



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Thursday 2 July 2026 at 6.00pm

PRESENT: Councillor S Butt (Chair), Councillor HB Patel (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Gallagher, Ibrahim, Mahmood, Maurice, Georgiou and I Ahmed

1. Welcome and Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Thomas with Councillor Iftekhar Ahmed substituting.

Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor Lorber, who had registered to speak as an objector in relation to the first application. Councillor Georgiou, therefore attended as his substitute for the duration of the meeting.

2. Declarations of interests

In relation to Agenda Item 4: 26/0225 - Brent NHS Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre for Health & Care, 116 Chaplin Road, Wembley, HA0 4UZ, and Item 5: 25/0810 - Kingsbury High School, Princes Avenue, London, NW9 9JR, the Chair had confirmed all members of the Committee had received approaches from objectors (comprising 1 approach in relation to Agenda Item 4 and 4 approaches in relation to Agenda Item 5) but had not engaged in discussion or sought to take any position on the application and therefore felt able to consider the applications impartially and without any form of predetermination.

No other declarations of interest were made during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 3 June 2026 be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

4. 26/0225 - Brent NHS Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre for Health & Care, 116 Chaplin Road, Wembley, HA0 4UZ

PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing buildings to provide within buildings of between 3 and 6 storeys, 108 residential units (Use Class C3) and car parking spaces together with associated public realm, landscaping and highway improvements, cycle parking and stores, and all other associated and ancillary works.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The prior completion of a satisfactory legal agreement; and
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report.

Gary Murphy (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the existing Old Wembley Hospital buildings on the site, along with the former Ambulance Station and to redevelop the site to provide replacement residential buildings ranging from 3 to 6 storeys comprising of;

- 108 dwellings (99 flats and 9 houses);
- Which include 11 affordable homes (all at London Affordable Rent level);
- New public realm, including landscaped publicly accessible pedestrian route connecting Chaplin Road and Fairview Avenue;
- Outdoor amenity space, including private balconies, terraces, communal courtyard, and children's play space;
- Associated landscaping, including new trees; and
- Vehicle parking and cycle parking spaces

Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which noted the receipt of a further representation from Councillor Lorber, together with the officers' responses. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions and informatives set out within the main committee report, together with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement.

The Chair thanked Gary Murphy 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 Sylwester Zabielski (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Sylwester Zabielski began by stating that he and his partner had purchased their property at 15 Fairview Avenue approximately 6 years ago, having regarded it as their long-term forever home.
- The property was described as a 2 storey red brick bungalow situated at the end of Fairview Avenue and adjoining the rear of the former Old Wembley Hospital site. It was stated that the property's features included its natural light, convenient location, relative tranquility, and the privacy afforded to both the dwelling and its garden.
- The speaker objected to the proposed development of the semi-detached houses that were designed to replace the parking lot at the back of the Old Wembley Hospital, specifically the construction of 4 dwellings which, in his view, would result in irreversible harm to the levels of daylight, sunlight and privacy currently enjoyed.

- The objector stated that both their dwelling and a garden outbuilding would be adversely affected by the proposed development and raised 3 principal concerns:
- 1) Firstly, Sylwester Zabielski described the kitchen as the heart of his home, being used for dining, entertaining guests and daily living activities. It was stated that the room currently benefited from good levels of afternoon sunlight. Concern was expressed that the erection of buildings measuring approximately 9.45 meters in height and positioned around 9 meters from the boundary fence would significantly reduce the amount of natural light available to the property. It was felt that this separation distance was substantially less than the 18 meters he understood to be required.
 - 2) Secondly, Sylwester Zabielski raised concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy. It was highlighted that the proposed dwellings incorporated windows facing towards their kitchen and expressed concern that this would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the household if the plans were not altered to the same rules he was required to follow while working on his garden house.
 - 3) Thirdly, Sylwester Zabielski referred to the anticipated construction period, which he estimated would last approximately 2 years. Concerns were expressed regarding the impact of the development process, including potential disturbance from demolition and construction works, dust, noise, and water related activities associated with the site.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Sylwester Zabielski recognised that change and progress were inevitable. However, he expressed the view that all development proposals should be subject to the same rules and standards. Sylwester Zabielski urged the Committee to reconsider the proposal, to review a document submitted by his partner seeking amendments to the scheme, and to support changes that would mitigate the impact on their home.

The Chair thanked Sylwester Zabielski for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- As an initial query, members questioned the distance between the proposed development and Sylwester Zabielski's property. In response, Sylwester Zabielski advised that the distance between the kitchen window and the boundary fence was approximately 1 meter. It was further stated that the proposed dwelling would be situated approximately 9 meters from the boundary fence.
- In referring to the concerns raised regarding overlooking, as well as the potential impacts arising from construction activities, including noise and dust, the Chair queried whether the objector's concerns would be addressed if mitigation measures were secured through planning conditions, including the relocation of windows or the installation of obscure glazing to prevent overlooking. In response, Sylwester Zabielski stated that such measures would

only partially address the concerns raised. It was expressed that the principal concerns related to the loss of daylight and sunlight to the property, which were considered to be significant. It was further mentioned that the kitchen had been described within the application process as a non-habitable room, a characterisation with which Sylwester Zabielski disagreed. Sylwester Zabielski advised that the kitchen was fully habitable and formed a central part of daily life, being used extensively. It was emphasised that the room was regarded as the heart of the home and that any reduction in natural light would therefore have a substantial impact on their enjoyment.

- Members were keen to seek details regarding the source of the statement that the kitchen was considered uninhabitable. In response, Sylwester Zabielski advised that the comment had been contained within documents published on the Council's website as part of the planning application process, through which stakeholders were able to submit representations in response to the application. Sylwester Zabielski confirmed that he was unable to identify the specific individual who had made the comment and did not know whether it had been made by a Brent officer or another respondent.

The Chair thanked Sylwester Zabielski for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider an additional request to speak which had been received from Councillor Lorber (who had registered to speak as an objector), who highlighted the following points:

- Councillor Lorber, who had presented a petition opposing the proposed development on behalf of local residents, began by stating that the site had formerly been located within his ward when he was first elected as a Councillor and was therefore very familiar with the area and its surrounding characteristics. It was explained that his objections reflected the concerns of local residents and were based on what he considered to be substantial overdevelopment of the site, including concerns regarding the overall height of the proposed buildings.
- Councillor Lorber further expressed concern regarding the level of affordable housing proposed within the scheme. It was stated that Brent required additional affordable housing provision and considered that the development failed to deliver an adequate number of affordable homes.
- Further objections were raised in relation to the proposed absence of on-site car parking provision for the 99 residential units. Councillor Lorber urged the Committee to consider the position of nearby developments, including Lowry Lodge and Turner Close, which he described as sustainable developments constructed approximately 15 to 20 years ago. Councillor Lorber advised that Lowry Lodge comprised 22 flats served by 22 car parking spaces, whilst Turner Close comprised 5 houses with 9 car parking spaces and 21 flats with 25 car parking spaces. In addition, it was noted that 10 car parking spaces were available on the surrounding road network through the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) arrangements.

- It was stated that the provision of sufficient parking within the area was important due to the site's proximity to Wembley and its surrounding facilities, including a police station, fire station, hospital facilities and a local school. It was felt that a failure to provide adequate parking on-site would inevitably increase parking pressures within neighbouring residential streets.
- Reference was made to the Council's policy approach of restricting the provision of parking spaces within new developments and refusing parking permits to future occupiers. Councillor Lorber stated that, in his view, evidence had not been provided to demonstrate that the policy operated effectively in practice. He contended that the system was capable of being circumvented and expressed the view that some residents would continue to own vehicles and park within surrounding residential streets, resulting in inconvenience and disruption to existing residents.
- In referring to pages 35 and 36 of the committee report, Councillor Lorber noted that these contained references to national, London Plan, and Brent Council policies relating to the creation of strong and inclusive communities. It was felt that the proposed development would not achieve those objectives. Instead, concern was expressed that the development, which he stated would create a community of 108 homes, could lead to conflict between new and existing residents as a consequence of parking demand generated by occupiers and their visitors.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Councillor Lorber emphasised that the proposal represented an unsustainable form of development that would give rise to avoidable conflict within the local community. It was further stated that the application site constituted public land and therefore presented an opportunity to deliver a greater level of affordable housing. In his view, the proposed development had failed to make adequate provision in this regard and therefore represented a missed opportunity to address local housing needs.

The Chair thanked Councillor Lorber 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, members sought further details regarding the raised in relation to parking provision and other associated issues in the near area to the proposed site. In response, Councillor Lorber advised that most of the surrounding area was located within a CPZ. It was stated that Chaplin Road was an extremely busy route and that, during works undertaken by the water company on Harrow Road, a significant proportion of traffic had been diverted through Chaplin Road, resulting in increased congestion. Councillor Lorber further advised that Chaplin Road served as an access route to the local primary school and was therefore already subject to substantial levels of parking demand and vehicular traffic. It was reported that local residents had expressed concern that a development comprising more than 100 residential units, with very limited parking provision, would result in displaced parking being accommodated within surrounding residential streets. Reference was made to

the Council's ongoing consultation regarding a Safe School Scheme for Barham Primary School. It was explained that the proposals would restrict vehicle access and parking within Danethorpe Road, Bassingham Road and neighbouring streets adjacent to the school. It was highlighted that Chaplin Road had not been included within the proposed restrictions and the view was expressed that motorists who would no longer be able to access or park within the surrounding streets would instead seek to use Chaplin Road, thereby placing additional pressure upon the area. It was considered that this was a factor which had not been taken into account within the planning application. In support of his concerns, Councillor Lorber referred to Lowry Lodge and Turner Close, which he regarded as examples of successful and sustainable development. The Committee were informed that he had visited the area at approximately 3pm on the day of the meeting in order to assess parking usage and observed that approximately 50% of the available parking spaces were occupied. He considered this demonstrated that parking provision remained necessary even during daytime periods when many residents were likely to be away from home. Councillor Lorber stated that, in his opinion, the proposal did not constitute sustainable development and expressed that the application formed part of a wider pattern of similar developments and that the cumulative impact of such schemes was creating conflict and difficulties for existing residents due to insufficient parking provision. He further advised that he had attended a consultation event relating to the proposed development and had specifically enquired as to why additional parking spaces had not been incorporated into the scheme, to which he had been informed by the developers that Brent Council planners had advised against the provision of further parking spaces.

- Further information was also requested regarding the history, purpose and significance of the site, including the reasons for its current form and use. In response, Councillor Lorber provided historical context regarding the site and explained that the original Wembley Hospital had been established prior to the creation of the NHS and noted that a building within the hospital grounds was known as Barham House. Councillor Lorber highlighted that Barham House had been named after Titus Barham and the Barham family. It was stated that the family had donated the land upon which the hospital had been constructed and that Mrs. Barham had played an active role in assisting with its operation. It was further mentioned that the hospital had been funded through contributions from the Barham family together with public subscription and therefore represented an important public asset. Concern was expressed that the proposed development failed to provide appropriate recognition of the contribution made by the Barham family. It was emphasised that heritage assets should not be considered solely in terms of their physical buildings, but also in relation to the individuals whose efforts had delivered important facilities and services for local communities. In this regard, Councillor Lorber highlighted the role played by the Barham family in establishing a much-needed public hospital for the residents of Wembley during the late 1920s and early 1930s. Councillor Lorber stated that the hospital was in the process of being lost and expressed concern that no replacement community facility had been proposed as part of the redevelopment. He considered that the installation of a limited number of information signs would not adequately reflect either the significance of the site

or the contribution made by the Barham family. In reiterating his earlier objections, Councillor Lorber stated that he regarded the proposal as an overdevelopment of the site and expressed the view that insufficient parking had been provided and that the development sought to maximise residential accommodation across the site without delivering any community facilities. It was felt that a development comprising 108 residential units with no community facilities could not reasonably be regarded as contributing towards the creation of strong and inclusive communities. For these reasons, Councillor Lorber urged the Committee either to defer consideration of the application in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit an improved scheme, or alternatively to refuse the application on the grounds he had outlined.

The Chair thanked Councillor Lorber for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Councillor Brown (who had registered to speak as a Ward Councillor), who highlighted the following points:

- Councillor Brown began by stating that, together with Councillor Lorber, he had organised and submitted a petition to ensure that the strong views of local residents were brought before the Committee, given the significant concerns that had been expressed regarding the impact of the scheme on the surrounding area.
- It was noted that the proposals for the former Wembley Hospital site included the provision of more than 100 residential units whilst incorporating very limited parking provision. Concern was expressed that this would result in additional vehicles being accommodated on surrounding residential streets, thereby increasing congestion and creating significant traffic related problems for existing residents, future occupants of the development and their visitors.
- It was further highlighted that the proposed 99 flats would be provided without any parking spaces and stated that, irrespective of the reasons for this approach, he considered the situation to be unacceptable.
- Councillor Brown also raised concerns regarding the level of affordable housing proposed within the scheme. It was noted that just over 10% of the homes would be provided as affordable housing and argued that this fell significantly below the targets set out within Brent's Local Plan. In his view, this level of provision was inadequate for a development of such scale.
- In addition, Councillor Brown expressed concern regarding the absence of any community facilities within the development despite the site replacing a former community asset. He referred to the historical significance of the site, noting that the original hospital had been established through public subscription and the efforts of the Barham family. It was considered that the proposals failed to provide appropriate community infrastructure or adequately recognise the site's heritage value.
- It was further stated that local residents deserved a higher quality scheme than that being proposed. It was felt that a development of this scale should deliver

a meaningful level of affordable housing together with the necessary infrastructure and facilities required to support future residents. Concern was expressed that the proposal would instead increase congestion and place further pressure on local roads and public services.

- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Councillor Brown expressed that he did not believe the application to be in the best interests of Wembley and urged the Planning Committee to refuse planning permission. He advised that he had spoken with numerous local residents and reported that none had expressed support for the proposal or considered it to be a beneficial development for the area.

The Chair thanked Councillor Brown 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:

- Clarification was sought regarding the concerns expressed by local residents in relation to the proposed development, in addition to the parking issues that had already been raised. In response, Councillor Brown advised that residents of Turner Close had expressed significant concern regarding the scale and height of the proposed buildings, which they believed would dominate and overshadow their existing homes. It was further reported that residents of Chaplin Road had raised concerns regarding traffic congestion within the area. It was stated that the surrounding road network was already heavily congested, particularly during school drop off periods associated with Barham Primary School. It was considered that these issues would be further exacerbated by the proposed school safety scheme affecting Bassingham Road and other routes serving the school. Councillor Brown expressed the view that the development had not been planned in a sensible or sufficiently considered manner. It was highlighted that the proposal comprised more than 100 residential units, including 99 flats that would be provided without any parking spaces. In his opinion, this would inevitably result in increased pressure on surrounding roads, leading to greater congestion and parking difficulties within the local area.
- Members queried whether the parking impacts associated with the development could be mitigated through the introduction of CPZ within the surrounding streets and sought Councillor Brown's views, together with those of local residents, on such an approach. In response, Councillor Brown advised that the surrounding streets were already subject to CPZs. As a result, it was considered that the introduction of additional CPZ would have little or no effect, as the area already operated within a CPZ and there was therefore no scope for further expansion.
- Supplementary queries were raised regarding whether extending the hours of operation of the CPZ could assist in addressing parking pressures associated with the proposed development, to which the Chair clarified that the CPZ operating on Chaplin Road was currently applied between 10am and 3pm.

- Further details were sought regarding the level of affordable housing proposed within the development, noting that it appeared to fall significantly below Local Plan expectations, and requested additional information regarding the implications of this shortfall in the context of housing demand within the borough. In response, Councillor Brown advised that one of the most significant areas of housing demand within Brent related to larger family homes. Concern was expressed that, whilst some of the affordable housing units proposed would provide smaller accommodation, including approximately 3 or 4 one-bedroom properties, the overall provision would not adequately address the borough's identified housing needs. It was noted that only 11 of the 109 residential units would be provided as affordable housing, representing just over 10% of the total scheme. It was stated that this level of provision fell substantially below the affordable housing targets expected by Brent for developments of this nature. The view was expressed that the proposal was a poorly conceived scheme that failed to deliver the type and quantity of housing sought by the borough and did not adequately respond to identified local housing needs.

The Chair thanked Councillor Brown for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Phil Clark (who had registered to speak as the applicant's representative), who highlighted the following points:

- Phil Clark began by stating, as outlined within the committee report, public facing healthcare services had ceased operating from the site in 2000. It was noted that the buildings had subsequently been declared surplus to requirements in 2019 and had remained vacant and unused since that time.
- The applicant's representative stated that the site constituted a sustainable brownfield location which had been allocated for redevelopment within the Council's Local Plan. It was explained that the proposals had adopted a design led approach intended to unlock and optimise the redevelopment potential of the site.
- Phil Clark advised that the application sought to address one of London's key priorities through the delivery of new homes in an accessible and sustainable location. The scheme would provide 108 high quality residential units, including affordable housing, family homes and wheelchair accessible accommodation. In addition, the proposals included a new publicly accessible pedestrian link connecting Fairview Avenue and Chaplin Road, positioned behind retained mature trees and supported by generous landscaped areas and children's play facilities.
- The Committee was informed that an extensive pre-application engagement process had been undertaken. This had included public exhibitions together with presentations to the Council's Community Review Panel, Design Review Panel and a Members' Briefing. It was noted that the proposals had evolved through ongoing engagement with Brent's Planning, Urban Design and Highways Officers. According to the applicant's representative, this process had resulted in significant improvements to the layout of the scheme, its

architectural appearance and the quality of the landscape and amenity provision.

- The applicant's representative highlighted a number of key benefits arising from the proposals. These included the redevelopment of a previously developed, sustainable and vacant site and a meaningful contribution towards the borough's housing supply, including the delivery of affordable housing. It was further stated that the scheme would improve the pedestrian environment and streetscape along Chaplin Road.
- In addition, the Committee was advised that the development would generate significant investment within the Wembley area through Council Tax receipts together with Section 106 and Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy (SCIL) contributions.
- Phil Clark further stated that the scheme had responded to requests to recognise the site's cultural heritage through the inclusion of information boards within the proposed pedestrian link.
- The applicant's representative additionally advised that the scheme would achieve an 11.7% biodiversity net gain, an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 and carbon savings of 75% through the incorporation of renewable technology and sustainable construction methods.
- Phil Clark expressed that Fairview New Homes remained committed to exploring opportunities to increase the level of on-site affordable housing through the utilisation of GLA grant funding.
- The applicant's representative further advised that Fairview New Homes did not engage in land banking practices and instead focused on the prompt delivery of developments from acquisition through to construction. It was stated that, subject to the grant of planning permission, construction of the development could commence in Autumn 2026, with the first homes anticipated to be completed in early 2028.
- The applicant's representative additionally advised that the proposals had been prepared with input from a multidisciplinary team of professional consultants. It was noted that the supporting documents submitted with the application had been carefully assessed by Council officers and had been deemed compliant with the requirements of relevant national, regional and local planning policies and guidance.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Phil Clark requested that the Committee support the officers' recommendation and grant planning permission for the proposed development.

The Chair thanked Phil Clark 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, members enquired how long the existing building had been vacant, to which Phil Clark advised that the site had been vacant since around 2019. It was explained that the site had only been acquired from the NHS earlier in the year and that, whilst the building had been used periodically during the Covid 19 pandemic for the storage of PPE equipment, it had otherwise remained unused.
- Members then sought clarification regarding the total number of parking spaces proposed for the development, to which Phil Clark confirmed that a total of 12 parking spaces were proposed.
- Following on from the previous question, members queried whether the parking spaces would be allocated. In response, Phil Clark confirmed that 9 parking spaces would be allocated to the family houses, which comprised 9 3-bedroom family homes. It was added that the remaining 3 Blue Badge spaces would be managed through a car park management plan.
- Members were keen to seek details on whether the level of affordable housing provision could be increased. In referring to paragraphs 43 to 59 of the committee report, which detailed the viability discussions undertaken in relation to affordable housing delivery, Phil Clark explained that the maximum reasonable amount identified through viability testing had been 10 affordable units. However, this provision had subsequently been increased to 11 units, including a 3 bedroom dwelling. It was noted that this exceeded the level supported by the viability assessment. It was mentioned that Fairview New Homes had an experienced in-house Affordable Housing Team and that, should a Registered Provider (RP) be secured and grant funding obtained, opportunities to increase the provision further would be explored. However, it was stated that the current position reflected the viability of the scheme at that point in time.
- Requests for information were raised regarding the number of jobs expected to be generated during construction. In response, Phil Clark advised that the section 106 agreement sought to achieve approximately 11 local employment opportunities, based upon a formula contained within Brent's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was noted that construction works would be subcontracted, but that approximately 11 local employment opportunities were anticipated.
- Referring to apprenticeship opportunities linked to Brent Works, members sought further clarification regarding the offer. In response, Phil Clark confirmed that apprenticeships formed part of the proposed section 106 Heads of Terms. It was further stated that the requirement was based on 1 apprenticeship for every 10 units delivered.
- Members enquired how long the proposed development would take to complete, to which Phil Clark advised that the anticipated construction duration was approximately 18 months.

- Further information was requested regarding the public consultation process, including the number of residents who had participated and the overall response received from the local community. In response, Phil Clark advised that 2 public exhibitions had been undertaken. It was explained that approximately 2,300 properties and businesses had received consultation material in advance of the exhibitions. It was noted that a second exhibition had been arranged following an issue identified during the first consultation exercise. Attendance had been higher at the first exhibition, with approximately 35 to 40 attendees, whilst the second exhibition had attracted approximately 20 to 25 attendees. It was stated that a mixture of support and concerns had been expressed and that the issues raised had been discussed with officers throughout the application process.
- Following up, members questioned what the principal concerns raised by residents had been during consultation. In response, Phil Clark advised that, at the time of consultation, the scheme had proposed a consistent 6 storey form across the site and that concerns had related primarily to the height and massing of the development. Parking provision had also been raised as an issue. It was noted that affordable housing had not formed part of those discussions as a position had not yet been established at that stage. It was explained that the design had subsequently evolved, with greater articulation and stepping in height. The scheme now stepped from 3 storeys on the eastern edge to respect the existing residential context, rising through 4 and 5 storeys, with 6 storeys limited to the north western corner where it related more appropriately to neighbouring civic buildings and larger scale development.
- With reference to residents' concerns regarding parking provision, members queried why the level of on-site parking was so limited. In response, Phil Clark explained that GLA policy, alongside planning policies within Brent and other London boroughs, promoted a move away from vehicle use in sustainable locations. It was highlighted that the site was classified as PTAL 4, benefitting from bus services on Chaplin Road and relatively equal proximity to Sudbury and Wembley Central railway stations. As a result, the site was considered sustainable and planning policy supported reduced levels of parking provision.
- Members then questioned whether discussions had taken place with planning officers regarding the possibility of increasing parking provision. In response, Phil Clark advised that Fairview's experience demonstrated that developments subject to car free restrictions often experienced a cultural shift in travel behaviour. It was stated that extensive discussions had taken place with the local authority regarding parking provision and that a negotiated position had ultimately been reached, which was reflected in the current proposal.
- Considering active travel policies, members enquired whether the consultation had identified factors discouraging active travel in the area and why residents felt that public transport options insufficient. In response, Phil Clark explained that the principal concern raised by residents had been the lack of parking provision. It was further noted that discussions had therefore largely focused on parking. It was added that the proposed Section 106 agreement included an active travel contribution and that a travel plan would also be secured.

- Members observed that the scheme did not fully achieve the Local Plan Policy BH6 target for 3 bedroom homes and asked why that target had not been met. In response, Phil Clark explained that the scheme delivered approximately 24% 3 bedroom accommodation against a target of 25%. It was further mentioned that achieving the appropriate balance of unit sizes within the development, whilst maintaining efficient building layouts, had resulted in the final mix proposed. It was noted that the scheme comprised approximately 26% one bedroom units, 50% 2 bedroom units and 26% 3 bedroom units, including 9 semi-detached and terraced 3 bedroom houses.
- The Committee questioned the rationale for allocating parking spaces to all family houses whilst providing no general parking for apartment residents beyond Blue Badge spaces. In response, Phil Clark confirmed that the 3 Blue Badge spaces were intended for apartment residents. It was explained that the allocation of the remaining 9 spaces to the family houses had emerged through the design and negotiation process and was considered the most appropriate arrangement. It was noted that 3 terraced houses had direct access from Chaplin Road with parking spaces immediately in front of them, making allocation logical, whilst the remaining house spaces had also been considered the most suitable use of the available parking provision.
- Members noted the provision of children's play space but expressed concern regarding facilities for older children and teenagers. Members questioned whether a dedicated indoor youth space could be incorporated within the development. In response, Phil Clark advised that the scheme met all on-site play space requirements for children up to the age of 11 years. It was noted that there was a shortfall of approximately 100 sqm² in provision for children aged 12 years and over, and that a financial contribution had therefore been secured through the Section 106 agreement to provide facilities at Barham Park. It was stated that a dedicated indoor youth space had not formed part of the development brief and added that, without an on-site management presence, ongoing management and supervision of such a facility would present challenges.
- Details were sought regarding discussions with Registered Providers concerning affordable and potentially social rented housing. In response, Phil Clark advised that there was no provision of social rent housing on the development and that providing social rent on the development would result in fewer affordable units than could currently be achieved through London affordable rent.
- Questions were raised regarding daylight impacts, the 45-degree rule and separation distances, with reference to the concerns highlighted by one of the previous speakers. In response, Phil Clark advised that the proposed development would be located approximately 9.7 meters from the rear elevation to the boundary fence and approximately 10.7 meters from the affected window. It was highlighted that the window at No.15 was a flank window rather than a rear facing window. Phil Clark additionally stated that, whilst he was not

suggesting there would be no impact, the proposed design represented the least harmful option available.

- Members noted that the application had originally proposed 4 affordable housing units, which had subsequently increased to 7, then 10, and finally 11 units, and questioned whether there had been a genuine intention to maximise affordable housing provision. In response, Phil Clark explained that the applicant had initially identified 4 affordable units as representing the maximum level supported by its viability assessment. It was noted that this position had been independently tested and challenged by the Council's viability consultant, including scrutiny of values, costs and interest percentages. As a consequence of those discussions, the affordable housing provision had increased to 10 units, with a further negotiation resulting in the inclusion of an 11th affordable unit.
- The Chair referred to concerns regarding overlooking from windows and questioned whether obscure glazing could be secured by condition. Assurances were also sought regarding the implementation of measures to mitigate construction dust and noise. In response, Phil Clark advised that the development had been designed in accordance with recognised good design principles and maintained a separation distance of approximately 9 meters from the site boundary. It was stated that the windows in question served bedrooms located on the second and third floors and that obscure glazing was therefore unlikely to be appropriate, as it would adversely affect residential amenity for future occupants. It was further explained that the scheme complied with the applicable separation distance standards contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). In relation to construction impacts, it was highlighted that a detailed Construction Management Plan had been prepared in consultation with officers, specifically addressing the relationship with No.15 Fairview Avenue. The Plan included measures relating to dust control, noise management and the positioning of site facilities. It was confirmed that compliance with the approved Construction Management Plan would be secured by condition.
- The Chair referred to the possibility of a commemorative plaque and sought clarification regarding discussions that had taken place. In response, Phil Clark noted that the matter had been raised at both the Member briefing during the pre-application stage and by local residents during public consultation. It was confirmed that a planning condition required details of the commemorative arrangements to be submitted to and approved by officers prior to installation. It was further mentioned that the specific content, historical references and number of plaques had not yet been determined, but that the matter was secured through a planning condition.

The Chair thanked Phil Clark 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:

- As an initial query, members sought clarification regarding the Council's target within the Local Plan for the delivery of affordable housing on new developments. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that both the London Plan and Brent's Local Plan contained a strategic target for 50% of new homes to be delivered as genuinely affordable housing. It was explained that this target was intended to apply across the plan period and not on an application-by-application basis. It was noted that, when the London Plan was adopted, it had been recognised that not all schemes would be capable of achieving the 50% target due to factors including viability considerations. As a result, the threshold or fast track approach had been introduced. Members were also informed that schemes delivering 35% affordable housing with the appropriate tenure split of 70% low cost rent and 30% intermediate housing would not be required to submit a financial viability assessment and could proceed via the fast track route, subject to an early stage review should substantial works not commence within 24 months of planning permission being granted. Members were further advised that developments on public sector land were subject to a 50% affordable housing threshold and, where this was achieved alongside the required 70% and 30% tenure split, no viability assessment would be required. Where the threshold was not met, applicants were required to submit a financial viability assessment demonstrating that the development would provide the maximum viable level of affordable housing. It was confirmed that Brent's Local Plan mirrored this approach and that the scheme under consideration had been viability tested and demonstrated to provide the maximum viable level of affordable housing. As a result, the proposal was considered to accord with the relevant London Plan and Local Plan policies.

Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) added that the application had not met the threshold for the fast-track approach and had therefore been subject to a full assessment of the applicant's submitted Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) both internally by specialist Council officers and externally by independent consultants acting on behalf of the Council. It was explained that the original Financial Viability Assessment, submitted in November 2025, proposed 4 affordable housing units as the maximum viable provision and identified a deficit of £508,485. Following an independent review by BNP Paribas, the Council concluded that the scheme would generate a surplus and could therefore support a greater level of affordable housing provision. A revised Financial Viability Assessment was subsequently submitted in January 2026, increasing the affordable housing offer to 7 units. Following further independent assessment, officers concluded that the scheme would still generate a surplus and could therefore accommodate additional affordable housing provision. Following further testing and review, it had been concluded that the provision of 11 affordable housing units would result in a deficit of approximately £191,000. However, the applicant had agreed to provide the 11 units as a without prejudice offer, meaning that the affordable housing provision proposed exceeded the level identified by the viability assessment as deliverable.

David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further advised that the Council's consultants had confirmed that the proposal represented the

maximum amount of affordable housing that could viably be delivered on the site. It was noted that current policy permitted either Social Rent or London Affordable Rent and that the affordable housing proposed fully complied with the relevant London Plan and Local Plan policies. Members were further reminded that every proposal involved both benefits and harms and that the role of the Committee as decision maker was to weigh those considerations in determining whether planning permission should be granted.

Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) additionally noted that the draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Agreement included provision whereby, should grant funding subsequently become available through a Registered Provider (RP) and the GLA, the affordable homes could be converted to social rent tenure.

- Concerns were expressed that developers appeared able to rely upon viability arguments to avoid meeting the Council's 50% affordable housing target and members questioned the value of maintaining such a target if it was not achieved in practice. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) acknowledged that since the Local Plan had been drafted around 2019/20 and subsequently adopted in 2020/21, economic conditions had become significantly more challenging. It was highlighted that there were substantial increases in construction costs, interest rates and other financial factors, all of which were assessed through the viability process. It was explained that viability assessments involved professional estimates which were rigorously tested and challenged by the Council's consultants and officers. It was noted that, in some cases, RPs had subsequently acquired blocks of affordable housing, resulting in a greater level of affordable housing delivery than was originally identified through viability assessments. However, officers were required to assess applications in accordance with adopted planning policies and the robustly tested viability evidence available at the time of determination. The Committee were further advised that development involved risks for developers and that if viability risks were considered excessive, schemes might not come forward at all, resulting in reduced housing delivery. It was added that there remained significant demand for both housing and affordable housing within the borough and that bringing forward developments had become increasingly challenging.

David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further stated that, when the Local Plan was reviewed, consideration would be given to the level of affordable housing likely to be realistically achievable in future market conditions. It was also noted that Brent had historically been one of the highest performing London boroughs in terms of housing and affordable housing delivery, although delivery levels had declined over the previous 2 to 3 years due to financial conditions. It was highlighted that housebuilding had fallen across Brent, London and nationally. It was reiterated that the strategic 50% affordable housing target was not intended to be applied on an application-by-application basis and therefore could not be treated as a material consideration in the assessment of the current proposal.

- Views were then sought regarding whether it was felt the proposed provision of 11 wheelchair user dwellings alongside only 3 Blue Badge parking spaces was adequate. Details were also in relation to accessibility and public transport connections. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) advised that policy required a minimum of 3% of units to be provided with disabled parking spaces, which had resulted in the provision of 3 designated disabled bays. It was noted that not all disabled residents necessarily owned vehicles. It was explained that a Car Park Management Plan would be secured to govern the allocation and monitoring of parking spaces, including arrangements to respond should demand exceed supply. In relation to accessibility, it was stated that the site had a Public Transport Accessibility Level (P-TAL) rating of 4, representing good accessibility. The development was located within standard walking distance of Wembley Central Station, which provided lift and stair lift access to all platforms, and was also served by 10 bus routes within the immediate vicinity. It was considered that the site's parking space provision supported the proposed car free approach.
- In referring to the Mayor of London's target for 80% of trips to be made by walking, cycling or public transport by 2041, members queried whether the development would contribute towards active travel enhancements in the area. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) advised that the Transport Assessment predicted only 11% of trips generated by the development would be undertaken by car, thereby aligning with the Mayor's target. Members were further advised that the developer would provide a £20,000 contribution towards active travel improvements.
- Members noted that the scheme would provide approximately 24% 3 bedroom accommodation against a policy target of 25% and expressed concern regarding the implications of not achieving the target. In response, Gary Murphy (Principal Planning Officer) advised that whilst officers sought to achieve policy targets wherever possible, this could not always be achieved on every site. It was explained that the provision of family sized accommodation depended upon the scale and form of development being proposed. Through negotiations during the application process, officers had secured an increase in the number of family sized units. Whilst acknowledging a marginal shortfall against policy, it was emphasised that this needed to be balanced against the wider planning benefits and overall housing delivery associated with the scheme.

Colin Leadbeater (Development Management Area Manager) additionally stated that a number of amendments had been secured throughout the application process, including through public engagement, in order to minimise impacts upon neighbouring residents. Taking all considerations into account, officers had considered that the provision of 24% family sized accommodation represented an acceptable level when balanced against the potential impacts associated with a more intensive form of development and the wider material planning considerations set out within the committee report.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) further advised that 4 of the 11 affordable housing units would comprise 3 bedroom homes, representing 36% of the affordable housing provision and therefore a

higher concentration of family sized accommodation within the affordable housing element.

- Members expressed concern regarding the adequacy of parking provision for future residents and visitors and suggested that insufficient parking would lead to increased pressure on surrounding streets. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that Local Plan parking standards represented maximum standards and that car free developments were expected to form the starting point for proposals in locations with good public transport accessibility. It was explained that the borough had a target to deliver 2,325 homes per year whilst simultaneously seeking to improve air quality, reduce congestion and support healthier and more sustainable travel patterns. It was noted that, even if maximum parking standards were applied, provision would equate to approximately 54 spaces and this would create significant design challenges. Officers were required to balance parking provision against wider considerations including air quality, public realm quality, amenity space, landscaping, tree planting and urban greening. Members were further advised that policy would support only the provision of the 3 disabled parking spaces in this instance. However, the developer had proposed a total of 12 parking spaces, including the 3 disabled bays. Officers considered this to represent an appropriate balance between parking provision and the delivery of a high-quality public realm.

John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) advised that future residents would not be eligible to obtain parking permits and therefore would not be able to generate overspill parking demand within the CPZ during its operational hours. It was highlighted that car free developments had been delivered across the borough for approximately 25 years without causing widespread congestion. It was considered that providing greater levels of parking would encourage additional traffic, congestion and road safety concerns. The car free approach was therefore regarded as consistent with sustainable development principles and the Mayor of London's transport objectives.

- In response to further questions concerning parking space provision for disabled residents, the Chair clarified that Blue Badge holders residing within the development would be eligible to apply for on street disabled parking. It was additionally confirmed that restrictions relating to parking permits would not apply to Blue Badge holders and that they could apply for a personalised disabled parking bay linked to their registered vehicle if required.

John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) further advised that Condition 34 required the submission of a revised Car Park Management Plan. It was explained that officers did not wish parking spaces to be sold alongside individual dwellings as this would reduce flexibility. Instead, officers favoured the annual allocation of parking spaces based upon need, with priority afforded to those with the greatest requirements, including Blue Badge holders and potentially families occupying larger dwellings.

- Members sought further clarification on where delivery drivers would park when servicing the development. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) advised that an access road would be available from Fairview Crescent, enabling refuse vehicles and delivery drivers to enter, stop and undertake deliveries. It was further mentioned that the Delivery Management Plan estimated approximately 16 delivery vehicle movements per day, equivalent to 1 or 2 vehicles per hour.
- In noting concerns that many residents required access to a vehicle in order to travel to work, members questioned how this would be accommodated. In response, John Fletcher (Team Leader - Development Control, Transport Planning) advised that the development was proposed as a car free scheme and prospective residents would be informed of this prior to occupation. It was suggested that individuals requiring a vehicle, might find alternative developments more suitable. It was noted that other developments within the borough, particularly those in less accessible locations, often provided higher levels of parking provision. It was considered that the proposal was appropriate for residents who did not require a car and who could benefit from the site's strong public transport accessibility.

David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) additionally noted that many smaller developments across the borough included parking provision, although these proposals did not routinely come before Planning Committee because they fell below the threshold requiring consideration by the Planning Committee. It was noted that such developments were often located in less accessible areas, particularly within the northern part of the borough, where parking provision tended to be greater.

- As a final query, members sought further clarification regarding the meaning of financial viability and the manner in which it was assessed. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that financial viability involved assessing the value generated for a development, and considering whether the value generated was greater than the cost of developing it. It was additionally explained that this process produced what was known as a residual land value. It was further stated that a range of factors were incorporated into viability assessments, including the Gross Development Value derived from private and affordable housing sales, development costs, contingencies and other financial assumptions. The resulting residual land value was then compared against a benchmark land value, representing the value of the land based upon its existing or appropriate use. This comparison was used to determine whether a development was financially viable and the level of affordable housing that could reasonably be delivered.

DECISION

Voting on the original decision to grant planning application, having considered the application, was as follows (4 in favour of granting planning permission and 4 in favour of refusal). The application was approved on basis of the casting vote from the Chair.

At the conclusion of the item, the Chair agreed to adjourn the meeting for a period of 15 minutes to allow for a short break prior to the consideration of the next item. The meeting reconvened at 8:15pm.

Given the subsequent identification of Councillor I.Ahmed not having been present for the whole debate, following the adjournment of the meeting, and clarification that he would not therefore be able to participate in the vote on the application, the vote was amended as follows (3 in favour of granting planning permission and 4 in favour of refusal).

As a result of the outcome of the discussion and amended vote, the Committee **RESOLVED** to defer the decision for the following reason(s):

- As the majority of Members on the Committee had indicated that they were minded to refuse the application, it was agreed to defer a final decision to a future Committee meeting in order to enable a further report to be provided addressing the indicative reasons outlined as the basis for refusal, including:
 - i) insufficient provision of affordable housing;
 - ii) insufficient parking provision on-site and impact of congestion on surrounding streets,
 - iii) lack of community space;
 - iv) lack of on-site play space for older children;
 - v) insufficient provision of family sized housing;
 - vi) harm to neighbouring amenity including loss of daylight; and
 - vii) impact on non-designated heritage asset and character to the streetscene.

Voting on the above decision was unanimous and accordingly, the application was deferred to allow for further assessment and consideration of the matters identified by the Committee.

5. 25/0810 - Kingsbury High School, Princes Avenue, London, NW9 9JR

PROPOSAL

Proposed construction of Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) Facility and cricket pitch and netting with fencing and lighting to the school.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The conditions and informatives required to secure the matters identified within the main committee report and supplementary report.

Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the addition of a multi-use games area facility comprising 2 artificial sports pitches. The pitch to the west had been marked on the plans for football and the pitch on the east had been marked on the plans for hockey. The 2 artificial sport pitches combined would occupy a 126m x 102.5m section of the schools playing field on the southern side of the school

site. Ancillary boundary fencing at a height of 4m and floodlights at a height of 15m were proposed for the 2 artificial sport pitches. A 2m acoustic fence was also proposed along the eastern and southern sides of the eastern pitch. In addition, the proposals sought to relocate the existing cricket practice facility, on part of the site used as a playing field and existing cricket pitch. Ball stop fencing at a height of 6m was proposed towards the western boundary, to serve the relocated cricket pitch.

Attention was also drawn to the supplementary report circulated in advance of the meeting, which noted the receipt of further representations, comprising 12 new objections and 8 additional comments from previous objectors, together with the officers' responses. The additional representations did not raise any new material planning considerations that would alter the officers' assessment or recommendation. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions and informatives required to secure the matters identified within the main committee report and supplementary 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 Deborah Nyman (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Deborah Nyman began by stating that she had resided in Roe Green Village, a valued conservation area since the late 1980s and was speaking on behalf of the Roe Green Village Residents' Association, which represented more than 250 households, together with other nearby residents affected by the proposal.
- The speaker expressed that residents were surprised that the application had been brought before the Committee, noting that the Committee had previously considered 2 similar proposals submitted by Kingsbury High School. It was noted that the second scheme had not been supported and was subsequently withdrawn during the appeal process, resulting in an award of costs in favour of the Association by the Planning Inspectorate.
- Deborah Nyman advised that many residents objected to the current proposals on the grounds that they were neither environmentally appropriate nor compatible with the character of the local community. It was further noted that these concerns had been set out in detail within representations submitted to Members and the Case Officer.
- Whilst emphasising that Roe Green Village had long been an established family community that had consistently supported the school and facilities intended solely for school use, concern was expressed that the current proposals were confusing, ambiguous and lacked sufficient clarity.
- The speaker further advised that a sunken gas main had been identified within the application site. In her view, as the infrastructure was located on school land, more stringent Health and Safety Executive (HSE) guidance should apply. It was felt that these requirements had not been adhered to and that, without compliance, the application was invalid and should not proceed.

- Deborah Nyman also maintained that the application was misleading, contending that it was not merely a modest proposal to improve school sports facilities but instead represented a significant intensification of use, including provision for commercial community hire. It was considered that such use would be incompatible with the historic suburban character of the neighbourhood and contrary to Brent's Green Neighbourhoods Action Plan, noting that the whole application site was located within the area covered by the Plan.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the replacement of natural grassland with a 3G playing surface. Deborah Nyman felt that this conflicted with the environmental objectives of the Green Neighbourhoods Action Plan. Reference was made to other recent sports-related developments within the borough which, in her view, had evolved into disruptive operations and had adversely affected the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- In concluding her presentation to the Committee, Deborah Nyman requested that the Committee either refuse the application or defer consideration of the matter in order to enable local residents to comment on the changes made to the original application.

The Chair thanked Deborah Nyman for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- As an initial question, clarification was sought regarding the speaker's earlier point in her presentation to the Committee that the application was misleading and lacked clarity. In response, Deborah Nyman clarified that she considered the application to be misleading because a number of matters contained within the original proposals had subsequently changed. It was explained that a new block plan had been introduced only recently and contained a number of elements that did not correspond with the technical documents previously submitted in support of the application. In her view, the revised plan differed significantly from the original proposals and should have been submitted as a new planning application.
- Questions were raised from members on whether local residents had been consulted on the revised plans. In response, Deborah Nyman advised that residents had not been consulted on the revised plans and further commented that there had not been a public consultation from the outset of the application process, which she considered disappointing given the level of engagement and communication that residents had historically maintained with the school.
- Details were sought from members regarding the potential impact and harm that the proposed development could have on local residents. In response, Deborah Nyman expressed that Roe Green Village was a Conservation Area and highlighted concerns regarding development in close proximity to residential properties. It was noted that, as with a previous application submitted by the school, the proposed development would be located adjacent to the rear boundaries of residents' gardens. It was further mentioned that the

original plans had included lighting columns measuring approximately 15 meters in height, whilst the proposed roofs were approximately 7.5 meters high. Whilst acknowledging that Roe Green Village comprised a relatively small community of approximately 250 households, she emphasised the importance that residents attached to the character and appearance of the area.

In continuing the response, Dan Hulsmann, supporting the speaker, advised that residents within the conservation area faced limitations in undertaking alterations to their properties that might mitigate the impacts of noise. It was stated that the installation of double glazing was already difficult within the Conservation Area and that residents would therefore be unable to adequately protect themselves from the effects of the proposed development. Concern was expressed that the proposal would have a significant impact on nearby residents through both noise and lighting. It was also stated that the low roof heights within the area enabled sound to travel considerable distances and that local residents already experienced regular disturbance from events held at the school. It was considered difficult for residents to shield themselves from existing noise impacts and it was felt that the proposed development would exacerbate these concerns.

- Members requested further information regarding the environmental implications of artificial sports pitches. In response, an additional supporting speaker advised that the intention was to address existing waterlogging issues by excavating the site to a significant depth and installing land drains and associated infrastructure to remove water from the area. In referring to information contained within the committee report, it was indicated that approximately 20,000 sqm of ground would be excavated. Concern was expressed regarding the scale of works required, with it being noted that substantial volumes of material would need to be removed from the site and replaced in order to install an artificial playing surface. It was further stated that the proposed drainage arrangements raised concerns regarding the displacement of surface water. In his view, water removed from the school site would need to be directed elsewhere and he raised concerns regarding the potential implications for neighbouring properties, particularly those in Manor Close, which were situated in close proximity to the site. It was expressed that local residents held strong concerns regarding the potential environmental consequences of the proposal.
- Members sought clarification regarding the extent to which existing facilities at the site currently affected neighbouring residents. In response, Deborah Nyman advised that the existing facilities did not have a significant impact on residents. and did not operate late into the evening. Concern was expressed that potential commercial use of the site would result in longer operating hours and increased activity levels.

At this stage in proceedings, the Committee agreed to apply the guillotine procedure under Standing Order 62(c) in order to extend the meeting for a period of 30 minutes to enable continued consideration of the planning application and remaining business on the agenda.

The Chair then thanked Deborah Nyman for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Alex Thomas (who had registered to speak as the applicant), who highlighted the following points:

- Alex Thomas (Headteacher, Kingsbury High School) began by expressing his support for the proposed Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) on the school's playing field.
- It was noted that the school had worked positively and collaboratively with officers in addressing all matters raised during the assessment of the application and that, as a result of those discussions, amendments had been made to the scheme, including refinements to the positioning of the facilities, in order to achieve an appropriate balance between meeting the school's needs and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- In setting out the rationale for the proposal, the speaker advised that the existing playing field was no longer fit for purpose. It was explained that substantial areas of the current facility suffered from poor drainage and an uneven surface, rendering them unsuitable for use during both winter and summer periods. As a consequence, the school was frequently unable to meet the demands of students, the curriculum and pupils from the co-located junior and infant schools from Roe Green.
- It was highlighted that the proposed MUGA would provide a purpose-built, high-quality sports facility that would significantly enhance sporting opportunities for pupils. The facility would support a broad range of activities, including football, netball, hockey and other physical education programmes. It was further noted that the all-weather surface would enable sport and physical activity to take place throughout the year, reducing disruption caused by adverse weather conditions. The proposed lighting would also facilitate the safe continuation of after-school sport, clubs and activities during the darker winter months.
- Alex Thomas further expressed that the proposal would contribute towards the promotion of healthier lifestyles, particularly in light of increasing concerns regarding childhood obesity. It was considered that the facility would support the wellbeing of pupils and assist in the development of teamwork, leadership and sportsmanship skills. It was additionally highlighted that the benefits of the proposal would extend beyond the school community, with the facility also being made available to local sports clubs and community groups, thereby increasing access to high quality sporting provision within the area.
- Addressing the design of the scheme, Alex Thomas explained that the proposal had been carefully designed to integrate appropriately within its surroundings. It was noted that the MUGA would be located towards the southern part of the site and would benefit from substantial existing landscaping along the site boundary. It was further explained that this mature vegetation, together with the colour and design of the fencing, would provide effective screening and significantly reduce views from neighbouring residential properties.

- The speaker further advised that the lighting strategy had been specifically designed to minimise light spill beyond the site boundaries. Given the significant separation distances between the facility and neighbouring properties, it was noted that officers had concluded that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact on residential amenity. It was therefore considered that appropriate mitigation measures had been incorporated into the scheme to ensure that sporting activities could take place without causing unreasonable disturbance to local residents.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Alex Thomas highlighted that the proposal had received considerable community support. It was noted that 43 letters of support had been submitted by parents, local residents and sports organisations, demonstrating a significant demand for improved sporting facilities. It was further stated that the proposal would deliver lasting educational, health and community benefits for current and future generations of pupils and local residents and expressed the view that children attending Kingsbury High School should have access to the same opportunities already enjoyed by young people elsewhere in the borough. It was additionally noted that the committee report had confirmed that the proposal complied with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the Brent Local Plan 2019-41 and therefore requested that members support the officer recommendation and grant planning permission.

The Chair thanked Alex Thomas for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- As an initial query, members sought clarification regarding the extent of public consultation undertaken in relation to the proposals. In response, Alex Thomas advised that, during 2025, consultation had been undertaken with 89 nearby properties. It was noted that consultation had also included local organisations and associations, including the Friends of Eton Grove Park and the Roe Green Village Association. Members were further advised that notification letters had been issued, a press notice had been published in April 2025 and site notices had been displayed in May 2025. Following amendments made to the proposals in consultation with planning officers, a further round of consultation had been undertaken in January 2026. This had included all those originally consulted together with any additional properties that had submitted representations in response to the initial application.
- Further clarification was sought on how many objections had been received from local residents. In response, Alex Thomas advised that around 9 objections had been received. It was noted that the committee report contained a summary of the concerns raised together with the mitigation measures proposed in response to those concerns.
- Details were sought on what facilities were currently available at the school. In response, Alex Thomas advised that the school did not currently provide any outdoor all-weather sports facilities. It was explained that the upper school site, accommodating approximately 1,000 pupils, contained a single gymnasium,

whilst the lower school site, also serving approximately 1,000 pupils, contained 2 smaller gymnasiums. Members were further advised that the proposed facility would be available for use by the local community and clarified that the school itself would be responsible for managing the bookings and operation of the facility. It was emphasised that the proposal did not involve a commercial operation managed by a third-party organisation.

- Members questioned how the school intended to manage the proposed facilities. In response, Tara Randall, supporting the speaker, advised that she had served as Lettings Manager at the school for 10 years. It was stated that the school had extensive experience in managing community use of its facilities and was currently well used by community groups and youth organisations. Members were advised that only within the previous 12 months had any concerns been reported regarding traffic or access arrangements. By way of example, it was noted that a Romanian church had hired facilities at the school on Sunday mornings for approximately 6 years and had operated successfully. Members were further informed that Hindu community groups utilised the site during Navaratri celebrations in October. It was considered that these arrangements were well managed and that the school had adequate parking provision to support such activities. In acknowledging concerns regarding traffic and congestion, reassurance was provided that where complaints had been received, they had been fully investigated, reviewed and responded to by the school. It was suggested that some congestion issues may have been attributable to other events occurring in the wider area, including funfairs and similar activities, rather than to the school's operations.

At this point during the proceedings, the Committee agreed to apply the guillotine procedure under Standing Order 62(c) in order to extend the meeting for a further period of 30 minutes to enable continued consideration of the planning application and the remaining business on the agenda.

- In continuing, members expressed concern regarding the potential for evening use of the facility to generate noise disturbance for local residents and sought clarification regarding how any complaints would be addressed. In response, Alex Thomas advised that the proposed facility would be located on the Princes Avenue upper school site. It was noted that the site benefited from parking provision and that issues relating to access and parking capacity had been fully assessed within the application. It was confirmed that the parking provision available at the upper school was considered sufficient to meet the anticipated demand arising from community use of the proposed facility. In relation to noise, it was conveyed that specialist reports had been commissioned and assessed as part of the planning application process. It was noted that the findings of those reports, together with the conclusions reached by planning officers, indicated that the anticipated noise levels would not result in detrimental impacts upon neighbouring residents. Tara Randall, supporter of the speaker, added that the proposed hours of operation were already specified within the report and that use of the facility would cease no later than 9pm, with activities potentially ending earlier on some occasions. It was stressed that the school was committed to complying fully with any conditions attached to a planning

permission and that no use would take place beyond 9pm, including at weekends.

- Referring to concerns regarding flooding, members understood that artificial turf could increase surface water runoff and contribute to flooding. Clarification was sought regarding the applicant's understanding of flood risk associated with the proposal. In response, Tara Randall, supporter of the speaker, advised that the technical reports submitted in support of the application identified a very low, or minimal, flood risk. It was explained that the proposed construction would incorporate a sustainable underground drainage system designed to manage the anticipated levels of surface water. Members were further advised that the planning application documentation detailed how the drainage system would operate and assessed existing flood risk conditions, which were identified as low or minimal. In her view, the sustainable drainage system would address these issues effectively and confidence was expressed in its operation based on the feasibility work that had been undertaken.
- Highlighting concerns relating to potential toxic PFAS chemicals associated with artificial turf raised further questions on whether the proposed surface would be an environmentally sustainable product. In response, Tara Randall, supporter of the speaker, expressed that she had also been concerned regarding reports about the use of rubber crumb infill materials, which had first gained attention several years previously. It was explained that the project had not yet progressed to the detailed design stage of the playing surface. However, in her role supporting the school's sustainability objectives and following the introduction of the school's Climate Action Plan in December 2025, Tara Randall emphasised that the school was keen to utilise newer forms of biodegradable or non-toxic turf. It was confirmed that the school was not seeking to install a traditional 3G rubber crumb surface, particularly given that the facility would be used by children and young people.
- The Chair then asked the applicant to outline the benefits of the proposed facilities and what potential opportunities pupils would lose if the application was not approved. In response, Alex Thomas advised that almost every secondary school within the borough benefited from similar facilities. It was stated that the school wished to provide the same opportunities for Kingsbury High School students to participate in sport and physical activity throughout the year, rather than only when weather and ground conditions permitted use of the existing playing fields. It was emphasised that the proposal sought to provide pupils at Kingsbury High School with the same sporting opportunities available to young people across Brent and London.

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

- Members were keen to seek details on whether there was an opportunity for conditions to be imposed in relation to the material proposed for use within the artificial turf. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area

Manager) advised that a condition had already been recommended requiring details of the materials to be used for the artificial turf surfaces. Whilst acknowledging the concerns regarding the potential safety implications associated with chemicals and microplastics within artificial turf, it was explained that these matters did not fall within the scope of land use planning and were instead regulated through a separate statutory regime under UK REACH product safety legislation. The Committee were further advised that Sport England, as the statutory consultee for sporting pitches, was undertaking ongoing work to develop a framework regarding the types of sports pitch surfaces to be utilised in future. Members were informed that the recommended condition was consistent with Sport England's consultation response on the application, which was a material consideration that the Council was required to take into account. It was confirmed that, should planning permission be granted, detailed specifications for the pitches would need to be submitted and agreed in consultation with Sport England following the resolution, if planning permission was grant permission.

- In response to further questioning regarding the positioning of the sports pitches and the separation distances between the pitches and neighbouring residential properties, officers presented slides taken from the drawing pack to illustrate the proposed block plans. Members were additionally advised that none of the proposed fences would exceed the 45 degree line requirements contained within SPD1. The nearest neighbouring properties were identified as Nos. 38 and 40 Grosvenor Crescent, located approximately 12 meters from the nearest fence, and Nos. 29 and 30 Manor Close, located approximately 11 meters from the nearest fence. Bacon Lane was located approximately 45.45 meters from the nearest fence. Officers further advised that the distance between the edge of the cricket pitch and the site boundary would be 12.84 meters. The distance between the edge of the cricket pitch and the boundary of the nearest property on Grosvenor Crescent would be 18.65 meters. Members were informed that the cricket pitch itself would not be enclosed by fencing, although ball stop fencing would be provided along the relevant boundary. The cricket pitch would otherwise remain open.
- In addressing earlier concerns raised by members regarding the proposed hours of operation, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) advised that a planning condition had been recommended, and agreed by the applicant, which would restrict the hours of operation in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and to safeguard ecological interests, including bats and other flying species. Members were further informed that the permitted hours of operation varied throughout the year to reflect ecological considerations, including mating seasons. Colin Leadbeatter detailed that from October to March the facilities would operate between 8am and 9pm, with floodlights required to be switched off no later than 9:15pm. During April, the facilities would operate between 8am and 7:30pm, with floodlights switched off no later than 7:45pm. Between May and August, the facilities would operate between 8am and 8pm, with no floodlighting permitted. During September, the facilities would operate between 8am and 7pm, again with no floodlighting permitted. It was emphasised that floodlighting would only

be permitted during the darker months of the year and would be subject to strict controls regarding switch-off times.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) added that, when originally submitted, the application had proposed operating hours of 8am to 9pm on weekdays and 8am to 11pm at weekends, including the use of floodlighting. Following consideration of consultee responses regarding residential amenity and ecological matters, including impacts on bats and hibernation periods, the proposed operating hours had been reduced and floodlighting had been removed entirely during the summer months.

At this stage during the proceedings, the Committee agreed to apply the guillotine procedure under Standing Order 62(c) in order to extend the meeting for a further period of 30 minutes to enable continued consideration of the planning application and the remaining business on the agenda.

- In continuing, members referred to Policy G4 of the London Plan concerning protected open space and requested further clarification as to why officers considered the proposal acceptable despite the loss of part of that open space. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) advised that the playing field was designated as protected open space under both the Local Plan and London Plan Policy G4, which generally restricted the loss of such land. It was explained that paragraph 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) permitted development on playing fields where an assessment demonstrated that the land was surplus to requirements, where equivalent or improved replacement provision was secured, or where alternative sports and recreational provision would generate benefits that clearly outweighed the loss. Officers had relied upon the third of these points. Sport England had confirmed that the proposal satisfied its exception test and considered that the benefits arising from the new facility significantly outweighed the loss of part of the existing playing field, which was not suitable for year-round use. It was further noted that the Football Foundation had confirmed an identified demand for additional MUGA provision across Brent and that England Hockey had also confirmed a requirement for additional hockey facilities, particularly for evening training sessions and weekend use. It was added that the existing cricket provision would be retained and relocated rather than lost.
- Views were then sought regarding whether it was felt officers were confident that the proposed planning conditions would adequately mitigate the potential for increased noise nuisance raised by local residents. In response, Colin Leadbeatter (Development Management Area Manager) highlighted that conditions had been imposed restricting the hours of operation, with activities generally ending before 8pm and only in limited circumstances continuing until 9pm. It was explained that Sport England had established acceptable noise thresholds for residential receptor locations and that a Noise Impact Assessment submitted with the application had demonstrated compliance with those standards. Members were advised that all identified residential receptor groups had been assessed as falling below Sport England's threshold of 50 decibels LAeq (A-weighted Equivalent Continuous Sound Level). Predicted

noise levels ranged between 44 and 49 decibels, depending on location. It was noted that there remained an additional margin below the applicable threshold. Members were further advised that a 2 meter high acoustic barrier would be installed around the hockey pitch, which was the pitch closest to residential properties, excluding the existing cricket facilities. In addition, no amplified sound would be permitted in association with use of the pitches. Taking these mitigation measures together, officers considered the impact on neighbouring residential properties to be acceptable. It was confirmed that this conclusion was supported by the Council's Environmental Health officers.

- Details were sought on whether there were any specific heritage or conservation considerations that should be taken into account. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that the impact of the proposal upon the conservation area had been fully assessed. This assessment included consideration of views into and out of the conservation area, including the visibility of floodlighting columns. Officers had considered the siting of the development to be acceptable within the context of the conservation area. Members were advised that, even if some degree of harm were identified, such harm would be categorised as less than substantial and at the lower end of the scale, with the public benefits of the proposal outweighing that harm. It was additionally mentioned that the assessment had considered the impact upon the main school building, which was identified as a non-designated heritage asset. Heritage considerations had been fully reviewed by the Council's Heritage Officer.
- As a final query, members questioned whether community rates would be available for use of the proposed facilities. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that Condition 18 required details of the proposed hire charges to be submitted and approved. It was explained that the condition also required the applicant to demonstrate how access to the facility would be provided to a diverse range of community groups and specifically how provision would be made for households on low incomes. Members were informed that reduced rates would be available for low-income families.

DECISION

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

- (1) The conditions and informatives required to secure the matters identified within the main committee report and supplementary report.

(Voting on the above decision was as follows: 7 in favour of granting planning permission and 1 in favour of refusal).

6. 25/1022 - Thanet Lodge Garages, Mapesbury Road, London

PROPOSAL

Demolition of garage block and erection of a new dwellinghouse with associated amenity space, provision for new pedestrian access and cycle and refuse storage and creation of additional hardstanding to allow reconfiguration of the parking layout (amended description).

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) The prior completion of a satisfactory legal agreement; and
- (2) The conditions and informatives, as set out in the committee report.

Curtis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) introduced the report, advising members that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of a garage block and erection of a new dwellinghouse with associated amenity space, provision for new pedestrian access and cycle and refuse storage. The recommendation remained to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions and informatives set out within the main committee report, together with the prior completion of a satisfactory legal agreement.

The Chair thanked Curtis Thompson for introducing the report. As there were no Committee questions raised at this point, the Chair then moved on to consider a request which had been received to speak on the application and invited Satbir Singh (who had registered to speak as an objector) to address the Committee in relation to the application, who highlighted the following points:

- Sabir Singh began by expressing that Brent had been his home since 1987. It was explained that, in 2020, he and his wife had purchased their first home, a top floor flat within Thanet Lodge on Mapesbury Road, following almost 10 years of saving. It was noted that their first child had been born shortly after they moved into the property.
- Following occupation of the flat, Sabir Singh described that the top floor flats constructed by the freeholder were, in his opinion, of a dangerously substandard nature, and had serious deficiencies relating to fire safety, fire compartmentation and cladding.
- Sabir Singh further advised that, in 2025, his mother, who had previously worked for Brent Council for many years, had suffered a stroke whilst living with Alzheimer's. It was explained that his family had subsequently relocated across the borough in order to provide care for her, as they considered that local social care services were unable to provide the level of support required. It was stated that, as a consequence, his flat had been placed on the market and that a purchaser had been secured in September 2025 despite the concerns he had identified regarding the property. However, it was reported that the developer

had refused to confirm that the ground rent account was up to date and had also refused consent for the sale to proceed.

- Sabir Singh further expressed that his mother had passed away in January 2026 and reported that, shortly afterwards, the developer had informed him that any future sale of the property would require payment of £15,000, which he stated had been described as “compensation” for objections he had submitted in relation to previous development proposals. He further reported that, in February 2026, the developer had stated an intention to go “one by one” through everyone who had ever objected to his plans and “make them suffer”. Sabir Singh advised that both conversations had been recorded and referred to the Metropolitan Police, whom he stated had subsequently raised concerns directly with the developer.
- The speaker further alleged that, whilst preparing the current development proposal, the developer had reported him and other leaseholders to their mortgage lenders, claiming they were in breach of their obligations and threatening forfeiture proceedings. It was stated that mortgage lenders had confirmed that no such breaches existed and expressed the view that these actions had created an atmosphere of intimidation. Sabir Singh highlighted that, as a result, some leaseholders were now reluctant to submit objections openly and, where objections had been submitted, they were often made anonymously.
- Referring to his professional experience working with MPs, journalists and City Hall on housing related matters, Sabir Singh acknowledged the significant need for additional housing within London. However, he urged Members to consider the developer's conduct and the credibility of commitments made in support of the application and expressed the view that granting planning permission would reward the behaviour he had described and could risk undermining public confidence in the Council and its decision-making processes. Reference was also made to the Council's responsibilities under the Local Government Act 1972 and the Representation of the People Act 1983, emphasising the importance of ensuring that individuals were able to participate in public decision making without intimidation.
- In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Sabir Singh urged the Committee to refuse the application and to utilise all available powers to hold the developer to account.

Following the representation made by Sabir Singh regarding his experiences with the applicant, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) expressed sympathy regarding the circumstances described. However, he advised that the Committee was required to determine the application based solely on the proposal before it and the relevant planning considerations. It was explained that the Committee could not take into account allegations relating to the behaviour of the applicant, their previous conduct or matters relating to fire safety associated with other developments. Whilst acknowledging the concerns raised, it was confirmed that such matters were not legally capable of being considered in the determination of the application.

Paul Weeks (Senior Planning Lawyer) reinforced this advice, explaining that the application was required to be assessed solely on its own merits, having regard to relevant planning policies and material planning considerations. He advised that the matters raised by the objector did not relate to the planning acceptability of the proposed development and therefore could not be taken into account by the Committee. It was reiterated that the Committee was required to focus their consideration on the planning merits of the proposal and its compliance with the relevant planning policy framework.

In considering the response, Satbir Singh sought further clarification, noting that part of the Committee's role was to facilitate fair participation and consultation and questioned how concerns relating to alleged intimidation of members of his leasehold community, whom he stated had been discouraged from participating in the planning process, could be addressed if they could not be considered by the Committee. In response, the Chair advised that the Committee was convened solely to consider the planning application before it. Whilst acknowledging the concerns raised, the Chair suggested that alternative legal advice should be sought in relation to those matters. It was further advised that, should Satbir Singh wish to pursue the matter, he could subsequently approach officers or the Council's planning lawyers for guidance. However, the Committee was unable to consider or discuss the alleged actions of the developer as they did not constitute material planning considerations. David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) further emphasised that the Committee was required to only consider matters which it was legally entitled to take into account.

The Chair then thanked Sabir Singh for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- Members were keen to seek details regarding the specific concerns that residents had raised in relation to the application. In response, Satbir Singh advised that residents considered the proposal to represent an example of overdevelopment. It was explained that Thanet Lodge comprised more than 40 apartments and was situated on a constrained site with limited land available to the rear and side of the building. It was stated that part of the surrounding land had already been separated from the wider site in connection with the construction of the developer's own dwelling. It was noted that the proposed dwelling would be located behind the refuse and recycling area serving the residential block. It was further stated that vehicle access to the rear of the building was approximately 2 to 3 meters in width and that the proposal would involve replacing the existing garages located adjacent to this access route with a new dwelling. In his view, the proposed dwelling would be positioned immediately adjacent to, and directly facing, the existing apartment building. Satbir Singh further advised that residents had concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, particularly given its location within a conservation area. Concerns had also been raised regarding the removal of trees within the garden area associated with the building. It was explained that the garden currently provided amenity space for the residents of more than 40 apartments within the development. It was further mentioned that approximately 5 or 6 parking spaces were located to the rear of the building, 4 of which formed part of individual leasehold interests. It was stated that these

parking arrangements would be removed or altered as part of the proposed development. Concerns were expressed that the proposal created a conflict between the proposed development and existing leasehold property rights, as it would involve alterations affecting parking spaces held under leasehold ownership and would encroach upon the communal garden area. In concluding his response, Satbir Singh acknowledged the need for additional housing in the borough but expressed the opinion that this proposal did not represent an appropriate solution to meeting housing need.

The Chair thanked Sabir Singh for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Councillor Hack (who had registered to speak as a Ward Councillor), who highlighted the following points:

- Speaking in relation to the application, Councillor Hack, as local Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and urged members to refuse planning permission. In his view, the proposal did not constitute a modest redevelopment but instead represented an overdevelopment of a constrained back land site. It was considered that the scheme would result in significant harm to neighbouring residents, the surrounding environment and the character and appearance of the Brondesbury Park Conservation Area.
- Councillor Hack expressed that the proposal would replace an open and landscaped area with an intrusive residential development which, in his opinion, was entirely out of keeping with its surroundings. It was noted that the spacious rear gardens within the area formed an important characteristic of the Brondesbury Park Conservation Area and contended that the proposal would erode that character. This was considered to be contrary to Brent Local Plan Policy BHC1 and London Plan Policy D3.
- Councillor Hack further advised that residents of Thanet Lodge would experience a material loss of residential amenity should the application be approved. It was stated that the proposal would replace an existing low level and unobtrusive structure with a significantly larger and more dominant building. In his view, this would result in increased overlooking, a loss of privacy, reduced levels of daylight and a greater sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the loss of garden space and vegetation within the site. Councillor Hack additionally raised concerns regarding leaseholder rights, noting that the proposal would result in the loss of existing garages and associated parking spaces which, he advised, formed part of long-established legal arrangements affecting residents.
- Councillor Hack informed the Committee that a number of residents had wished to attend and address the meeting but had felt unable to do so due to concerns regarding intimidation by the freeholder.
- Councillor Hack further expressed that the application should not be considered in isolation and referred to what he described as a concerning history of

planning and building compliance matters associated with the wider site. It was stated that, around 2019, the freeholder had undertaken development works and that residents had subsequently reported subsidence and cracking within Thanet Lodge.

- Reference was also made to concerns that elements of a previously approved planning permission had not been implemented as approved. These concerns included the omission of an approved green roof, failure to undertake approved landscaping works, development extending beyond the approved garden boundary and the erection of structures within communal gardens without planning permission. Councillor Hack considered these matters relevant as they raised legitimate concerns regarding confidence in compliance with planning conditions attached to any future consent.
- As a local Ward Councillor, Councillor Hack expressed serious concern regarding what he viewed as a recurring pattern of non compliance with planning requirements and a disregard for the interests of local residents. He advised that Members were being asked not merely to approve an additional dwelling but to permit further development on a constrained site within a Conservation Area despite, in his view, the significant impacts on residential amenity, green space, biodiversity, parking arrangements, drainage and the historic character of the area.

The Chair thanked Councillor Hack for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- Members expressed deep concern regarding allegations of bullying, intimidation and aggressive behaviour that had been referred to during the discussion and questioned whether there were any codes of conduct or standards expected of applicants participating in the planning process which were intended to prevent such behaviour. In response, Councillor Hack expressed that the concerns raised had been reported both to the Council and to the Metropolitan Police. Councillor Hack stated that more than 20 individuals had wished to attend the meeting, including both leaseholders and tenants of Thanet Lodge, in order to speak about a range of issues affecting the development and described the situation as concerning. He further highlighted concerns regarding potential drainage impacts and other material matters which, in his view, could arise as a direct consequence of the proposed development. Additional concerns were raised regarding policy compliance and affordability and it was suggested that the proposal would enable further actions by an individual whom he considered had demonstrated disregard not only towards local residents but also towards the Council. Councillor Hack added that, in his view, freeholders had a responsibility to treat residents with respect and to operate in accordance with the frameworks established under national legislation.
- Members asked Councillor Hack to describe the characteristics of the surrounding area. In response, Councillor Hack advised that the Brondesbury Park Conservation Area had largely been established during the late 19th

century and was characterised predominantly by substantial residential properties. It was stated that an important feature of the conservation area was the presence of land and green space, which contributed significantly to its character and appearance. He further advised that, in his view, the application should not be considered in isolation and referred to what he believed to be evidence that previous development and associated conditions had failed to enhance the conservation area. The opinion was expressed that the current proposal would not provide any enhancement to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would fail to preserve the historic qualities of an area which had been established during the late 1800s.

- Further concerns were expressed that, where a consultation process had allegedly been affected by bullying and intimidation, and representations had been made to that effect by 2 speakers, the integrity of the consultation process as a whole could be regarded as compromised. In response, Paul Weeks (Senior Planning Lawyer) advised that there were statutory requirements governing consultation on planning applications and that, provided those requirements had been met, the correct legal process had been followed. It was explained that it was not the role of the Planning Committee to make findings or judgements on the allegations that had been raised and that the Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to investigate such matters. He further advised that, insofar as he was aware, the consultation process had included the publication of site notices and other statutory notifications, thereby providing interested parties with the opportunity to submit representations. Whilst acknowledging that it could be a serious matter if individuals had been prevented from responding, it was noted that the Committee could not determine with certainty whether this had occurred.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) provided further clarification that the initial consultation had been undertaken in April, during which 66 addresses had been consulted. This had included all properties within Thanet Lodge together with neighbouring properties adjoining and surrounding the site. It was noted that 2 further rounds of consultation had subsequently been carried out. The first, undertaken in December 2025, related to proposed amendments involving the enlargement of the parking area. A subsequent consultation exercise had then been undertaken on substantially the same plans in order to clarify the description of development and specifically to include the proposed extension of the hardstanding area, which constituted development and therefore needed to be captured within the application description. Members were informed that press notices and site notices had also been displayed and that the consultation process had been undertaken in accordance with all statutory requirements. Referring to the committee report, Victoria McDonagh advised that a total of 20 objections had been received, some of which comprised multiple submissions from the same respondent. Of those objections, 7 had been submitted without an address being provided. It was confirmed that those objections had nevertheless been taken into account as part of the planning process. Victoria McDonagh further advised that an application of this nature would only be referred to Planning Committee where 8 or more objections had been received from individuals residing within Brent or from businesses operating within the borough, with postal addresses

provided. It was confirmed that more than 8 valid objections meeting those criteria had been received, thereby triggering referral of the application to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Chair thanked Councillor Hack for responding to the Committee's questions and then moved on to consider a further request to speak which had been received from Michael Burroughs (who had registered to speak as the applicant's agent).

Prior to the agent's presentation to the Committee, David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) sought clarification from the applicant's representative in relation to comments made by an objector concerning parking spaces located within the application site. In referring to claims that certain residents held leasehold interests in parking spaces situated within the application area, it was questioned whether any party other than the applicant held a lease of 7 years or more over any part of the site. In response, Michael Burroughs, on behalf of the applicant, advised that his understanding was that there were 4 penthouse apartments and 4 associated parking spaces within the site. He further advised that the parking spaces were let on rental agreements for periods of less than 7 years.

Moving on, the Chair invited Michael Burroughs to address the Committee, during which the following points were highlighted:

- Michael Burroughs began by first responding to concerns that had been raised regarding objections and allegations of intimidation. He advised that 22 objections were recorded on the Council's website in relation to the application. In his view, this represented a significant level of engagement when considered against the approximately 60 consultation notifications that had been issued. It was noted, however, that not all objections appeared to be publicly available on the Council's website and expressed concern regarding this matter. It was stated that local authorities should operate transparently in the way decisions were reached and suggested that, where objections were being considered by the Council but were not available for public inspection or review by the applicant, this raised concerns regarding transparency.
- The applicant's agent further advised that planning permission could not be refused on the basis of the character or conduct of an applicant and that the Committee was required to determine the application on its planning merits.
- Michael Burroughs then outlined what he considered to be 3 key reasons in support of the proposal. Firstly, he advised that there was an outstanding planning permission for the redevelopment of the existing garages on the site by way of a single storey flat roof building. As a consequence, he considered that the principle of residential redevelopment on the site had already been established and accepted. Secondly, Michael Burroughs advised that, in the event the current application was refused, and an appeal was pursued unsuccessfully, the applicant would likely seek to build a flat roof building. It was noted that the surrounding area was predominantly characterised by buildings with pitched roofs and that flat roof buildings were relatively uncommon. Thirdly, Michael Burroughs referred to the officer recommendation, noting that the Case Officer had undertaken a detailed assessment of the

application and had recommended approval. In concluding his presentation to the Committee, Michael Burroughs stated that he considered the officer's analysis to be thorough and endorsed the conclusions reached within the committee report in full.

The Chair thanked Michael Burroughs for addressing the Committee and then invited members to ask any questions they had in relation to the information presented. The following key points were noted:

- Member requested clarification regarding the proposed bin storage arrangements and asked for an explanation of the self-build development element of the proposal, including how self-build provisions related to development requirements and the applicant's intentions in that regard. Members also noted that the required Urban Greening Factor score of 0.4 had not been achieved and sought comments from the applicant's agent on this matter. In response, Michael Burroughs advised that the bin stores were proposed in exactly the same location as within the previously approved scheme. It was stated that the Council had approved the bin store arrangements in that position previously and there was no reason to indicate that they should not be approved again. In relation to self-build development, it was explained that the concept was initially introduced in connection with SCIL. It was noted that a self-builder was defined as an individual who intended to live in the dwelling they had constructed for a period of 3 years. Such individuals were classified as self-builders and were eligible for exemption from SCIL charges. It was further noted that this would be relevant to the current proposal, as a SCIL exemption would apply in this case. It was also mentioned that an application for the exemption could only be made once planning permission had been granted. Michael Burroughs further explained that self-builders were also exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. It was stated that this affected the requirement for ecological reporting. It was added that, in this instance, the site was also exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements because it constituted a small site. It was additionally noted that the site already benefited from consent for redevelopment and members were advised that, should Biodiversity Net Gain become a significant issue, reference could be made to the previously approved consent and associated design. Regarding the Urban Greening Factor, Michael Burroughs stated that planning policies recognised the difficulties associated with achieving urban greening targets on small sites and that a degree of flexibility was envisaged in such circumstances. He advised that the Urban Greening Factor for the proposal fell only marginally below the required score of 0.4. Michael Burroughs expressed the view that the particular circumstances of the site represented a good effort towards achieving the required level of urban greening. It was also noted that the site was currently predominantly concrete in nature, with little or no existing greenery, and stated that the development would result in the site becoming significantly greener than its current condition.
- Members requested a response to allegations of bullying and intimidation during the consultation process. In response, Michael Burroughs stated that he was unable to comment on the validity of the allegations, as he was not involved in the circumstances surrounding the consultation process. He advised that the

Council had issued 60 consultation notifications and had received slightly more than 20 responses. It was stated that there was no evidence within those responses to indicate that residents had been subjected to bullying. Members were further advised that the objections he had reviewed were typical planning objections and that none of them alleged bullying or intimidation.

- Views were sought on whether the agent considered the proposal, involving the redevelopment of a one-bedroom dwelling into a 3-bedroom dwelling, to constitute overdevelopment of the site. In response, Michael Burroughs stated that he did not consider the proposal to represent overdevelopment and advised that the scheme made full use of a developable site and that this approach was consistent with planning policy requirements.

The Chair thanked Michael Burroughs 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:

- Clarification was first sought regarding the self-build development criteria and how the proposal satisfied the exemption from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) explained that self-build and custom build development referred to a dwelling that was constructed for the applicant's own occupation. It was noted that the dwelling could be physically built by a third party on behalf of the applicant and that there was no requirement for the applicant to undertake the construction work themselves. However, the dwelling must be intended for the applicant's own occupation and there was a 3-year period during which it could not be sold or occupied by another person. Victoria McDonagh further advised that there were a number of circumstances in which developments could be exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements. One particular circumstance was the application of the de minimis test, where less than 25 sqm of habitat would be affected. Members were advised that in this case, the site plan extended into part of the car parking area and communal garden, where a tree was located. Whilst the submitted plans indicated that the tree would be retained, concerns had been raised by the Council's Tree Officer regarding the risk of damage to the tree during construction works due to the differing ground levels between the car park and garden areas. Victoria McDonagh advised that the Tree Officer had indicated, in principle, that the removal of the tree would be acceptable subject to appropriate replacement planting. It was explained that a tree represented approximately 41 sqm of habitat and, therefore, if the tree were affected, Biodiversity Net Gain requirements would be triggered if the development were not proceeding as a self-build scheme. The Committee was advised that, in similar circumstances, the Council had secured legal agreements requiring applicants to establish the biodiversity baseline value of a site. In the event that the development was not delivered as a self-build scheme, a requirement would then arise for Biodiversity Net Gain to be provided through offsite habitat credits. It was stated that this approach enabled the Council to secure the necessary mitigation. It was further explained that officers were required to assess the proposal on the

basis that it would proceed as a self-build development and, on that basis, it met the applicable exemption.

- Members questioned whether the design of the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with the Victorian style properties within the road or whether it would differ from the existing character of the area. In response, Curtis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) advised that the proposal incorporated materials commonly found within the conservation area, including coping stones and red clay materials. It was noted that the appearance of the existing garages was currently unsightly and made no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area. It was stated that officers considered the scale and materials proposed for the dwelling would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation area and that the scheme would deliver public benefits through the provision of a new family sized dwelling. Overall, officers considered the proposal to be sympathetic to the character of the area and compliant with relevant conservation objectives.

Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) additionally noted that the Heritage Officer had been consulted on the proposal and had concluded that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. It was further stated that the existing garages were of a more contemporary form of construction and were not considered to be of special interest. As a result, they did not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and there was no heritage objection to their removal. The Committee were informed that amendments had been sought by the Heritage Officer during the course of the application process, including revisions to the fenestration and materials in order to ensure greater compatibility with the surrounding area. It was clarified that these amendments had been made and the Heritage Officer was satisfied with the proposal from a heritage perspective.

At this point in the proceedings, the Committee agreed to apply the guillotine procedure under Standing Order 62(c) in order to extend the meeting by a further 30 minutes to enable continued consideration of the planning application and the remaining business on the agenda.

- Returning to the allegations of intimidation and bullying raised by a number of speakers, members requested confirmation as to whether the Council had been made aware of these matters. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) confirmed that such matters had been raised and advised that the issues related to the behaviour of the applicant and did not constitute material planning considerations. It was noted that this position had been set out within the committee report.
- Referring to the receipt of 20 objections members questioned how many responses had been submitted in support of the proposal. In response, Curtis Thompson (Career Grade Planning Officer) advised that no responses of support had been received. Following up, members queried how many objections had been received in relation to the application, to which Curtis Thompson confirmed that 20 objections had been received, as detailed within

the committee report. Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) added that all representations received in relation to planning applications were considered as part of the decision-making process, provided they raised material planning considerations. It was advised that applications were required by law to be assessed against the planning policies contained within the Development Plan. The Committee heard that a high number of objections would not, in itself, justify refusal of an application where the proposal was otherwise considered acceptable against policy requirements. Equally, a significant volume of support would not justify approval of a proposal that conflicted with the Development Plan or gave rise to identified planning harm.

- Clarification was sought by members on why the loss of green space arising from the proposed development had been considered acceptable. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that the extension to the car parking area would result in a minor encroachment into the communal amenity space, amounting to approximately 1% of that area. She further advised that the area currently occupied by the garages would be enhanced through new landscaping to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling. The loss of amenity space had therefore been weighed against the benefit of providing a new family sized dwelling.
- With reference to the increase in accommodation from a 2 bedroom scheme previously approved to a proposed 3 bedroom dwelling, members questioned whether the development would be out of keeping with the conservation area. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) advised that planning permission had been granted in 2024 for a 2 bedroom house and that the current proposal sought permission for a 3 bedroom dwelling. The Committee was informed that the proposal complied with the space standards contained within the London Plan and would provide a private garden exceeding 50sqm. She further advised that, in terms of density and site usage, the proposal fully complied with the relevant space standards and was not considered to constitute overdevelopment.
- Further questions were raised on how many trees would be lost as a consequence of the development if it were to go ahead. In response, Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Service Manager) clarified that only one tree would be affected. It was stated that there was a likelihood that the tree would be severely damaged during development and would therefore require removal. However, a planning condition would secure the planting of 2 replacement trees to compensate for the loss. All remaining trees on the site would be retained.
- David Glover (Head of Planning and Development Services) advised that, whilst the Committee discussion had been taking place, officers had been undertaking further investigation regarding ownership interests within the application site. It was explained that planning legislation required applicants to complete the appropriate ownership certificate, declaring whether they owned all of the land within the application site, whether there were additional owners, or whether the identities or addresses of other owners were unknown. It was

noted that applicants were not required to demonstrate ownership at the point of submission but were legally required to complete the correct ownership certificate. As concerns had arisen following a statement by a previous speaker who had referred to leasehold interests within the application site. David Glover informed the Committee that officers had subsequently accessed Land Registry information and that this had raised doubts regarding the ownership certificates submitted with the application. It was noted that Certificate A had been completed, indicating that the applicant owned all land within the application site. However, in light of the existence of leasehold interests and references to other named parties, David Glover advised that there was uncertainty as to whether the correct ownership certificate had been submitted. It was therefore recommended that consideration of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee in order to verify that the appropriate ownership certificates had been completed.

- Further to this, a Member stated that they had reviewed the relevant legislation concerning self-build developments and noted that the definition referred to individuals or associations qualifying for self-build status. The Member further stated that their understanding was that the freeholder in this instance was Java Properties International Limited, based in Finchley Road, and requested that officers also seek clarification as to whether a company could qualify as a self-build applicant for the purposes of the legislation.

Having considered the application, the Committee **RESOLVED** to defer the decision for the following reason(s):

- To allow the ownership certificates relating to the application to be evaluated prior to determination and to clarify whether the scheme would fall within the definition of self-build.

7. Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting closed at 10:30 pm

COUNCILLOR S BUTT
Chair