

# COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on  
Item No  
Case Number

15 August, 2018  
04  
18/0752

## SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	23 February, 2018
WARD	Alperton
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Wembley
LOCATION	All Units at Afrex House, Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1NX
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing buildings at Afrex House, and redevelopment to provide a residential development of 3-5 storeys for 31 residential units (9 x 1bed, 18 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed), creation of public realm and alterations, landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and all associated works.
PLAN NO'S	See condition 2
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><b><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></b></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view <b>ALL</b> document associated to case <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_138747">https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=DCAPR_138747</a></p> <p><b><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy</u></b> .</p> <p><b>Please use the following steps</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Please go to <a href="https://pa.brent.gov.uk">pa.brent.gov.uk</a></li><li>2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "18/0752" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box</li><li>3. Click on "View Documents" tab</li></ol>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Resolve to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement

### Section 106 Heads of Terms

1. Payment of Council's legal and other professional costs in preparing and completing agreement, and monitoring and enforcing its performance
2. Securing 5 affordable rental units (*The unit size mix is detailed in the affordable housing section below*), and a post implementation review.
3. A detailed 'Sustainability Implementation Strategy'
4. Carbon offset payment of £44,404.
5. a Section 278 Agreement to include highway works to resurface the Mount Pleasant footway and Grand Union Walk footpath along the site frontage in block paving, including the formation of a new site access, construction of a 3m wide loading bay in the footway separated from the site access, reinstatement of the redundant vehicular crossover at the western end of the site to footway, provision of all associated street furniture and tree planting and all associated changes to lining, signing, lighting and drainage to be undertaken at the applicant's expense prior to occupation of the development;
6. a financial contribution of £15,500 towards the extension of Controlled Parking Zones in the vicinity of the site, including the subsidisation of parking permits for existing local residents in the area;
7. a 'car-free' agreement for the development, removing the right of any future occupiers to on-street parking permits within any CPZ introduced in the area in the future; and
8. establishment of a public right of way to and along the canalside of the development,
9. a financial contribution of £49,426 towards affordable workspace elsewhere in the Borough.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and Impose conditions (and informatives) to secure the following matters:

### Conditions

1. Standard 3 year permission
2. List of all approved plan numbers/documents
3. Sound insulation
4. Tree protection
5. Private and communal amenity space
6. Delivery bay area
7. Accessible Homes
8. Satellite dishes
9. Car parking layout
10. Water Use
11. Considerate Constructors Scheme
12. Ecology
13. Residential Travel Plan
14. Restriction C3 to C4
15. Restrictions on windows
16. Refuse storage
17. Construction and Demolition Environmental Management Plan
18. Air Quality Neutral Assessment
19. Demarcation of the canal edge
20. Land contamination (investigation)
21. Canal and River Trust – Waterway wall
22. Surface water drainage
23. Canal and River Trust – Risk assessment and method statement
24. Materials
25. Drainage Strategy
26. Piling - Thames Water
27. Children's playspace
28. Landscaping
29. Car parking – electric vehicle charging points
30. Cycle parking
31. Access gate to canal side walk
32. Domestic boilers

### 33. External lighting

#### Informatives

1. CIL Liabile approval
2. Asbestos
3. Thames Water
4. Canal and River Trust
5. Highways
6. Repair damage
7. Living Wage
8. Fire Safety Advisory Note

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

That, if by 3 months of the committee date the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## SITE MAP



### Planning Committee Map

Site address: All Units at Afrex House, Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1NX

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

## PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings on site, and construct a residential development. It would be between 3 and 5 storeys and contain 31 residential units. There would be associated refuse and cycle storage within the building. To the east would be 14 car parking spaces. To the west an area of open space would be created adjacent to the existing pathway leading to the canal, and a further area created adjacent to the canal.

The development would be an 'L' shape, with one leg running parallel to the canal, and the other running broadly at right angles north towards Mount Pleasant. Residential units would face the canal at ground floor level, but with an area of defensible space in front of them. Moving north would be the plant room, refuse storage and lobby for the residential units. There would be further residential units (totalling 7 at ground floor level) fronting on to the newly created open space (also with defensible space which could be used as amenity space), with the cycle storage located near to the public highway. Behind these units would be a further cycle store and 14 parking spaces, three of which would be for disabled users. To the front of the site where it meets Mount Pleasant it is intended to have further landscaping.

Above this at first floor level, would contain a further 8 residential units. These, along with the floors above, would have projecting balconies which would sit above the defensible spaces at ground floor level but would not project over the publicly accessible areas. The units nearest to the canal would be accessed from an external walkway to the rear of the site. The layout at second floor level would reflect the floor below. Above this at third floor level two sections of the building would be cut out to create communal amenity spaces, reducing the number of units to 6. Finally, there would be a fourth floor level but only at the corner of the 'L' where the building faces both towards the canal and west towards the Liberty Centre. This would contain 2 units. Above this would be a further communal roof terrace.

## EXISTING

Afrex House is a site in commercial use forming an L shaped site, measuring approximately 0.27 hectares. The site includes buildings, which are single or double storey, and open land which is in use for car parking repairs, with storage of some vehicles. There is a mixture of flat and pitched roofs. To the south is the Grand Union Canal and the existing buildings extend to the canal edge. To the west is a path leading to a pedestrian bridge over the canal with the Liberty Centre beyond. To the north is public highway, where Mount Pleasant meets Beresford Avenue. Finally, to the immediate east is another commercial building which is in different ownership.

The site is within walking distance of the stations at Alperton and Stonebridge Park, and the 224 bus route runs along Mount Pleasant. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed or locally listed buildings on the site itself or nearby.

The site is within the Alperton Growth Area, which is designated within the Core Strategy as one of the areas within the borough where the majority of the planned growth is expected to occur. It is also part of a wider Housing Zone. Within this it is part of site allocation A7 (Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue). This area is also subject to an Article 4 Direction restricting a change of use using permitted development rights from B1a, B1c and B8 to residential. The Direction was made on 4 August 2017 and is scheduled to come into force on 11 August 2018.

It is Waterside Development which is a buffered area around the Grand Union Canal. The entire borough is within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

## SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key planning issues for Members to consider are set out below. Objections have been received regarding some of these matters. Members will need to balance all of the planning issues and the objectives of relevant planning policies when making a decision on the application:

- **Representations Received:** A total of 3 objections and 5 letters of support have been received

principally raising concerns regarding land use, design, the impact on neighbours, and highways and transportation. There are a number of other matters which are dealt with below.

- **Land use:** The loss of the existing uses on site is considered alongside the promotion of the site as a residential development within the Housing Zone. An off site contribution towards affordable workspace is proposed.
- **Design:** – The height of the building would be taller than those immediately around it, but the Alperton Masterplan considers the area appropriate for this form of development. Overall, the proposal is considered to be high quality design and the creation of the canalside walk and open space is a key positive to the development. .
- **Housing density:** –The density is high and the site has a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) at the moment. However, good standard of accommodation is proposed and the development is in keeping with emerging developments within the wider Site Allocation and Alperton Growth Area
- **Quality of the resulting residential accommodation:** – The residential accommodation proposed is acceptable. The mix of units is broadly in accordance with the standards within the Alperton Masterplan, and the flats would have good outlook. There is a reasonable amount of amenity space.
- **Affordable housing:** –The viability has been tested and it has been demonstrated that the proposal is providing the maximum reasonable amount that can be provided on site, with a tenure split that best responds to the borough’s needs.
- **Neighbouring amenity:** – There would be an impact on the Liberty Centre, but there would also be an improvement in many regards. It should be noted that the Liberty Centre has been converted from an office building to residential use under permitted development and the windows of this building are situated in close proximity to the side boundary of that site. To achieve the loss of daylight in line with BRE guidance would result in the permitted development conversion significantly affecting the capacity of this allocated development site and on balance, the provision of additional housing, including affordable housing, is considered to outweigh the loss of daylight. There are also improvements in the appearance of the building (over that of the existing building) mitigates the loss to some extent. Overall, with conditions the proposal is considered acceptable.
- **Highways and transportation:** –The alterations to the public highway would be acceptable, considering the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. The scheme proposes 14 on site car parking spaces (3 will be designated for use by Blue Badge holders). Whilst the scheme does result in overspill parking in the region of 11 spaces, a CPZ contribution is sought from this development to fund the consultation and implementation of a CPZ in the surrounding area, together with removal of rights for residents within the development to apply for parking permits.
- **Trees, landscaping and public realm:** – One tree is proposed to be retained and additional trees would be provided as part of a wider landscaping along the canal, the new open space and the Mount Pleasant frontage. The canalside walk and open space created are strongly supported.
- **Environmental impact, sustainability and energy:** –The measures outlined by the applicant are considered to maximise the carbon savings. There are also other measures proposed., and these are supported

## MONITORING

The table(s) below indicate the existing and proposed uses at the site and their respective floorspace and a breakdown of any dwellings proposed at the site.

### Floorspace Breakdown

Primary Use	Existing	Retained	Lost	New	Net Gain (sqm)
-------------	----------	----------	------	-----	----------------

### Monitoring Residential Breakdown

Description	1Bed	2Bed	3Bed	4Bed	5Bed	6Bed	7Bed	8Bed	Unk	Total
EXISTING ( Flats û Market )										
EXISTING ( Flats û Intermediate )										
PROPOSED ( Flats û Market )	7	12	2							21
PROPOSED ( Flats û Intermediate )	2	6	2							10

## RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

### Relevant planning history

**November 2010:** Appeal into the serving of an enforcement notice (ref: E/09/0170) **allowed** and the enforcement notice quashed. The alleged breach of planning control was “The change of use of the premises to a mixed use as highway, offices, car repair, car servicing, car sales, tyre fitting, repair, sales, mini cab and residential use”. The inspector concluded that the breach of planning control which the Council had identified had not occurred.

### Permissions relating to nearby sites

**December 2017:** Planning permission (ref: 16/4478) **granted** at Abbey Wharf and the Delta Centre for “Demolition of existing buildings at Abbey Wharf, Delta Centre and all of 152 Mount Pleasant and redevelopment to provide a residential-led, mixed-use development of up to 6 storeys comprising 135 residential units (34 x 1bed, 79 x 2bed and 22 x 3bed) and 247sqm of commercial space (A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 and D2), landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and associated works”.

In addition, there have been a number of applications for the units at the eastern side of the Liberty Centre. They have been for prior approvals to change the use of them from B1 to residential, and for subsequent alterations and additions.

## CONSULTATIONS

### Consultation with neighbours

A press notice advertising the proposal was published on 22 March 2018, and a site notice was displayed on 9 March 2018. In addition, letters were sent to 183 neighbouring properties on 9 March 2018.

Following this, 8 representations have been received. Three are objections and five are in support. The 5 in support provide no other detail than stating that “I support the planning application for Afrex House”. They have come from a website set up by the applicant themselves, rather than having resulted directly from the Council’s own consultation. However, they are all from addresses on Mount Pleasant which were considered close enough to the site to have been consulted directly. The three objections raised the following issues:

Objection	Paragraph discussed in / response
<b>Land use</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal is not in keeping with the current industrial / commercial use of the area.</li></ul>	See paragraphs 3 - 11.
<b>Design, conservation and heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The site is currently an eyesore, but the proposed height is of concern. It should not exceed 3 storeys so as to be more sympathetic to the adjacent Liberty Centre.</li></ul>	See paragraphs 12 - 18.
<b>Neighbouring amenity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The construction would have an unfavourable effect a nearby business, which may be unsympathetic to such a development and its potential residents.</li><li>The height of the units would invade the privacy of neighbours.</li><li>This is one of a number of developments nearby.</li></ul>	See paragraphs 34 - 46.
<b>Highways and transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>If the car park was to be heavily or overly used then it would affect the neighbouring business. The proposal is likely to increase vehicle movements in the area and is likely to attract deliveries.</li><li>There would be additional pressure on parking when there is already a problem.</li><li>A CPZ would not ensure that residents could park.</li><li>Existing residents should not have to incur the charges of a CPZ to address this (<i>Please note that the comment actually states that residents “should incur the costs”, but this is considered to be a typo given the</i></li></ul>	See paragraphs 47 - 85.

<p><i>objection as a whole</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport nearby is inadequate, with only the single decker 224 bus route nearby, which is not frequent enough to deal with the increased passenger numbers.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Other matters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The representation advises that they have a legal right of way across the site identified within the title deeds. The car park would interfere / block with this.</li> <li>There would be party wall and structural implications.</li> <li>The development would put pressure on an overcrowded and overpopulated area.</li> <li>There is not an A+E department nearby, with patients having to attend Northwick Park Hospital. There would be difficulties in obtaining an appointment to see a doctor or dentist.</li> <li>Schools are already overcrowded.</li> <li>There is currently pooling of water in front of the site, and oil floats on the water.</li> </ul>	<p><b>See paragraphs 101 - 106.</b></p>

### Internal consultations

The following consultees were consulted, and made comments as detailed:

- Environmental Health – No comments received. However, given the similarities between this site and Abbey Wharf, a number of conditions that were secured for Abbey Wharf and recommended for this scheme in relation to noise, construction impacts, air quality, contaminated land, and odour.
- Local Lead Flood Authority – No objections raised.

### External consultations

The following consultees were consulted, and made comments as detailed:

- Thames Water** - No objections, but request for a condition requiring a piling method statement to be submitted, including measures to prevent and minimise potential damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with Thames Water.
- Canal and River Trust** – No objections subject to a number of conditions being secured.
- The Environment Agency** - No comments received, which the Environment Agency has previously advised indicates that there are no constraints which they are concerned with.
- Historic England (Archaeology)** - The site is not within an archaeological priority area, and there is low archaeological potential.
- Natural England** - Advised that they do not wish to make comments on the application, on the basis that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites. Also, noted is it that it is for the local planning authority to determine whether the proposal is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment.
- London Fire Brigade** - Confirmed that on the basis of the layout as provided, subject to sprinkler systems within both buildings, the scheme is acceptable but needs to comply with Building Regulations

### Community groups

- Alperton Riverside Forum - No response received.
- Alperton Area Friends - No response received.
- Heather Park Neighbourhood Watch

## POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following planning policy documents and guidance are considered to be of relevance to the determination of the current application:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)



- Technical Housing Standards 2015
- London Plan Consolidated with amendments since 2011 (March 2016)
  - Policy 1.1 - Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
  - Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
  - Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
  - Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
  - Policy 3.6 - Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
  - Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
  - Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities
  - Policy 3.10 - Definition of affordable housing
  - Policy 3.11 - Affordable housing targets
  - Policy 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
  - Policy 3.13 - Affordable housing thresholds
  - Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation
  - Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
  - Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
  - Policy 5.5 - Decentralised energy networks
  - Policy 5.6 - Decentralised energy in development proposals
  - Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy
  - Policy 5.9 - Overheating and cooling
  - Policy 5.10 - Urban greening
  - Policy 5.11 - Green roofs and development site environs
  - Policy 5.13 - Sustainable drainage
  - Policy 5.14 - Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
  - Policy 5.15 - Water use and supplies
  - Policy 5.17 - Waste capacity
  - Policy 5.21 - Contaminated land
  - Policy 6.1 - Strategic approach
  - Policy 6.9 - Cycling
  - Policy 6.10 - Walking
  - Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment
  - Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime
  - Policy 7.4 - Local character
  - Policy 7.5 - Public realm
  - Policy 7.6 - Architecture
  - Policy 7.14 - Improving air quality
  - Policy 7.15 - Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
  - Policy 7.19 - Biodiversity and access to nature
  - Policy 7.21 - Trees and woodlands
  - Policy 7.30 - London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces
  - Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations
  - Policy 8.3 - Community infrastructure levy
  - Policy 8.4 - Monitoring and review
- Mayor's Housing SPG 2016
- London Borough of Brent Core Strategy 2010
  - CP 1 - Spatial Development Strategy
  - CP 2 - Population and Housing Growth
  - CP 6 - Design & Density in Place Shaping
  - CP 8 - Alperton Growth Area
  - CP 17 - Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent
  - CP 18 - Protection and Enhancement of Open Space, Sports and Biodiversity
  - CP 19 - Brent Strategic Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Measures
  - CP 21 - A Balanced Housing Stock

- London Borough of Brent Development Management Policies 2016
  - DMP 1 Development Management General Policy
  - DMP 8 Open Space
  - DMP 9 Waterside Development
  - DMP 9A Managing Flood Risk
  - DMP 11 Forming an Access on to a Road
  - DMP 12 Parking
  - DMP 13 Movement of Goods and Materials
  - DMP 14 Employment Sites
  - DMP 15 Affordable Housing
  - DMP 18 Dwelling Size and Residential Outbuildings
  - DMP 19 Residential Amenity Space
- London Borough of Brent Site Specific Allocations 2011
  - A.7. Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue
- Brent's Supplementary Planning Guidance 17:- Design Guide For New Development
- Brent's draft Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 – Brent Design Guide
- Brent's 106 Supplementary Planning Document
- Brent Waste planning guide
- Alperton Masterplan 2011

## DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

### Background

1. The site is an awkward shape, with the adjacent building not being within the same ownership. It is understood that this neighbouring property has a right of access over part of Afrex House which broadly corresponds with the existing open parts of the site. This complicates development of this site.
2. The Liberty Centre is to the west on the other side of the existing pedestrian route through to the canal. There have been a number of prior approvals granted to change the use of some of the units from office to residential. In addition, planning permission has been granted for alterations and extensions to create further residential units. This applies to units 6, 7, 8, and 10. However, the Council considers that the change of use has occurred unlawfully at number 10. Number 9 remains in commercial use so is less sensitive to changes.

### Land use

3. Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy promotes the Alperton Growth Area as mixed use regeneration along the Grand Union Canal. It seeks a compact and sustainable waterside community, and an enterprise hub with modern light industrial units, studios and managed workspaces. Across the entire area a minimum of 1,600 new homes are to be promoted between 2010 and 2026.
4. The application site is part of a wier site allocated within the Site Specific Allocations (SSA), which was adopted in 2011. It is listed as Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue. The allocation is described in the document as:

*Mixed use development including residential, work/live, managed affordable workspace and amenity/open space. Proposals should seek to introduce active frontages along Mount Pleasant as well as improve canal side access for pedestrians, with moorings for canal users as well as conserve and enhance the canal's Site of Metropolitan Nature Conservation Importance designation. Access to remaining industrial area to the west will be improved. Improvements will be sought to public transport as part of any proposal to develop the site.*

5. The indicative capacity is listed as 100 units, and it was expected that it may come forward for

development in 2017-18. The justification for this is stated within the document:

*This industrial area is becoming increasingly marginalised with ageing buildings, poor pedestrian and vehicular access and vacant and derelict units. The canal side location raises the possibility of introducing higher value uses to improve the local environment and the development of new workspace.*

6. This is a significant material consideration.
7. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing 1,628sqm of commercial floorspace. The residential would be 2,947sqm in area.
8. Policy DMP14 of the Development Management Policies concerns employment sites. It advises that Local Employment Sites will be released to non-employment uses where a continued wholly employment use is unviable or there are significant benefits consistent with the wider objectives of the Development Plan. Where non-employment uses are proposed the maximum amount of existing floorspace type or Managed Affordable Workspace shall be incorporated. An objection notes that the proposal is not in keeping with the current industrial / commercial uses of the area. However, the site allocation is significant, and it clearly indicates that the future of this site is envisaged to be as a mixed use site with residential and commercial uses. Abbey Wharf is coming forward as a residential led development with some commercial, and construction is under way. The justification for the site allocation cited above is relevant. It does need to be acknowledged that the buildings have not become so outdated that vacancy has developed into a real issue on this part of the site allocation, but this is likely to become more acute over time. Poor pedestrian and vehicular access is an issue currently. This, coupled with the stated vision for the site allocation suggests that it is not possible to protect the uses in their current form. The more recent designation of Alperton as a Housing Zone (by the GLA) adds further weight to the push for housing on this and other nearby sites. The existing businesses on site are not compatible with residential uses, hence why the proposal is for different commercial uses than are currently on site, particularly given the size of this site.
9. It has been explored whether or not the proposal should incorporate replacement commercial units, such as work/live or managed affordable workspace which are referred to in the site allocation. The site's unusual shape is considered to make this difficult: there would only ever be a small frontage on to Mount Pleasant, and even though longer frontages exist on to the newly created open space and the canal there is unlikely to be much passing trade. The building itself is narrow which would make it difficult to create a unit which has sufficient space. It could theoretically be serviced from the street. Therefore, given the specific circumstances on this site it is not considered that much would be gained compared to the residential floorspace which would inevitably be lost. Were the remainder of the site to come forward then it would be considered if this would make a commercial element possible. As secured with other developments within the Alperton Growth Area (Abbey Wharf and 253a Ealing Road), it is proposed that the loss of employment floorspace is compensated for by a financial contribution towards affordable workspace of £ £49,426.
10. The question then is whether or not the proposed residential use is acceptable. Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy seeks to increase the supply of housing, and Alperton is expected to make a significant contribution to this. The site allocation anticipates 100 units as the capacity. This is only one part of the allocation, and the development at Abbey Wharf exceeds this in its own right (135 units). The proposal would further increase this by 31 to 166. Although the specifics of the design, the quality of the accommodation, and the impact on neighbours is discussed below, the principle of increasing this number is considered acceptable. The designation of the Alperton Housing Zone suggests a greater emphasis on housing than was the case when the site allocation was originally designated. Therefore, this is considered acceptable and would contribute to meeting the housing needs of the borough.

### **Design, massing and scale**

11. Design is an important consideration, and buildings need to be high quality. This is promoted by policy 7.6 of the London Plan, CP6, CP8 of the Core Strategy and DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies. The applicant has provided a Design and Access Statement in support of the proposal. The site is not within a conservation area and does not contain listed buildings, and there are none nearby which would be impacted on by the proposal. The existing buildings on site are not considered of any great merit and their demolition is supported.
12. The context to the north of Mount Pleasant and Beresford Avenue is mainly of two storey residential

properties, whilst to the south the area has historically been commercial properties between 1 and 3 storeys. As noted above, this is now changing with the planning policy leading to residential led developments. The general principle has been that the tallest buildings would be nearer to Alperton and Stonebridge Park Stations, with lower buildings in between. Abbey Wharf is up to 6 storeys in height as it fronts Mount Pleasant but also fronting the canal (although there is also a single storey element).

13. The layout is described above as two blocks forming an 'L' shape. This particular arrangement is considered to optimise the amount of development on the site, as it follows the broad shapes of the site whilst still leaving space around the buildings for open space and parking. It has been considered if an alternative arrangement could be used instead, but the proposal does respond to the size and shape of the site, especially as it has still to provide access over it. Given the potential for development on the remainder of the site it has been explored if the proposal would fetter this. Consideration has been given to what form of development would work if the wider site did come forward: it could potentially extend along the Mount Pleasant / Beresford Avenue frontage in an east-west direction. This is not confirmed, nor is the Council committing itself to supporting such an approach. This would need to be assessed at the time. However, given that this would create a broad 'U' shape, which is what has been shown to work at Abbey Wharf then it appears feasible. Therefore, there are no significant concerns about preventing development on this adjacent site. It should be noted that the scheme has been designed to provide a set back of at least 9m (with the exception of a bedroom to the three bedroom units that provides a distance of 8.6m) to the neighbouring site boundary to the north east. The windows to the communal walkways are closer to this boundary, but are recommended to be conditioned to be obscured glazed. Likewise the bedroom to the eastern corner units that front the canal are within 5m of the site boundary. It is recommended that these windows are conditioned to be obscured glazed at lower level (upto 1.7m high) and clear glazed at higher level. Subject to these mitigation measures it is not considered that the development will compromise the remainder of the SSA coming forward for redevelopment.
14. The Alperton Masterplan advises that buildings of mainly three storeys in height would respect the existing context. The form of the building has been described above: it would have five storeys of accommodation, with the tallest part of this being at the point of the 'L' adjacent to the canal and the bridge. It would then extent up the equivalent of another storey but this would not be solid and would enclose one of the communal roof terraces. It would also partially conceal the staircase providing access to it, but would not be solid and the sky would be visible through it. Alongside the rest of the canal it would be 4 storeys, but there would be set back from the canal edge. This is approximately 5.6m, but when the defensible space is factored in, the space for pedestrians reduces to approximately 3.6m. This is considered sufficient to create a usable and attractive space with natural surveillance from the residential units which look out on to it. The projecting balconies above would not extend over the pedestrian walkway. Towards the north the height drops to 3 storeys before rising again to 4 storeys where it presents itself to Mount Pleasant. The Liberty Centre is a collection of different units that have now been individually altered. However, the most recent planning permissions allow for additional storeys to three of the units to take them up to 4 storeys in height, matching or exceeding much of the proposed development. With Abbey Wharf extending to 6 storeys where it fronts the street the height of the proposal is considered acceptable.
15. The buildings themselves would follow a similar design aesthetic to Abbey Wharf. They would be predominantly brick, with different tones to break up the sections of the building. The windows and their side panels are proposed to be bronze, with similarly coloured metal railings to the balconies. The windows would be slightly set in to the building and the different use of bricks would add some texture. The details are considered broadly acceptable, but a condition would seek details to ensure that the eventual appearance is as high quality as possible.
16. In addition to the canal side walkway an open space between the Liberty Centre and the proposed building would also be created. This is done by pulling back the building line of the existing commercial buildings to open out the narrow passageway. This passageway is currently lit and well used as an accessway to Park Royal. However it is not attractive: there are high railings on either side, and scrubby vegetation. There is also evidence of anti-social behaviour with drinks cans discarded behind the railings. The proposal therefore represents an opportunity to improve this. The space would be widest to the north and then steadily narrows to the point where it meets the canal side walk. There is proposed a gate a condition would require details of how this would be managed. At each point it would be much wider than now, and allows for landscaping and street furniture as well as the defensible space for the adjacent flats described above. Further detail on the landscaping is provided below in terms of the *Impact on Neighbours*.
17. Overall, the building's design and appearance is considered acceptable. It would be taller than the

guidance specifically states, but this pre-dates the designation of the Housing Zone, and the proposed building is comparable in height to others approved in the vicinity. Overall, the impact would be positive. The materials proposed are considered high quality but specific details would be required by condition. The creation of the open space is a key benefit.

### **Quality of the resulting residential accommodation (including housing density and mix)**

18. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan seeks high quality residential units. Based on a PTAL of 2, the density matrix within the London Plan suggests that 200-450 habitable rooms per hectare is appropriate on the basis that the site is considered urban. This drops to 15-250 if it is considered suburban. The development would have a density of 326 habitable rooms per hectare, so beyond the lower amount. The guide is important but is inevitably very broad and applies across London. The site is within walking distance of public transport, and there is potential for this to be improved (see later section on Highways and transportation). The designation of Alperton as a Housing Zone, also implies a high density. It would be a lower density than was considered acceptable at Abbey Wharf (518 habitable rooms per hectare). It should also be noted that the emerging London Plan has a focus on a design led approach to secure high quality developments.
19. The ground floor units facing the open space would be accessed from it. The defensible space is shown as being approximately 2m and demarcated from the open space by a hedge. This would be less separation from a public area than is usual for nearby terraced and semi-detached properties, but is considered sufficient. Any increase in depth (which would be possible) would come at the expense of the open space, which is considered to be a real benefit of the scheme (as described above). To the canal the 2m separation would also be provided, even though this is not the main entrance to these units. Instead, they are accessed from a passage to the rear. The rest of the development would be served by two lobbies, which would be overlooked from public areas to maintain security.
20. The number of units per core is no more than 5 for each of the two cores, which is acceptable. The units themselves exceed the minimum sizes within the London Plan: Two of the 3 bedroom units would be well in excess of the minimum standards. They would be logically laid out. Ten of the units would be single aspect, but none of these would face north meaning that they could get direct sunlight through the well sized windows. Of these two could be made dual aspect by the addition of a window to a bathroom, but this is unlikely to add much outlook. A further 4 units would have an access on to the canal and on to an access corridor. This would slightly compromise their outlook as occupiers may seek to take measures to protect their privacy. However, it would affect a small proportion of the development and there is not an alternative arrangement that would prevent this. The other units would have dual aspect with a significant number of them having an attractive outlook on to the canal.
21. Related to this it is expected that the level of daylight and sunlight received by the flats would be acceptable. The buildings around it are fairly low in height and there would be a degree of separation between them and the proposed units. The balconies and the deck access would reduce light to some of the flats, but the former would improve the quality of the units and the latter appears inevitable.
22. SPG17 recommends that there is a distance of 20m between habitable rooms. The draft SPD1 proposes to reduce this to 18m, but is not adopted as yet. Private balconies are a feature of the development above ground floor level. There are some areas where overlooking between units may be possible, but it would only be to a small degree and measures would be taken to reduce this. A condition would be imposed to require further details of the balconies to be submitted for approval. Other than the deck access there would be no significant opportunities for overlooking between units within the site. Beyond this, there would be no opportunities for the proposed units to be overlooked by existing properties on the south of the canal, as the separation is too great. To the east the existing commercial building would not overlook the properties, and the comments above on design demonstrate that the remainder of the site could theoretically be developed in such a way that future overlooking need not occur. To the north there is separation from properties on the opposite side of Mount Pleasant. There is a degree of concern that the unit at ground floor level could have its privacy compromised to a degree by persons on the public highway. However, a condition could require details of landscaping / defensible space which would address this. The relationship with the Liberty Centre to the west is detailed in the section on *Impact on Neighbours*.
23. Private amenity space would be provided, and each flat would have its own private amenity space. At ground floor level the defensible space which would double as amenity space, even if some of it is not directly accessed from the flats. Above this the balconies would each be 1.5m in width and greater than 5sqm (as recommended by the Housing SPG). Brent's own guidance is for 20sqm for non-family sized

units and family sized units above ground level. The average private balcony for each flat would be 10.5sqm, with a number being less but some approaching 20sqm. In addition, the communal roof gardens and the further communal area at ground floor would provide an additional 332sqm of space. This would increase the average to 21.2sqm, albeit that it is not distributed absolutely evenly across the site. The new public areas would serve a different function, and could not be used in the same way as the private or communal space. However, even without this the overall amount is considered acceptable and a condition would ensure that the eventual appearance and layout would be high quality.

24. The London Plan includes guidance on this, which is based on the GLA's requirement for 10sqm for each child. There are no specific details of playspace equipment on the drawings. The communal roof areas could provide some limited opportunities for small children, but it would be the new open space to the west would have potential for informal play opportunities, and this would ensure that the space can be a high quality shared space for all to enjoy. Specific details would be provided as part of a condition.

25. The applicant has indicated that the units would accord with Building Regulations requirement M4(2) 'Accessible and adaptable dwellings', and that 10% would meet M4(3), which is designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable. This accords with adopted policy. A condition would be imposed to require that this is done. Comments below on disabled parking are also relevant to the wheelchair units.

26. The mix of units is:

	NUMBERS				PERCENTAGE			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	Total	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	Total
<b>Affordable rent</b>	2	2	1	5	40%	40%	20%	100%
<b>Intermediate</b>	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Private</b>	7	16	3	26	27%	62%	12%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	9	18	4	31	29%	58%	13%	100%

27. 13% of the units would be family sized, with the others being 1 and 2 bedrooms. Policy CP2 seeks 25% to be family units (with 3 bedrooms or more). The Alpertown Masterplan contains a different mix.

	PERCENTAGE			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Affordable rent	5%	35%	30%	30%
Intermediate	40%	40%	20%	0%
Private	40%	40%	15%	5%

28. This seeks 60% of the affordable units as family sized, 20% of the intermediate units and 20% of the market unit. The site does not lend itself to family accommodation as readily as some do, as there are limited opportunities for significant ground floor garden space. Securing one of the family sized units as affordable rent is positive. The development is relatively small at 31 units which makes it less likely that the mix will match the guidance. Overall, the mix is not identical to the guidance, but the developer has not sought to maximise 1 bedroom unit and so this is considered acceptable.

29. The applicant has provided a noise impact assessment. This included measurements of the existing background noise levels as a baseline on which to assess the suitability of the site for residential usage. Noise from road traffic and commercial operations are a factor. It is recommended that a condition is secured to ensure that the internal noise environment is appropriate. This would ensure that the mitigation, principally sound insulation, is included within the final design of the building.

30. Overall, the quality of the accommodation is considered acceptable. There would be some compromises, principally at ground floor level. However, this is a function of the site layout and its awkward shape. Conditions are suggested seeking further details of specific points.

### **Affordable housing, tenure and viability assessment**

31. London Plan Policy 3.12 requires boroughs seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on private and mixed use developments, having regard to a number of factors, including development viability. Policy CP2 of Brent's Core Strategy sets a strategic target that 50% of new homes delivered in the borough should be affordable. Brent's DMP15 reinforces the 50% target set by policy CP2 and the need to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. It also notes that 70% of new affordable housing provision should be social/affordable rented housing and 30% should be intermediate housing in order to meet local housing needs in Brent. London Plan Policy 3.11 sets a ratio of 60% social/affordable rented housing and 40% intermediate housing for new affordable housing across London.
32. The applicant submitted a Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) to support this application. The Council appointed consultants to independently assess this FVA. The Council has evaluated the appraisal in order to ensure that the proposed affordable housing represents the maximum reasonable amount. The applicant put forward an offer of 10 intermediate units (in the form of shared ownership) and 2 social rented. This equated to 32%, but the tenure mix did not reflect the Council's needs with the ration being 17% / 83%. However, the Council's consultants did some further analysis and identified that a mix which would better accord with the Council's requirements would be 4 affordable rented units, and 1 shared ownership. This would be 16% affordable housing. In further discussions with the applicant it has been agreed that 5 affordable rented units and no shared ownership is preferable. Essentially, we would have 3 more social rented units, and 10 less shared ownership units than was proposed. Although this is not in accordance with the borough wide tenure split, it would provide 5 high quality units. On a relatively small development, there is an advantage to having one type of affordable housing. The headline percentage of affordable housing is less than was originally proposed, but officers consider that it represents more of what the Council needs.
33. The Affordable Housing proposals therefore represent the maximum reasonable proportion of Affordable Housing, with a tenure split that better reflects the Council's adopted policies. Nevertheless, relatively small changes in the key parameters can have a significant impact on scheme viability and the level of Affordable Housing that the scheme can deliver, particularly in an area where significant change is envisaged through the consent and build-out period. A post-implementation review of the financial viability of the scheme is accordingly considered to be necessary. The affordable Housing proposals are considered to be acceptable.

### **Impact on neighbours**

34. The impact on neighbours is also a significant consideration, and policy DMP1 seeks to ensure that this is acceptable. The buildings to the east are currently commercial and so are not as sensitive to noise as residential uses. The character of the Liberty Centre has changed with the introduction of a number of residential units which would be impact on by the proposal. Other than this, the nearest units are opposite on the northern side of Mount Pleasant and on the southern side of the canal, some distance away. Therefore, the main focus is on the Liberty Centre and how it will impact on the site and vice versa

### *Daylight and sunlight*

35. The impact on daylight to existing properties is different to levels proposed within the development itself, as they are already inhabited. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) is a measure of daylight. The criteria to consider are whether the resulting levels of daylight are less than 27%, and if not then does the level remain above 80% of the existing level. Daylight Distribution (DD) is a further measure. It is recommended that it is not less than 0.8 times its former value.
- Unit 5 - 12 windows were tested. Seven satisfy VSC. The other 5 would retain values which are not untypical of a setting such as this. Five of the rooms tested accord with the test for DD.
  - Unit 6 - 7 windows were tested. There would be an impact on 6 of these windows in terms of VSC, and 3 for DD.
  - Unit 7 - 4 windows were tested. None would satisfy VSC, but are not far below the test. One would meet the requirements of DD.
  - Unit 8 - 2 windows were tested. Neither would satisfy VSC, but are not far below the test. The same is true for DD but the discrepancy is not great.
  - Unit 9 - Not in residential use.
  - Unit 10 - 19 windows were tested, and 15 satisfy the requirements. The other 4 would not be far below the requirements.

36. There would therefore be an impact, and this is largely a result of the existing buildings on site being lower than what is there. However, the proposal would essentially replace unattractive lower buildings which are in close proximity with the opposite. As discussed above, the Liberty Centre has been converted from an office building to residential use under permitted development and the windows of this building are situated in close proximity to the side boundary of that site. To achieve the loss of daylight in line with BRE guidance would result in the permitted development conversion significantly affecting the capacity of this allocated development site and on balance, the provision of additional housing, including affordable housing, is considered to outweigh the loss of daylight. There are also improvements in the appearance of the building (over that of the existing building) mitigates the loss to some extent.
37. For sunlight, only those which face the site and are within 90 degrees of due south are considered, and this means that it is a lower number of windows tested than for daylight. Sunlight is expressed as a percentage of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). Eleven windows were tested, but they served 4 rooms. Each room would satisfy the test and the amount of sunlight received by these units is acceptable.
38. Overshadowing involves calculating the effects of these spaces being in permanent shadow on 21 March (the spring equinox), when at least half of the space should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight. There is potential for the new open space to be overshadowed, but there is no alternative location for it to be provided and it would still be a positive aspect.
39. In conclusion, your officers are of the view that given the benefits associated with the development of this site (the provision of a number of new homes in the borough) and the dense urban nature of the subject site and surrounding sites, the benefit of the proposed development is considered to outweigh the harm associated with the loss of daylight and sunlight. It should also be noted that the units within the Liberty Centre was converted into residential as part of the prior approval process. The prior approval process provides limited matters to be considered as part of the planning application. This includes the relationship of residential windows to neighbouring sites. It is not considered that the matter would warrant a reason for refusal.

#### *Privacy*

40. As discussed above, issues relating to privacy and overlooking can occur where windows or amenity areas are introduced within 20m of existing windows to habitable rooms, although this may be reduced to 18m in due course within SPD1. However, this does not relate to the relationship across streets, and the relationship with the Liberty Centre, across the pedestrian access, is akin to a street relationship. A distance of 10m (to be reduced to 9m within SPD1) is sought from habitable rooms to the boundary with adjoining areas of private amenity space. In this instance the impact would also be limited to the Liberty Centre. There are a number of windows facing east from the Liberty Centre towards the site, and as identified above some now serve residential units with the remainder in commercial use. Not all of the alterations and extensions have been constructed, but are considered anyway. The ground floor sits behind railings and realistically it will remain as such so it is the upper floors which are of relevance. The distance between the buildings would be approximately 13.9m to 14.3m, with 1.5m less for the balconies. However, it should be noted that the majority of the application site is sited 9m or more from the site boundary. It is the windows within the Liberty Centre that are much closer to the site boundary.
41. The roof terraces for units 5, 6, and 7 within the Liberty Centre would each have obscured glazing with a set back from the rear edge of the roof. These existing properties do not have a particularly attractive outlook, and the open space proposed would be an improvement as well as an amenity which residents can use. There are some measures which would mitigate potential for overlooking. The landscaping would include trees which would serve as a natural screen across the area as well as being a pleasant addition. The railings to the proposed balconies could also be designed such that the distance between the individual rails and the angles between the windows could obscure views, and this would be preferable to obscured glazing. Whilst the applicant has provided some details on this already, further details would be sought via a condition to ensure that this is considered in more detail later. With these measures the proposal is considered acceptable, and it would be of mutual benefit to both existing and future residents. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Liberty Centre was converted to residential through the prior approval process. This did not allow officers the opportunity to consider the relationship of these windows to neighbouring sites. On balance, given the wider benefits of this proposal and the aspiration for the SSA, the shortfall in separation distances to the Liberty Centre, should not preclude the wider SSA being developed.

#### *Other considerations*



42. Vibration is unlikely to occur from the completed development. It is possible that vehicles making deliveries could cause some vibration, but this would be limited and localised to the site itself. It is also unlikely to be frequent enough as to cause prolonged nuisance. There is potential for vibration during the construction period. Some of this is inevitable, and by definition would be temporary. However, the requirement for a Construction Management Plan (CMP) would ensure that this is managed as much as is possible.
43. The impact on air quality has been considered. Officers in Environmental Health have reviewed this report and advised that the development is not associated with significant parking increases and the trips generated by site end-users have been assessed to be insignificant. They have however requested further information on vehicle movements for the operational phase. Your officers recommend that a pre-commencement planing condition is secured for a revised air quality assessment to be submitted.
44. In all other respects (namely compliant with annual and hourly mean target concentrations for both NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>) the council is satisfied with the findings in the report and has no further comment. A condition is recommended in to provide details of all domestic boilers installed demonstrating that the rated emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) do not exceed 20 mg/kWh.
45. Existing nearby occupants are not expected to be impacted on in a significant way by the proposal, which would not have inherently detrimental impacts on air quality in the way an industrial use may have. Some impacts during construction are to a degree inevitable, but there is also potential for mitigation. There is potential for an improvement over and above the current situation. Nevertheless it is suggested that a condition is imposed to ensure that the mitigation suggested by the applicant is enacted.
46. Obtrusive light can be a problem. Lighting along the canal and in the open space would need to be appropriate, and a condition would be imposed seeking further details. This is based on the impact on neighbours, future residents of the site and the canal itself. Whilst comments have not been received from the Canal and River Trust at the time of writing this report, in the case of Abbey Wharf, the Canals and Rivers Trust advised that they were keen to ensure that there is no light spill from the development will affect the water.
47. The development itself is not expected to result in problematic noise to existing properties. Residential uses do not create the same level of noise as commercial uses, and the removal of the existing commercial uses is likely to result in a decrease in noise levels experienced.
48. The building is not so tall that any issues of microclimate are expected. Tall buildings can create canyon effects with increased wind. However, this proposal is only 5 storeys at its highest point and it relatively open on all sides.
49. Security is an issue which can affect neighbours and visitors to the area. Comments above on natural surveillance are relevant. There would be a significant number of windows facing out from the site as to discourage anti-social behaviour and the widening out of the existing narrow pathway would be an improvement. There is evidence of some anti-social behaviour in this area and someone would be less likely to conceal themselves than is currently the case. Flats are also occupied throughout the day and night as opposed to the commercial units where it is more focussed on daylight hours.

## **Highways and Transportation**

### Site layout and car parking

50. Car parking allowances for the existing and proposed uses on the site are set out in Appendix 1 of the adopted DMP 2016, with servicing requirements set out in Appendix 2. As the site does not have good access to public transport services and is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), the higher residential allowances apply. It should also be noted that the Alpertown Masterplan seeks 0.6 spaces per unit in the Waterside Development Area.
51. The existing workshop would therefore be permitted about seven car parking spaces. No formal marked spaces are provided within the site at present, but the existing forecourt and driveways around the building would be capable of accommodating at least seven independently accessible car parking spaces. The workshop also requires servicing by full-sized lorries, but the tightness of the roads and forecourt around the site means servicing requirements would be difficult to fully accommodate.

52. The scheme proposes 14 spaces, of which three will be designated for use by Blue Badge holders (10% of the total). The headroom provides suitable clearance for high-top conversion vehicles for wheelchairs. The layout of the car park meets standards in terms of dimensions and the inclusion of six electric vehicle charging points (3 active and 3 passive) meets London Plan requirements for 40% of spaces to have charging facilities.
53. Policy DMP12 also requires that any overspill parking generated on the highway can be safely accommodated so that it does not harm existing on-street parking conditions in the area. As a proxy, it is generally assumed that residential demand will average 75% of the maximum parking allowance, which would translate to demand for 25 spaces and result in a potential overspill of 11 cars from the site. To verify this, car ownership data from the 2011 Census has been examined and this suggests that car ownership for flats in this area averages 0.715 cars/flat, which would lead to parking demand for 22-23 cars. This ties in well with the above approximation.
54. Objections have raised concern about the potential for overspill parking and the impact on the wider area. To help to mitigate any future parking problems that may arise, funding towards the introduction of a CPZ (including potential subsidy towards existing residents permit costs) should be sought through a S106 Agreement. To be consistent with other developments in the area, a sum of £500 per flat (total £15,500) is sought. Removal of the right of future residents of this development to parking permits should the CPZ be introduced is also sought to limit the potential for overspill parking and this has been acknowledged by the applicant in their Transport Statement. One objection notes that a CPZ would not ensure that a resident could park. Whilst it is not a guarantee of this, it would remove the ability for persons not living in the vicinity to park there now, which does not currently exist. Therefore, at the very least it would ensure that the situation does not worsen.
55. The London Plan requires the provision of a secure long-term bicycle parking space for every 1-bed flat and two spaces for all larger flats. The two proposed storage rooms around the edge of the carpark have capacity for 52 standard bicycles and an accessible bike, which provides sufficient parking in a secure and sheltered location close to the various entrance cores for the flats. A further Sheffield stand is proposed at the front of the site for visitors.
56. Two bin storage areas are proposed to accommodate six Eurobins and eight wheeled bins, thus satisfying storage requirements. The car parking area is too constrained to accommodate turning by refuse vehicles though, so they are proposed to stand in Mount Pleasant when collecting refuse. The bin store closest to the site entrance is therefore shown with surplus capacity to allow all bins to be brought to that store on collection days by the site management. This would keep refuse carrying distances to 14m. The proposed arrangements have been reviewed by Veoila (the waste contractor within the Brough) who have advised that the arrangements are acceptable.
57. Fire access to the units at the rear of the site also exceeds the maximum hose reach distance of 45m. A Fire Safety Report has been prepared by the applicant which includes measures such as dry risers to address the distance of 45m being exceeded. The proposal has been reviewed by London Fire Brigade. They have confirmed that the scheme based on the current layout of the plans is required to provide 100% sprinkler coverage (to BS 9251) in both blocks. The detailed design consideration of the fire strategy will be considered through Building Regulations.
58. The proposed 5m width of the driveway to the car park will allow two-way flow and the location of the access on the outside of a bend in the highway means vehicular sightlines are comfortably provided. The crossover to the site should be raised up to footway level to indicate priority for pedestrians.
59. The junction spacing to Beresford Avenue measures only about 10m though, which is well below standards. However, the access is in the same location as for the existing site and will be very lightly used. There are also proposals in the Alperton Masterplan to amend the layout of the Mount Pleasant/Beresford Avenue junction to alter its priority, which would address this issue anyway. This is not therefore considered to be a significant concern.
60. The reduction in the number of access points from Mount Pleasant is otherwise welcomed in highway safety terms and the cost of removing the redundant crossover on the western side of the site and reinstating it to footway with full height kerbs will need to be met by the developer.
61. Aside from works to modify the existing site accesses, the applicant also proposes works within the adopted highway of Mount Pleasant fronting the site to repave the footway in Marshall's Myriad Priora

block paving, with a block-paved servicing lay-by (2.5m x 11m) re-provided within the footway immediately adjoining the site access with a time limit of 20 minutes. Although this is generally welcomed in terms of helping to maintain clear visibility past a service vehicle to the zebra crossing in Mount Pleasant, the lay-by would need to be amended to provide a physical separation from the site access, but this could be addressed as part of the later section 38 / 278 process to formally alter the public highway. It should also have a minimum depth of 3m to comply with standards for kerbside loading.

62. Again, if the Masterplan proposals to reconfigure the priority at this junction do proceed, there may not be sufficient space to retain the loading bay, but this could be factored into the design at the time. The level of deliveries generated by the proposal would not very significant anyway.
63. Suitable demarcation will need to be provided along the rear boundary of the existing adopted highway, which is assumed to remain in its current location (please note that any planters within the site must not encroach over the existing adopted highway). Bollards are indicated around the edge of the footway to prevent unlawful driving over the footways and tree planting is also indicated within the adopted highway.
64. The re-paving works are also proposed to include the resurfacing of Grand Union Walk footpath in Marshall's Myriad Priora block paving, which is welcomed.
65. All works in the existing highway will need to be undertaken through an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. Although the submitted hard surfacing details are fine in principle, please note that detailed drawings of future materials and construction details within the existing highway will need to be agreed through the Section 278 process.
66. Pedestrian access to the building will be provided from its western side, fronting Grand Union Walk, with a 3.5m-8.5m wide landscaped pedestrian area created along the building frontage. This will provide a high quality segregated access to the building for pedestrians, whilst also having the benefit of improving the overlooking and general feeling of security along Grand Union Walk, which is currently enclosed by walls and fences.
67. The pedestrian route will also extend around the building and along the canalside. With redevelopment of further sites to the east proposed, this will form a useful pedestrian route along the northern side of the canal, linking the bridge at Grand Union Walk to the proposed significant redevelopment of the Northfield Industrial Estate.
68. The route does need to remain open for access to all to be of use though, so the gate shown at the southern end of the courtyard area is not welcomed and a condition is required to ensure that this area is kept open and is attractively landscaped and managed in perpetuity. The pedestrian route along the southern side of the site thus be secured for future public use as a condition of any approval.
69. Lighting details have been provided. For the pedestrian area along the western side of the site, an average horizontal illuminance of 5 lux (min. 0.6 lux) is proposed, increasing to 10 lux (min. 4.5 lux) along the Grand Union Canal. This is considered acceptable, and although not specifically requested a reduction would be sufficient to ensure that the area is well lit. Similarly, an average illuminance of 10 lux is proposed for the car park, whereas 5 lux would generally suffice.

#### Transport Impact

70. Although the development is of a modest scale, a Transport Statement has been submitted with the application.
71. The statement has considered likely future trips to and from the site, based on comparisons with surveys of journeys to and from six other blocks of flats in inner and outer London with low to moderate access to public transport services and varying levels of off-street parking, and this has been supplemented by the Council's own analysis of more recent survey data to ensure robustness.
72. The TA thus estimates future peak hour trips to and from the site totalling 3 arrivals/17 departures in the morning peak (8-9am) and 11 arrivals/7 departures in the evening peak (5-6pm). Modal share figures from the 2011 Census for Brent were then applied to these trips, based on 30% of those residents in employment travelling as car drivers. On this basis, peak hour vehicular trips to and from the site are estimated at 1 arrival/5 departures in the morning peak hour and 3 arrivals/2 departures in the evening peak hour (5-6pm).

73. These vehicular flows represent less than 1% of the existing flows along the adjoining roads, particularly if the net traffic (discounting traffic associated with the existing car repair workshops) is considered. As such, there is considered to be no need to undertake any further examination of highway or junction capacity in the area.
74. In terms of public transport impact, the development is estimated to add 7 additional passengers to morning Underground services and 6 to evening Underground services, the majority of whom are likely to use the Piccadilly line from Alperton station (although some may use alternative lines at Stonebridge Park and Hangar Lane).
75. Data for existing passenger flows through Alperton station has been obtained from Transport for London and comparing figures suggests that even if all passengers from this development use Alperton station, flows through the station would increase by less than 1% in each peak hour, with less than one additional passenger per train on average. This increase is not considered to be significant, particularly since planned upgrades by TfL to the Piccadilly line will increase capacity by 60% by 2026.
76. Bus journeys to and from the site are estimated at 4 trips in the morning peak hour and 3 trips in the evening peak hour. Some rail and Underground passengers may also use the bus to access nearby stations. One bus route (no. 224) currently serves the site at a frequency of four buses per hour in each direction, but no more than 1-2 additional passengers per bus would be expected on average. This is again not considered significant enough to warrant further analysis.
77. Bus route extensions (e.g. routes 83 and 440) to serve future further redevelopment in this area have been proposed as the Alperton Masterplan is developed and built-out, but the scale of this development is not sufficient by itself to warrant any such route extensions at this time. Funding from another site nearby has been secured which Transport for London could request to improve services.
78. Walking and cycling trips are predicted to be low and there are again proposals to improve walking and cycling links through the area as the Masterplan is developed and individual sites come forward. This particular development will play its part in that respect by providing the canalside path link from Grand Union Walk, with future developments aiming to improve pedestrian and cyclist links to Alperton station.
79. The road accident history for the area was examined for an area within about a 250m radius of the site for the five year period spanning 2012-2016. This identified a total of 17 accidents, of which six occurred in the close vicinity of this site and the adjoining junction of Mount Pleasant and Beresford Avenue. For a primarily residential suburban area, this accident rate is considered relatively high. Officers in Transportation have therefore requested for details to be provided for the most recent three year accident record (September 2014-August 2017).
80. This shows five slight personal injury accidents in the immediate vicinity of the site - three between cars at the junction of Beresford Avenue and Mount Pleasant and two on the zebra crossing to the west of the site.
81. Officers in Transportation have advised that if the Council does proceed with a scheme to amend the Mount Pleasant/Beresford Avenue junction to a simpler layout that gives priority to the dominant east-west flow (as recommended in the draft Alperton Housing Zone transport assessment), then this may help to improve safety at the junction by reducing turning movements. That scheme is dependent on future funding though, potentially through CIL.
82. Nevertheless, the development is not predicted to generate sufficient numbers of new trips in the area to worsen the road safety record. Indeed, it would be likely to improve matters by removing the car repair business from the site, which currently parks vehicles over the footways and forecourt areas which reduces intervisibility between vehicles and pedestrians. Therefore it is considered that the proposal is acceptable on highway safety grounds taking in account the current road layout.

### Travel Plan

83. Although the development falls below the usual threshold at which a residential Travel Plan would be required, the applicant has nevertheless submitted a Travel Plan to help to manage journeys to and from the site.
84. The objective will be to promote alternative modes of transport to the car and ensure more efficient use

of vehicles, with the aim of reducing the proportion of car trips to and from the site from an estimated 30% (as predicted within the Transport Statement) to 20% within five years of occupation. This target will be reviewed once an initial survey of trips has been undertaken, within six months of 75% of the flats being occupied.

85. The Travel Plan will be managed by a Travel Plan Co-ordinator employed by the Site Management Company. This person will provide travel information and promotional material to residents through Welcome Packs and notice boards. These will include information on Car Clubs and car sharing initiatives, promotion of public transport discount options (e.g. through commuter clubs) and promotion of walking and cycling. It would be useful if the promotion of the Car Clubs included the offer of subsidised membership for new residents.
86. The success of the plan will be monitored using i-TRACE compliant surveys undertaken three and five years after occupation of the development, in accordance with standard practice. Given the small scale of the development, securing the implementation of the Travel Plan through a condition would be satisfactory.
87. A Delivery and Servicing Plan has also been incorporated within the Transport Statement to help to manage delivery scheduling through a vehicle booking system, with the aim of minimising deliveries during peak hours. However, as a purely residential development, it will be difficult to deliver meaningful results given the impromptu and unscheduled nature of the few deliveries expected per day (three on average). As such, whilst the attempts to manage deliveries are welcomed, there is no need to secure the operation of the Plan through a condition or legal agreement.

#### Construction Management Plan

88. Finally, an outline of a Construction Logistics Plan has been included in the Transport Statement. However, this is very light on detail and does not avoid the need for a full plan to be provided for the development, which should comply with Transport for London's guidance.
89. Working hours of 8am-6pm on weekdays and 8am-1pm on Saturdays are proposed and the estimated maximum volume of daily deliveries is predicted at 40. Details of whether these will be unloaded on-site or from the loading bay fronting the site are unclear at present. Either way, pre-booking of deliveries will be essential to ensure this volume of daily deliveries can be accommodated at all times on site or in the designated loading bays and this has not been referred to. Banksmen will also be required to assist safe access onto the site, particularly if vehicles need to reverse in from Mount Pleasant.
90. The site is located close to the North Circular Road, so all deliveries are expected to use that route, reaching the site via either Ealing Road / Mount Pleasant or via Beresford Avenue, which is acceptable. No off-street car parking is proposed for staff, although cycle parking will be provided. As the surrounding roads are not within a Controlled Parking Zone, Travel Plan measures should be employed to discourage car use amongst construction workers.
91. As above, a full Plan will need to be produced for the development prior to a material start as a condition of any approval.

#### **Trees, Landscaping and Public Realm**

92. There are no trees on site which are subject to a Tree Protection Order. An assessment of the trees on the site has been provided, and unsurprisingly they are limited. There is a Wild Cherry near to the layby on Mount Pleasant, which is indicated to be retained. A condition is proposed requiring that tree protection is installed prior to the commencement of development.
93. The design section above has described and assessed the public spaces that would be created to the west and fronting the canal. To reiterate, these are considered tangible benefits to the wider Alperton area. Precise details would be provided via a condition, and this should incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) methods to minimise surface run-off. Having viewed the outline proposals provided with the planning application, the Tree Officer is of the view that more and larger trees than are shown on the drawings are provided. This tallies with the discussion about overlooking above where landscaping is a means by which this can be mitigated.

#### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

94. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted as part of the application. In March 2016, an extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out. The Appraisal states that the buildings adjacent to the canal have a low potential to support bat roosts, but a phase II bat survey was still carried out. No bats emerged and therefore no further survey work is required. However, mitigation is suggested.
95. The offsite canal is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC; Metropolitan tier). Strategic design and landscaping are required to avoid light spill onto the canal. Additional precautionary measures to protect the canal during construction have been recommended and this would be secured by condition. Mitigation measures have also been suggested, and the Appraisal confirms that implementing these recommendations will ensure that there are no significant impacts upon protected species. The mitigation measures include the following:
- tree planting along length of the canal (species to include Goat willow and common alder)
  - good practice measures to be taken during the construction phase of the development to avoid unnecessary impacts to the canal
  - oil and chemicals will be stored away from the canal and protected by bunding
  - machinery and wheels to not be washed within 8 metres of the canal as the washwater could pollute the water course
  - it is recommended that the building is demolished within the bat hibernation period (1st October - 1st March). To mitigate for the loss of roosting opportunities on site, it is recommended that a Schwegler 1FR bat tube is installed within the site
  - new tree planting.
  - the removal of any vegetation should ideally be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (which is generally taken to be March to August, inclusive), but if not then it should first be checked by a qualified competent person.
  - Install five additional bird nest boxes (Schwegler 1MR or any Vivara pro Woodstone nest boxes) into the external walls of new buildings.
  - Install one bat tube

With conditions in place to ensure these mitigation measures are implemented, the proposal is considered acceptable.

### **Contaminated Land**

96. The applicant has submitted a land contamination assessment, which is appropriate given that the historic uses of the site could have deposited contaminants into the soil. The report has been reviewed by officers in Environmental Health. The report includes details of a desk study walk over, preliminary risk assessment, ground investigation and contamination assessment. Due to access issues only a limited amount site investigation has been undertaken, sample locations are located to the north of the site and only one round of groundwater monitoring has been undertaken. More sample locations are required to provide greater site coverage and provide a greater degree of site characterisation. As further information is required, officers in Environmental Health have recommended that conditions are secured requiring a further site investigation following demolition, and a verification report to show that remediation has been carried out. This is particularly important given the relationship with the canal. As part of the Abbey Wharf application, The Canal and River Trust has identified a risk of contaminated water entering the canal. To discharge the conditions the applicant will need to address this specific point. With these conditions the proposal is considered acceptable.
97. An objection cites an existing situation on the frontage of the site whereby pooling water mixes with oil. It is not clear if the source of this is this or the neighbouring site. The development would involve a new frontage which would improve on the current drainage problems. It would also remove a potential source of the oil. Notwithstanding, this is a scenario which should not be occurring and is a situation that will need to be monitored to ensure that pollution is not occurring.

### **Sustainability and energy**

98. Chapter 5 of the London Plan includes policies requiring that developments are constructed to minimise their carbon emissions. This is based on the energy hierarchy: 'Be lean', 'Be clean', 'Be green'. This can be summarised as firstly reducing the carbon within the building's structure so that less energy is used. Secondly, considering whether there are methods to increase energy efficiency, and this is done through Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and connection to District Wide Heating Networks (DWHN). Finally, renewable energy should be incorporated into the design of the building. Since October 2016 London Plan policy has sought zero carbon. In practice it is not usually possible to achieve this with on-site

measures alone. Therefore, an offset payment can be used that is equivalent to the remaining CO2.

99. The Applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement. The proposal has targeted sustainability throughout the lifetime of the building. Passive design measures also feature within the building to prevent overheating and avoid excessive requirements for heating and cooling. The total overall carbon reduction is predicted to be 36% through high fabric efficiency, and through the use of Photovoltaic panels which would be over the parts of the roof which are not to be used as amenity space.

100. At the 'Be Lean' stage the thermal performance of the building has been considered to deliver low U-values. Natural daylight has been maximised to reduce the need for artificial lighting and maximise winter solar gains to reduce heating requirements. The balconies would limit heat gain in the summer by shielding the unit below. At the 'Be Clean' stage it has been explored if there is a Decentralised Heating Network for the development to connect up to. Currently, there is not one and it appears unlikely that this is feasible. It is also a relatively small development and so it is not realistic that it could provide the infrastructure on site. Finally, the 'Be Green' stage proposes to incorporate PV panels on the roof. They would be orientated to maximise exposure to light, facing south at an angle of 30 degrees from the horizontal.

101. As noted above an offset payment can be used to cover the CO2 contributions that cannot be mitigated on site. The Council has adopted a sum of £60 per tonne over a period of 60 years. Based on an annual shortfall of 24.7 tonnes over 30 years, this equates to £44,404. The measures detailed above, and the offset payment would be secured through the section 106 agreement.

102. The London Plan also has a target for water use. Policy 5.15 requires developments to minimise the use of mains water by incorporating water saving measures and achieve a consumption target of 105 litres (or less) per head per day. A condition would be imposed to ensure that this is achieved.

### **Flooding and Sustainable Drainage**

103. The application has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Report. The site falls within Flood Zone 1 and the risk of flooding is very low. At present, all surface water from the site is discharging to public sewer, but there will be approximately 50% reduction in the surface water discharge from new site. The developer is proposing storage tank and surface water discharge will be restricted to 20 l/s and this will reduce the flooding risks. The report has been reviewed by the Local Lead Flood Officer and confirmed to be acceptable.

### **Other matters**

104. An objection notes a legal right of way across the site identified within the title deeds, and that the development would interfere or block this. As noted above the right of way exists but the area identified is not to be built on. It would be where the car parking area is. Notwithstanding that, the granting of planning permission would not override this. It would be a matter that the applicant would need to satisfactorily address outside of planning legislation. In addition, matters such as party wall and structural considerations would also fall outside of the planning system, but would still need to be successfully addressed before the development could proceed.

105. A further objection cites an existing situation on the frontage of the site whereby pooling water mixes with oil. The development would involve a new frontage which would improve on the current drainage problems. It would also remove a potential source of the oil. In any event this is a scenario which should not be occurring and it is a situation that will need to be monitored to ensure that pollution is not occurring.

106. Details of waste and recycling are referred to above, specifically in relation to vehicular access to the storage areas. Residential storage is shown at ground floor level accessed from the car parking area to the rear. There would be 2 separate areas to serve each of the cores. This is considered broadly adequate, and a condition would require that the areas are open for use prior to occupation.

107. Consultation with Historic England's Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has confirmed that this is not within a site of archaeological importance. An assessment has been submitted as part of the planning application regardless. Overall, the conclusion is that the proposal would not impact on any heritage or archaeological features (whether statutory or non-statutory).

108. This is the third site along this section of the canal for which planning permission has been sought,

with one of these developments now being constructed. The other is 100 Beresford Avenue (16/0389), where a planning application was submitted in January 2016 but is not yet determined. The planning policy for the growth area seeks further developments. At the moment they have not come forward, but if they do and were to receive planning permission then there is a possibility that more than one development could be constructed at the same time. This has the potential to increase the level of disruption during the construction period. The Construction Management Plan is proposed to minimise the impact of this development. Whether or not more than one development is built in an area at one time cannot be controlled through planning.

## Conclusion

109. The site is allocated for a mixed use development, and is potentially an important part of the Mount Pleasant Area given its location on the canal. This allocation includes a significant number of residential units and the residential led proposal accords with this allocation. The proposal would result in the loss of existing occupied industrial/office space, but it has been acknowledged that it is not possible for the exiting provision to be protected in its current form, particularly with the site allocation envisages a residential led scheme. The nature of the site is such that replacement commercial stage is not considered feasible.
110. The design and appearance of the building is considered to be of high quality, with an appropriate relationship to the surrounding existing uses and also the likely future context. The proposed development is higher than as was set out in the Alperton Masterplan. However, the relation between the existing buildings in the vicinity and the surrounding development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the principles of urban design. The creation of open space is crucial, and a real benefit of the development. It also influences the impact on neighbours, where there would some loss of light, but in its place would be a more attractive outlook across the new open space.
111. Affordable Housing is proposed at a rate of 16 % (by unit) which is considered to represent the maximum reasonable proportion that the scheme could deliver. The split between tenures is not identical to the Council's policies, but provides units which would make a contribution to meeting housing needs. Nevertheless, small changes in scheme viability could affect the viable levels of provision and a post-implementation is accordingly considered to be necessary. This is in line with the relevant policies and guidance.
112. The residential accommodation proposed would be high quality, with the units being well sized with good outlook and amenity space (private and communal). There are some single aspect units, and the ground floor does not have the same level of amenity and privacy as the upper floors. Overall, though it is acceptable.
113. There would be a potential impact on the highway and transportation. The creation of a CPZ and the removal of residents' ability to obtain parking permits is crucial to ensuring the impact of a development of this size being acceptable. Section 106 contributions are required to implement the CPZ. The transport impact of the proposal on all modes of transport is considered acceptable, with the level of parking considered to be sufficient. A number of improvements to sustainable transport to be brought forward in the area to support regeneration.
114. The applicant has demonstrated that, with the imposition of conditions and section 106 obligations, the proposal accords with policies on environmental sustainability, and would have an acceptable impact on existing trees, ecology, and flood risk. The proposed landscaping represents a real positive of the scheme that can also enhance biodiversity.
115. Overall, it is concluded that the development is acceptable, and it is recommended to the committee to grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions.

## CIL DETAILS

This application is liable to pay **£433,397.19\*** under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

We calculated this figure from the following information:

Total amount of eligible\*\* floorspace which on completion is to be demolished (E): 1628 sq. m.

Total amount of floorspace on completion (G): 2947 sq. m.



Use	Floorspace on completion (Gr)	Eligible* retained floorspace (Kr)	Net area chargeable at rate R (A)	Rate R: Brent multiplier used	Rate R: Mayoral multiplier used	Brent sub-total	Mayoral sub-total
Dwelling houses	2947		1319	£200.00	£35.15	£368,613.39	£64,783.80

BCIS figure for year in which the charging schedule took effect (Ic)	224	224
BCIS figure for year in which the planning permission was granted (Ip)	313	
<b>Total chargeable amount</b>	£368,613.39	£64,783.80

\*All figures are calculated using the formula under Regulation 40(6) and all figures are subject to index linking as per Regulation 40(5). The index linking will be reviewed when a Demand Notice is issued.

\*\***Eligible** means the building contains a part that has been in lawful use for a continuous period of at least six months within the period of three years ending on the day planning permission first permits the chargeable development.

**Please Note : CIL liability is calculated at the time at which planning permission first permits development. As such, the CIL liability specified within this report is based on current levels of indexation and is provided for indicative purposes only. It also does not take account of development that may benefit from relief, such as Affordable Housing.**

## DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



# Brent

## DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

## DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

---

Application No: 18/0752

I refer to your application dated **23/02/2018** proposing the following:

Demolition of existing buildings at Afrex House, and redevelopment to provide a residential development of 3-5 storeys for 31 residential units (9 x 1bed, 18 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed), creation of public realm and alterations, landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and all associated works.

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

at **All Units at Afrex House, Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1NX**

The Council of the London Borough of Brent, the Local Planning Authority, hereby **GRANT** permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out on the attached Schedule B.

Date: 03/08/2018

Signature:

**Alice Lester**  
Head of Planning, Transport and Licensing

### Notes

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

DnStdG

## SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

- 1 The proposed development is in general accordance with the:-  
National Planning Policy Framework 2018  
London Plan 2016  
Brent Core Strategy 2010  
Brent Development Management Policies 2016  
Brent Site Specific Allocations
  
- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning on the date of this permission.

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

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

ZZ-DR-A-3\_02-000 Rev D0-1 "Site Location Plan"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-005 Rev D0-1 "Existing Street & Canal Elevation"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-006 Rev D0-1 "Existing Street & Canal Elevation"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_02-001 Rev D0-1 "Existing Roof Plan"

RF-DR-A-3\_02-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Block Plan"

00-DR-A-3\_03-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Ground Floor Plan"

01-DR-A-3\_03-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed First Floor Plan"

02-DR-A-3\_03-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Second Floor Plan"

03-DR-A-3\_03-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Third Floor Plan"

04-DR-A-3\_03-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Fourth Floor Plan"

Proposed Roof Plan

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-001 Rev D0-1 "Proposed East and Internal North Elevation"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-003 Rev D0-1 "Proposed North and Internal East Elevation"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-004 Rev D0-1 "Proposed Street & Canal Elevation"

ZZ-DR-A-3\_05-002 Rev D0-1 "Proposed South and West Elevations"

Proposed Section A-A and B-B

Proposed Section C-C

INL20621-09 "Landscape Masterplan Roof Level" dated February 2018

INL20621-10F "Landscape Masterplan Ground Floor" dated July 2016

INL20621-11 "Soft Landscape Proposals"

INL20621-12 "Hard Landscape Proposals"

INL20621-13 "Roof Landscape Proposals"

Supporting Statements/documents

INL20621-03B "Tree Protection Plan" dated June 2016

Transport Assessment prepared by Phil Jones Associates (dated February 2018)

Energy Strategy prepared by Metropolis Green (dated 21/02/2017)

Sustainability Statement prepared by Metropolis Green (dated 21/02/2017)

Air Quality Assessment prepared by Entran Limited (dated February 2018)

Noise Assessment prepared by Entran Limited (dated February 2018)

Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs Heritage (dated February 2018)

Planning Statement prepared by Lichfields (dated February 2018)

Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan prepared by ACD Environmental Ltd (dated February 2018)

Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Roger Cory Partnership dated August 2016

Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental Ltd dated June 2016

Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Cratus Communications dated February 2018

Geo-Environmental Report prepared by WDE Consulting dated February 2018

Design and Access Statement prepared by Broadway Malyan

Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by Anstey Horne (dated March 2018)

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

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

<b>Time level</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Maximum noise</b>
Daytime Noise	Living rooms and bedrooms	35 dB LAeq (16hr)
07:00 – 23:00	Outdoor Amenity	55 dB LAeq (1hr)
Night time noise 23:00 – 07:00	Bedrooms	30 dB LAeq (8hr)

Reason: To obtain required sound insulation and prevent noise nuisance.

- 4 Prior to the commencement of development the tree protection measures shown on drawing INL20621-03B by ACD Environmental shall be installed and remain in place for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: To protect the Wild Cherry tree on the public highway.

- 5 Prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby approved the private and communal external amenity space shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and made available. It shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and offer acceptable amenity standards for future residents.

- 6 Prior to the occupation of any part of the development, the delivery bay and temporary refuse area shall be laid out and provided in accordance with the approved drawing, and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the highways network is appropriate.

- 7 Not less than 10% of residential units shall be constructed to wheelchair accessible requirements (Building Regulations M4(3), with the Affordable Rented units provided as fully adapted units and the intermediate and private units provided as Easily Adaptable) and the remainder shall meet easily accessible/adaptable standards (Building Regulations M4(2)).

Reason: To ensure suitable facilities for disabled users and to future proof homes.

- 8 A communal television aerial and satellite dish system shall be provided, linking to all residential units unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development in particular and the locality in general.

- 9 The car parking spaces and accesses shall be laid out and made available prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained as such for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure that the impact of the development on the highways network is appropriate.

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

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

- 11 No development shall be carried out until the person or organisation carrying out the works is a member of the Considerate Constructors Scheme and its code of practice, and the details of the membership and contact details are clearly displayed on the site so that they can be easily read by members of the public.

Reason: To limit the impact of construction upon the levels of amenity that neighbouring occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.

- 12 Mitigation measures described in the approved Ecological Appraisal prepared by ACD Environmental dated June 2016 shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal does not adversely impact on ecological habitats..

- 13 The Residential Travel Plan dated February 2018 shall be adhered to throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable modes of transport.

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

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

- 15 The windows on the northern elevation of the development to the communal walkways at first floor level and above shall be obscured glazed and top-opening at 1.7m high above internal floor level, and the windows to the bedroom on the eastern flank wall of the development shall be obscured glazed and top-opening upto 1.7m high above internal floor level. The windows shall therefore be permanently retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: In the interests of the amenities of the adjoining sites within the SSA.

- 16 The refuse areas shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be provided and made available prior to the occupation of the residential units. They shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the residential units are high quality and that the development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

- 17 A Construction and Demolition Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of any construction works on site (including demolition). This shall include hours of deliveries, and outline measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development. The approved Plan shall be fully implemented thereafter throughout the demolition and construction of the development in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To limit the detrimental effects of noise and disturbance from demolition / construction works on adjoining sites and nearby residential occupiers.

- 18 Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition works) a scheme an Air Quality Neutral Assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report must be undertaken in accordance with guidance published by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The assessment shall include mitigation proposals should it be found that the development is not air quality neutral. The approved measures shall thereafter be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the development would not result in a detrimental impact on local air quality.

- 19 (a) Following the demolition of the buildings and prior to the commencement of building works, a site investigation shall be carried out by competent persons to determine the nature and extent of any soil contamination present. The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the principles of BS 10175:2011. A report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of building works, that includes the results of any research and analysis undertaken as well as an assessment of the risks posed by any identified contamination. It shall include an appraisal of remediation options should any contamination be found that presents an unacceptable risk to any identified receptors.

(b) Any soil remediation required by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out in full. The development shall not be occupied until a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, stating that remediation has been carried out in accordance with the approved remediation scheme and the site is suitable for end use (unless the Planning Authority has previously confirmed that no remediation measures are required).

Reason: To ensure the safe development and secure occupancy of the site

- 20 Prior to the commencement of the development (excluding demolition of the existing buildings on site) hereby permitted, full details of the proposed surface water drainage, including any SUDs measures and discharge rates, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To determine the potential for pollution of the waterway and likely volume of water. Potential contamination of the waterway and ground water from wind blow, seepage or spillage at the site, and high volumes of water should be avoided to safeguard the waterway environment and integrity of the waterway infrastructure.

- 21 Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement outlining all works to be carried out adjacent to the water must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Canal and River Trust. The risk assessment shall also include details of a monitoring strategy for the canal wall during the demolition and construction process. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Statement.

Reason: To ensure the proposed works adjacent to the water do not have any adverse impact on the safety of waterway users and the integrity of the canal, prior to any works taking place.

- 22 Prior to commencement of the development (excluding demolition) details of all exterior materials including samples (which shall be made available for viewing on site or in another location as agreed) and/or manufacturer's literature shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include but not be limited to:
- (i) building envelope materials e.g. bricks, cladding;
  - (ii) windows, doors and glazing systems including colour samples; and
  - (iii) balconies and screens (including measures to prevent overlooking occurring)

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is high quality, and in the interest of the privacy of future occupants and occupants of the Liberty Centre.

- 23 Development shall not commence until an updated drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, in line with the submitted Drainage Strategy (dated August 2016, prepared by RCP), has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

Reason: The development may lead to sewage flooding; additional information required to ensure the development will avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.

- 24 No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

- 25 Within 6 months of commencement of development, a plan detailing the proposed 'play-on-the-way' shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:

- (i) the location of the equipment
- (ii) details of the equipment / measures to meet the minimum standards for play

The approved equipment / measures shall be installed prior to the occupation of the residential units and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To ensure there is sufficient provision of areas and equipment for children's play.

- 26 Notwithstanding any details of landscape works referred to in the submitted application, a scheme for the hard and soft landscape works and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development (including species, plant sizes and planting densities) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of commencement of development. Such a scheme shall include:-

- (a) all planting and trees including location, species, size, density and number incorporating native species;
- (b) details of the layouts of the publicly accessible spaces;
- (d) details of the provision of artificial bird and bat boxes;
- (e) areas of all hard landscape works including details of materials and finishes. These shall have a permeable construction and include features to ensure safe use by visually impaired and other users;
- (f) the location of, details of materials and finishes of, all street furniture, drainage and external

cycle stands;

(g) proposed boundary treatments including walls, fencing and retaining walls, and defensible space indicating materials and height;

(i) a detailed (minimum 5-year) landscape-management plan showing requirements for the ongoing maintenance of hard and soft landscaping;

(j) details of materials, lighting, tactile paving, handrails and wayfinding signs;

(k) details of all tree planting pits (including surfacing);

The approved details shall be completed in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

- 27 Within 6 months of commencement of development, full details of electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The spaces shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of any part of the development and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To encourage sustainable forms of transportation.

- 28 Within 6 months of commencement of development, full details of the cycle spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The spaces shall be provided in accordance with these details prior to the occupation of any part of the development and retained for the lifetime of the Development.

Reason: To encourage sustainable forms of transportation.

- 29 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (excluding demolition of the existing buildings on site) a structural survey of the waterway wall should be undertaken, and full details of this and any proposed repairs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Canal and River Trust. The waterway wall works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the proposed works do not have any adverse impact on the safety of waterway users and the integrity of the canal, prior to any proposed works taking place on site which might impact on the waterway wall.

- 30 Prior to the commencement of the demolition of the existing buildings on site, an area defined as a consistent distance of 2m from the canal edge shall be demarcated from the rest of the site using baulk timbers, concrete road barriers (or other equivalent methods of enclosure). No demolition material or plant shall be stored within this area until such time as condition 25 (waterway wall survey) has been fully discharged and any approved measures / repairs have been implemented in full, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Canal and River Trust.

Reason: To ensure the proposed demolition works do not have any adverse impact on the safety of waterway users and the integrity of the canal.

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



area.

Reason: To protect the amenity of existing and future residents and in the interest of safety and ecology.

- 32 Within 6 months of commencement of development details of the access gate providing access to the canalside walk shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of the gate's appearance and how access will be managed to maximise access through it to the canalside walk.

Reason: To ensure that it is attractive in appearance and that appropriate access is provided to the canalside walk.

- 33 Prior to the first occupation of the residential units hereby approved, details of all domestic boilers installed demonstrating that the rated emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) do not exceed 20 mg/kWh, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boilers shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect local air quality.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 Delete this and enter unique informative here
- 2 The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at [www.brent.gov.uk/CIL](http://www.brent.gov.uk/CIL).
- 3 Applicants are reminded of hazards caused by asbestos materials especially during demolition and removal works and attention is drawn to the Asbestos Licensing Regulations 1983. Licensed Contractors only are permitted to remove asbestos which must be transferred to a licensed site. For further advice the Council's Chief Environmental Health Officer should be contacted.
- 4 **Waste Comments**  
With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.  
<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services>

We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: "A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquires should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing [wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk). Application forms should be completed on line via [www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality](http://www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality).

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We will need to check that your development does not reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you are considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: [developer.services@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk) Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

### **Water Comments**

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

- 5 The applicant/developer should refer to the current "Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust" to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained (<https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice>).

The applicant/developer is advised that any encroachment or access onto the canal towpath requires written consent from the Canal & River Trust, and they should contact the Canal & River Trust's Estates Surveyor, Jonathan Young ([jonathan.young@canalrivertrust.org.uk](mailto:jonathan.young@canalrivertrust.org.uk)) regarding the required access agreement.

- 6 The applicant is advised to notify the Council's Highways Service of the intention to commence works prior to commencement. They shall contact Mark O'Brien (Public Realm Monitoring Manager) at [Mark.O'Brien@brent.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.O'Brien@brent.gov.uk), and include photographs showing the condition of highway along the site boundaries.
- 7 The applicant is reminded that any damage caused to the public realm as a result of the development shall be repaired prior to occupation.
- 8 All Non Road Mobile Machinery utilised in the development must be registered on the following site : <https://nrmm.london/>

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Denis Toomey, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 1620