree line as set out in SPD1 in relation to the gardens of these.
56. The proposed building envelope would not breach the 30 degree line in relation to any of these properties.
57. The rear windows of number's 92-102 are over 18m from the rear elevation to the proposed house and thereby comply with SPD 1 in this regard.
58. The rear boundary of number 100 Dollis Hill Lane's garden is within 9m and as such it is considered necessary to recommend a condition to restrict the rear facing dormer window at first floor to protect the privacy of number 100 Dollis Hill Lane, to be non-opening and obscure glazed below a height of 1.7m (measured from the room the dormer window serves).
59. There are windows and a patio/garden area within 9m of some of the southern boundary, the boundary treatment is shown on the sections at 2m in height. A new fence is proposed along the southern boundary, it would measure 2m in height.
60. The proposed rear patio would have a raised platform, approximately 30cm higher than the nearest land level shown to the rear (as measured from Section 2). The southern boundary of the site is staggered, resulting in a varied distance from the proposed development to each part of the boundary, for example the proposed raised patio at the narrowest part would be approximately 1.7m from the southern boundary serving number 100 Dollis Hill Lane. Owing to the setback boundary, the distance would then increase to approximately 6m to the boundary with number 98 Dollis Hill Lane. The distance would then increase

marginally to the southern boundary (serving 92-96 Dollis Hill Lane).

61. The boundary treatment, together with the distance to boundaries and land levels are such that the proposed raised terrace and windows are not considered to give rise to harmful overlooking to the rear gardens and habitable room windows of properties along Dollis Hill Lane.
62. Notwithstanding that the topography slopes upwards from the rear gardens/properties on Dollis Hill Lane, it is not considered that the proposed development, including the garden, windows and raised patio area would result in harmful overlooking to the properties and gardens at Dollis Hill Lane.

5-7 Randall Avenue

63. The garden associated with number 7 Randall Avenue would be reduced, however the remaining garden would exceed 50qm which would comply with the size prescribed for family sized dwellings within Policy BH13 in the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041.
64. These are a pair of two-storey, semi-detached properties located west of the development. The proposed building envelope would not breach the 30- or 45-degree angles prescribed in SPD 1. No windows are proposed to the side elevation at upper floor level and as a result the proposed development is not considered to result in adverse harm to the light, outlook or create sense of enclosure or overlooking to occupiers at number 5 or 7 Randall Avenue. A ground floor level window is proposed to the side elevation approximately 5.8m to the boundary, however given the height of the boundary treatment, this is not considered to result in overlooking to numbers 5-7 Randall Avenue.

Number 9 Randall Avenue

65. Number 9 Randall Avenue is located north of the proposed development; the rear garden associated with 9 Randall Avenue is located directly north of the proposed dwelling.
66. Officers have used the submitted drawings and have calculated that the proposed development would not breach a 45-degree line in relation to the garden of number 9 Randall Avenue. Given the relationship of the development to the residential property at number 9 Randall Avenue, the 30-degree line would not be applicable as the development does not face onto any rear habitable room windows within No. 9 Randall Avenue.
67. In terms of privacy, a 9m gap is maintained between windows at the boundary with number 9 Randall Avenue's Garden. The windows within number 9 Randall Avenue are located at an oblique angle to the windows proposed within the development and are in excess of the 18m distance prescribed within SPD 1.
68. In summary, the proposal would generally conform with the guidance in SPD1 and is considered to have an acceptable impact to neighbouring amenity.

Construction Impacts

69. Given the proximity of the site's access to neighbouring dwellings a condition is recommended for a Construction Method Statement to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development. This condition would be a pre-commencement condition to ensure that the ground works are managed appropriately.
70. The basement development has the potential to give rise to nuisance during construction. The applicant has submitted a Basement Impact Assessment which sets out a proposed construction methodology however the document does outline that there are no significant trees within close proximity of the building footprint which is incorrect. Nevertheless, the report provides information on the topographical flood risk and geographical nature of the site. Environment Health Colleagues have advised the submission of a Construction Method Statement which is considered appropriate given the access to the site and proximity to residential properties.

Flood Risk and Drainage

71. Policy BSUI4 Sets out the need for proposals for minor developments, householder development, and conversions should make use of sustainable drainage measures wherever feasible and must ensure separation of surface and foul water systems. The proposal includes the provision of additional hardstanding for the parking and turning area. This is proposed to be permeable paving which will limit run-off from the site. The patio is not proposed to be permeable, but is surrounded by soft landscaping (grass).
72. The site is not in a Critical Drainage Area and is in Zone 1 for Flood Risk. As such, there is a low risk of flooding including surface water flooding. Whilst the site is susceptible to being at low risk of groundwater flooding, the Basement Impact Assessment sets out that the basement floor slab would use waterproof concrete with an internal Delta membrane, designed so that any ground water that seeps into the building will return back as ground water via a pumping station. Such matters would be dealt with under building regulations.

Green Infrastructure

Trees

73. Policy DMP1(h) highlights the need for development proposals to retain existing blue and green infrastructure including water ways, open space, high amenity trees and landscape features and providing appropriate additions or enhancements where possible.
74. Policy BGI2 states that development with either existing trees on site or adjoining it that could affect trees will require:
 - Submission of a BS5837 or equivalent tree survey detailing all tree(s) that are on, or adjoining the development site;
 - In the case of minor development which results in the loss of trees provision of appropriate replacements on site;
75. An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan was submitted with this application. Brent's Principal Tree Officer was consulted on the application and their comments form this section of the report.
76. The site is not covered by a Tree Preservation Order, however there are trees which are protected by the Homestead Park Conservation Area designation to the north-east of the site.
77. Parking is proposed with two parking bays shown within RPA of G3 Leylandii and T4 category B Eucalyptus: This is proposed to be of no-dig construction method and so is likely to have limited impact on the trees as outlined.
78. Hard surfacing within RPA of G5 and T6 Apples. Again, proposed as no dig and fully permeable. These trees are of much less public amenity than the other trees to the northeast of the site.
79. The access drive is within RPA of T1 category B Norway Maple. There is already an access drive here and so it is considered that this will not have an adversely increased detrimental impact than the existing.
80. Landscaping proposals including the planting of eight Acer palmatum 'Aureum' trees, these are a relatively small tree and the Tree Officer has advised a condition to be recommended to include a revised tree planting strategy, which should include a greater variety of trees species to be planted to ensure both visual interest and a more resilient scheme particularly in respect of climate change.
81. Representations have been received relating to the felling of trees on site. It appears that this may have been done prior to the submission of this application, as the site is not located within a Conservation Area, these trees are not expressly protected.
82. In summary, the impact to trees would be acceptable, subject to a condition ensuring that the development be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and tree

Protection Plan.

Ecology and Urban Greening Factor

83. London Plan policy G6 highlights the need for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) to be protected.
84. 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.
85. Development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain.
86. Policy BGI1 (d) sets out the need for all developments to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and avoid any detrimental impact on the biodiversity of an area.
87. Policy BH4 sets out the need for all minor residential developments (less than 10 dwellings) are required to deliver an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 on site.
88. In terms of greening and ecology, the UGF score has not been calculated, and no information has been provided regarding ecology on site. It is noted that the site is not within or adjacent to a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation Statement. An objection has been received regarding bats and nesting birds in this area. It is understood that tree removal has taken place outside of the current application, however the site with retained conifers and shrubs to be removed do not show a likelihood of supporting protected species. Although there was not any evidence providing of nesting birds in trees close to the proposal, a bird box on the garage appears to be used and would be subject to legislation that protects any nesting birds, if the development were to take place and demolition carried out nearby.
89. Overall, the plot has potential for a new landscaping and sufficient planting to create an appropriate setting for the proposed dwelling and add ensure a sufficient level of greening to the plot. Therefore, whilst an Urban Greening Score was not submitted, given the nature of the site and the proposal sufficient information has been submitted for the Local Authority to secure an appropriate level of greening on site via a landscaping condition. A landscape plan is recommended by condition which would ensure the soft landscaping of the site.

Biodiversity Net Gain

90. Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
91. This sets out the need (subject to some exceptions) that every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.
92. The applicant has confirmed that the development would be exempt from the Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain on the basis that the development would fall under 'Self-build and custom build applications'. The guidance states that all of the following conditions to qualify for an exemption as a self-build or custom build.

'The development must:

93. consist of no more than 9 dwellings

94. be on a site that has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares

- consist exclusively of dwellings that are self-build or custom housebuilding as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015'
- Representations were received that raised that questioned if the development was eligible to be considered a self-build, the applicant was noted as a company rather than an individual on the application form. The Local Planning Authority sought further clarification from the agent in relation to Self-Build Exemption. The applicant provided a Biodiversity Net Gain and Self & Custom Build Statement.
- It included the following Statement in reference to the applicant:

'Although the applicant is 'Psart Limited', a private property investment company, the dwelling is being constructed solely for the personal occupation of the company's owner, who has commissioned, directed, and meaningfully engaged in the design and construction process. For the purposes of the legislation, the relevant test concerns the nature of the dwelling and the identity/intentions of the individual(s) for whom it is being built, rather than the corporate form through which the application is submitted.'

95. Based on the information available, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, this development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements. This exemption applies as the development falls within the specified criteria outlined in legislation and regulations. The applicants are advised to review the statutory guidance for further details on exemptions and any other environmental obligations that may apply.

96. Notwithstanding this planning application Mandatory Net Gain is a legal requirement under the Environment Act. Should the development not become Self-Build as outlined then the development would be in breach of the Environment Act 2021.

97. Whilst the development may be exempt from the Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain. Brent's Policy BGI1 (d) sets out the need for all developments to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and avoid any detrimental impact on the geodiversity of an area. The proposal includes tree planting and other landscaping. As outlined above, a revised landscape plan/tree planting strategy condition is recommended, and it is considered that the tree/shrub planting proposed is sufficient to secure appropriate BNG.

Transport Considerations

Parking and Access

98. No.7 is a semi-detached house that is believed to be in use as a small-scale HMO within Use Class C4. It has a detached garage on its north side set 25m from the highway and accessed via a 2.8m wide crossover and a shared drive with No.9. Randall Avenue is a local residential access road were on street parking is unrestricted and a parking survey from 2013 confirmed that Randall Avenue is heavily parked at night.

99. No.7 is a semi-detached house that is believed to be in use as a small-scale HMO within Use Class C4. It has a detached garage on its north side set 25m from the highway and accessed via a 2.8m wide crossover and a shared drive with No.9. Randall Avenue is a local residential access road were on street parking is unrestricted and a parking survey from 2013 confirmed that Randall Avenue is heavily parked at night.

100. Two off-street parking spaces are proposed access via the shared access, following the demolition of the existing garage. This accords with the parking provision that was approved for the previous outline planning permission. The proposal would meet the maximum parking standards should No. 7 be in use as a dwellinghouse and would slightly exceed the parking standards should No. 7 remain in use as a small-scale HMO. However, the exceedance for the HMO use is small and unlikely to impact the surrounding road network or materially discourage non-car modes of transport. It is recommended that a condition is attached to ensure that one space is provided for each dwelling (existing and proposed).

101. Both parking spaces are proposed to be provided with electric vehicle charging points, which is recommended to be secured through condition.
102. Cars using these spaces should be able to leave the site in forward gear and a paved area has been indicated for turning of cars to this end. A condition is also recommended requiring the turning area to be kept clear to enable this.

Cycle and Refuse Storage

103. Drawing number 101 proposes a bin store for the new dwelling, which will be set into the rear garden of no. 7. The location of the new bin store will be just within the 20m wheeling distance to the public highway, in compliance with Waste and Recycling Guidance. Bin storage for the existing dwelling will be provided within the front garden of no. 7. This is acceptable.
104. Drawing number 101 proposes cycle parking within the private garden of both the new dwelling and existing dwelling, which is compliant with the London Plan and welcomed.

Lighting:

105. Brent's Transport Team referred to their previous comments that had advised that safe pedestrian access from the highway to the new dwelling must be provided for security and noted that the proposed site plan (drawing number 100) does show eight wall-mounted lights positioned along the access road, which are welcomed.
106. The proposal will result in the provision of a new basement and therefore transportation would seek a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) to ensure the proposal does not impact the highway during construction. The basement impact document does state that grab lorries and works will be kept within the site, but a CLP should be submitted to ensure that debris is not carried out onto the Public Highway and that damage and obstruction to the highway do not occur.

Fire Safety

107. Criterion A of Policy D12 of London Plan sets out that in the interests of fire safety and to ensure the safety of all building users, all development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety and ensure that they:

- 1) *identify suitably positioned unobstructed outside space:*
 - a) *for fire appliances to be positioned on*
 - b) *appropriate for use as an evacuation assembly point*
 - 2) *are designed to incorporate appropriate features which reduce the risk to life and the risk of serious injury in the event of a fire; including appropriate fire alarm systems and passive and active fire safety measures*
 - 3) *are constructed in an appropriate way to minimise the risk of fire spread*
 - 4) *provide suitable and convenient means of escape, and associated evacuation strategy for all building users*
 - 5) *develop a robust strategy for evacuation which can be periodically updated and published, and which all building users can have confidence in*
 - 6) *provide suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development*

108. The building would be located outside of the 45m hose distance from Randall Avenue and would require the use of a sprinkler system within the building. The drawings and the fire statement confirm the use of sprinklers. Notwithstanding the submitted Fire Statement, there is a legal requirement to ensure the proposal would comply with Building Regulations and other building safety legislations that sit outside

of the remit of the planning permissions regime, including detailed requirements of Approved Document B (fire safety).

Equalities

109. 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

110. The proposal is considered to accord with the development plan and adopted Supplementary Planning Documents, having regard to all material planning considerations, and the application should be approved subject to conditions.

111. Weight has been given to the planning history, including the dismissed appeal scheme as a material planning consideration.

112. It is considered that this scheme has overcome the previous reasons for the dismissed appeal. The proposal would deliver one family sized home and would contribute modestly towards Brent's housing targets.

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: **25/1029**

To: Mr Poptani
Sterling Town Planning
58 Hassop Road
London
NW2 6RX

I refer to your application dated **03/04/2025** proposing the following:

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

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

at 7 Randall Avenue, London, NW2 7RL

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: 03/02/2026

Signature:

David Glover
Head of Planning and Development Services

Notes

1. Your attention is drawn to Schedule A of this notice which sets out the rights of applicants who are aggrieved by the decisions of the Local Planning Authority.
2. This decision does not purport to convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or under any enactment other than the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DnStdG

SCHEDULE "B"Application No: **25/1029****SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

1 The proposed development is in general accordance with policies contained in the:-

London Plan 2021
Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041

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

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

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

001 – Proposed Landscape Plan
001 – OBU – Existing Site Plan
140 – Existing and Proposed Long Section CC
301 – Existing and Proposed Section 1
302 – Existing and Proposed Section 2
303 – Existing and Proposed Section 3
304 – Existing and Proposed Section 4
305 – Existing and Proposed Section 5
100 Rev B – Proposed Site Plan
101 Rev B – Proposed Site Plan
110 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
111 – Proposed Basement Floor Plan
112 – Proposed First Floor Plan
113 – Proposed Roof Plan
120 – Proposed Front Elevation
121 – Proposed Rear Elevation
122 – Proposed Side Elevation 1
123 – Proposed Side Elevation 2
130 – Proposed Section AA
131 – Proposed Section BB
132 – Proposed Section CC

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

3 The south-west facing window within the dormer of Bedroom 3 and the window of the first floor ensuite shall be constructed with obscure glazing and non-opening or with openings at high level only (not less than 1.7m above floor level) and shall be permanently returned and maintained in that condition thereafter unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity.

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

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

- 5 The approved cycle store and bin store facilities shall be installed and made available for use prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter retained, kept free from obstruction and maintained for the life of the development and not used other than for purposes.

Reason: To ensure the suitable provision for cycle parking provision and refuse facilities.

- 6 The works shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations/mitigation set out within the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (Tree Protection Plan July 2024 Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by GHA trees arboricultural consultancy dated 24th July 2024) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of tree protection.

- 7 The dwellinghouse hereby approved shall be designed to comply with Building Regulations M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable homes' standards.

Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible homes, in accordance with policy D7 of London Plan 2021.

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

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

- 9 The parking spaces hereby approved shall be allocated such that one parking space is allocated for the existing dwelling at No. 7 and the other parking space shall be allocated to the new dwelling hereby approved. The parking spaces shall be provided prior to first occupation of the new dwelling hereby approved including the provision of electric vehicle charging points for both space, and retained thereafter, and they shall not be used other than for purposes ancillary to the respective dwelling.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of parking, in the interest of highway flow and safety.

- 10 The access and turning areas as shown on the site plan hereby approved shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved drawings prior to first occupation of the new dwelling hereby approved and shall thereafter be kept clear and made available for access and turning.

Reason: To ensure safe access within the site and in the interest of highway flow and safety.

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

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

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

12 Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved (including site clearance and demolition works), a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CLP shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- i. Construction programme, forecast construction trip generation (daily) and mitigation proposed;
- ii. Site set up and access arrangements and booking systems, ensuring vehicle loading and unloading takes place clear of the highway;
- iii. Construction phasing and details of times when the use of a crane would be required;
- iv. Vehicular routes to the site;
- v. Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- vi. Storage of plant and materials used during the construction period;
- vii. Wheel washing facilities;
- viii. Any temporary lighting;
- ix. Protection of the carriageway and any footway users at all times during construction;
- x. Erection of hoardings, security fencing and scaffolding on/over and pavements and carriageway;
- xi. Contact details of personnel responsible for the construction works

Details of measures to be used to ensure that disruption to existing nearby residents is minimised as much as possible during the construction period (including demolition) shall also be provided.

The development shall thereafter be constructed fully in accordance with the approved Construction Logistics Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is constructed in an acceptable manner and in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety.

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

13 Prior to development commencing above ground on the development, a detailed landscaping scheme and implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall incorporate the hard and soft landscaping details proposed on the approved plans, as well as further details of, but not limited to the following:

- (i) Details of hard surfacing, including details of permeable paving, tree pit design, underground modular systems, etc.
- (ii) Boundary treatment, means of enclosure and retaining structures
- (iii) Species, locations and densities for existing landscaping to be retained and the provision of new trees, grass and shrubs;
- (iv) Provision for rain gardens where feasible;
- (v) Details to maximise the urban green factor (UGF) for the site in line with policy BH4 of Brent's Local Plan and biodiversity net gain;
- (vi) Details of lighting for the access way

The landscaping scheme shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development. It shall thereafter be maintained fully in accordance with the approved Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Any trees and shrubs planted in accordance with the landscaping scheme which, within 5 years of planting are removed, dying, seriously damaged or become diseased shall be replaced in

similar positions by trees and shrubs of similar species and size to those originally planted, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

There shall be no excavation or raising or lowering of levels within the prescribed root protection area of retained trees unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless required by a separate landscape management condition, all soft landscaping scheme shall incorporate written five year maintenance programme following planting.

Reason: In order to introduce high quality landscaping in and around the site in the interests of the ecological value and biodiversity of the site and to ensure a satisfactory landscaping of the site in the interests of urban greening and visual amenity having regard to Local Plan Policies DMP1, BGI1 and BGI2 and London Plan policies G5, G6 and G7.

14 Details of materials for all external building work, including samples which shall be made available for viewing in an agreed location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on the development (excluding demolition, site clearance and laying of foundations). The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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

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 - The applicant must ensure, before work commences, that the treatment/finishing of flank walls can be implemented as this may involve the use of adjoining land and should also ensure that all development, including foundations and roof/guttering treatment is carried out entirely within the application property.

4 - Based on the information available, in accordance with the Environment Act 2021 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, this development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements. This exemption applies as the development falls within the specified criteria outlined in legislation and regulations. The applicants are advised to review the statutory guidance for further details on exemptions and any other environmental obligations that may apply.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Sarah Dilley, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 2500