



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Monday 24 May 2021 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Johnson (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Donnelly-Jackson, Dixon, Chappell, S Butt and Maurice

Apologies were received from Councillor Kennelly.

### 1. **Declarations of interests**

None.

### 2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

None.

### 3. **20/2974 - 3 Millennium Business Centre & self storage to rear, Humber Road, London, NW2 6DW**

#### PROPOSAL:

Outline planning application for proposed new warehouse building located to the rear (matters to be applied: access, appearance, layout and scale).

#### RECOMMENDATION:

Resolve to grant planning permission subject to prior completion of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

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.

Paige Ireland, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Principal Planning Officer advised

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 May 2021

that the proposal followed an application for a similar form of development in 2019 which was refused for transport related reasons.

In reference to the supplementary report, the Principal Planning Officer drew members' attention to the following points:

- The applicant had submitted a Fire Statement since the publication of the main report. However, as it did not fully meet the submission requirements a Fire Statement prepared by a suitably qualified third party assessor was still needed.
- A local resident had requested that the application be considered in light of the impact of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood Scheme on Humber Road.
- A further query had been raised as to how carbon reduction was being achieved in the development which was addressed in the supplementary report.

Andrew Crossley, objector, then raised several concerns including:

- The basic floor data in the Transport Statement was thought to be 7900 square metres rather than 2900 square metres. As such, the transport impact had not been assessed correctly and the development would lead to increased traffic congestion.
- The development did not represent an extension of an existing business as suggested, but rather a separate business location. There was little consideration of the relationship with neighbouring properties, especially regarding access, layout and fire safety.
- The proposed layout would block the main loading bay of Henfield Storage, the adjacent business. This would result in heavy traffic and congestion at the front of the site and onto the road.

In response to questions from members, Andrew Crossley made the following points:

- Henfield Storage had engaged with the applicants and made its objections clear. However, these conversations had not led to any alterations to the proposed development.
- The warehouse was not heated and as such there was little potential for internal overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems. The offices at

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 May 2021

the front of the site were being refurbished and it was assumed that environmental considerations would be taken into account.

- The proposed development would likely make Henfield Storage unviable and, should the application be granted in its current form, it was unlikely to renew its current lease.
- The proposed parking arrangements would congest the Henfield Storage loading bay and limit pedestrian access. It would also block off the building's current fire exit.

Alison Hopkins, objector, then raised several concerns including:

- The loss of parking spaces on-site would burden local residents, as they had limited access to off-street parking.
- The development did not represent an extension of an existing business as suggested, but rather a separate business location. Any new building on the site should be considered a change of use.
- The car parking on site was already congested and the Transport Statement failed to recognise the existing parking demands.
- It was possible that the applicant intended to allow full-sized articulated lorries to access the warehouse. Humber Road already had issues with HGV traffic avoiding the bus lane on the A5 and Staples Corner to get to the A406. The road was narrow and could not accommodate HGVs.
- The application should be considered in light of the impact of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) on Humber Road. As a result, traffic on the road had increased significantly.

In response to questions from members, Alison Hopkins made the following points:

- Humber Road was used as a rat run to avoid the bus lane on the A5 and Staples Corner to get to the A406. The area prohibited vehicles over 7.5 tonnes except for access and residents felt that the restriction was not being enforced.
- Residents were not in favour of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) because they did not want to pay for parking. Should a CPZ be enforced, residents felt that they would be competing for parking spaces and this would be detrimental to community cohesion.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

24 May 2021

Chris Harding, the agent, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- Millennium Business Centre had worked with officers to ensure adequate servicing provision for full-sized articulated lorries could be provided on site. However, they did not expect the provision to be needed.
- The application was an outline planning application only and the final development would be governed by further consultation. The outline application acknowledged concerns in terms of traffic and parking and limited the size and number of vehicles on site.
- The owners had already introduced a controlled parking system which had shown to discourage long-term vehicle use and parking. The parking requirement would not be increased by the proposed development.
- Work was underway to reduce the number of tenancies. There were currently 50 tenancies and this number would be reduced to two or three. The proposal would reduce traffic on site and on surrounding roads.

In response to questions from members, Chris Harding made the following point:

- Millennium Business Centre had consulted with both the existing leaseholder and surrounding residents, despite there being no statutory requirement to do so. Furthermore, all those with a legal interest in the property had been notified.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including traffic, highways and parking, energy and sustainability, air quality, access and fire safety. Officers then clarified a number of key points including:

- As with the previous application, an Air Quality Neutral Assessment had not been undertaken. This was required to be submitted by condition and should include mitigation proposals should it be found that the development was not air quality neutral. In addition, no overheating assessment had been submitted with the application to demonstrate how this would be properly managed and as such this information was also required through condition.
- It was estimated that the proposal would result in an increase in daily arrival and daily departure vehicular trips. While this additional traffic was not considered sufficient to warrant a further investigation of its impact on the local road network, the applicant had agreed to provide a Travel Plan which

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 May 2021

would help to manage the impact on both the local road network and parking provision.

- During the course of the application the applicant had demonstrated that adequate servicing provision for full-size articulated lorries could be provided on-site. However, the applicant had stated that articulated lorries were unlikely to be used.
- It was confirmed that the basic floor data in the Transport Statement was correct, contrary to previous comments by objectors.
- If in use by articulated lorries, the access road would be wide enough to allow a car to pass and therefore the loading bay would not hugely obstruct access or parking.
- Officers had not carried out any review of the impact of the nearby LTNs on Humber Road. However, officers had assessed the impact on those roads closer to the LTNs and traffic had fallen in each one (though it was recognised that this might partly be due to the impact of the pandemic).
- A parking assessment had been undertaken which predicted demand for 37 parking spaces, with other vehicles staying for a short period, and as such the proposed provision was sufficient. A Travel Plan and Car Parking Management Plan would be used to help manage demand in the future.
- The applicant had submitted a Fire Statement since the publication of the agenda. However, as it did not fully meet submission requirements, it was still considered necessary to require the submission of a Fire Statement prepared by a suitably qualified third party assessor via condition.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation.

DECISION: Deferred to a future meeting subject to the undertaking of a site visit and further information on the impact on local road networking and a draft Travel Plan.

**4. 21/0686 - 14 Canterbury Road, London, NW6 5ST**

PROPOSAL:

Development authorised by the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Act 2017 relating to the Canterbury Works Headhouse and Compound, consisting of: the vent shaft headhouse building comprising three principle connected

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 May 2021

headhouse elements (mechanical and electrical plant building, fan room and vent stacks); road vehicle parking within the compound with a hardstanding area; earthworks within the compound area for the headhouse building, including retaining walls and associated hardstanding area; an autotransformer station (location only); fencing (location only) encircling the headhouse building to create a secure compound; and artificial lighting equipment affixed to the headhouse building and within the compound.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Resolve to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions as set out in the report.

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.

Paige Ireland, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Principal Planning Officer advised that, as the proposal was not a planning application, members would need to consider whether the works ought to, or could reasonably be, modified. Members would need to consider: whether the proposal would preserve the local environment or local amenity; prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in local area; preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or a nature conservation; and whether the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

In reference to the supplementary report, the Principal Planning Officer drew members' attention to the following points:

- A further objection had been received since the publication of the main report regarding the potential impacts on surrounding properties.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

24 May 2021

- The supplementary report addressed discrepancies in the main report regarding the 30-degree rule when considered in relation to Canterbury Terrace.

Lucy Neal, the agent, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- Operational personnel would visit the site infrequently to undertake scheduled maintenance. The site would also be a dedicated intervention point, allowing access down to the Euston Tunnels for the emergency services in the event of an incident occurring.
- During a normal night, only the site entrance would be lit to a dim 5 lux and there would be no light spill. Maintenance events were expected to be infrequent and, if undertaken at night time, would result in a 1-5 lux light spill. In the event of an intruder at night, there would be 1-5 lux light spill to adjacent buildings and in the event of an emergency there would be illuminated to 20 lux and a 1-5 lux light spill to adjacent buildings.
- A daylight and sunlight assessment had been undertaken for Carlton and Canterbury House and found that the proposed development was compliant.
- HS2 and its contractors would design, construct, operate and maintain stationary systems to avoid significant adverse effects of noise and to minimise adverse effects of noise.
- Indicative plans had been provided to demonstrate how the building would be embedded into the landscape by providing soft landscape areas along the site boundaries, providing tree buffers between the HS2 site and its receptors as a visual mitigation and enhancing biodiversity.
- A robust dark grey engineering brick had been chosen as the predominant external material due to the inner London locality. The overall building sought to be a good neighbour by minimising its impact whilst remaining within HS2 functional requirements. This minimising of scale has been achieved by its “sculptural” design.

In response to questions from members, Lucy Neal made the following points:

- The timber clad main headhouse building would fade to a silver grey, blending in with the proposed landscaping. Green walls had been considered in place of timber but was not viable due to ventilation concerns.
- An indicative proposal had been put forward to provide learning opportunities for St Mary’s Catholic Primary School within the triangular

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

24 May 2021

area to the east of the site. This would likely take the form of a pocket park and was subject to further talks with the school.

- St Mary's Catholic Primary School had been consulted throughout the development process. They had consulted on all aspects of building design and temporary works. There were upcoming meetings with the schools regarding the pocket park and road safety.
- Accesses into the site were acceptable in highways safety terms. St Mary's Catholic Primary School had been consulted on these arrangements and had raised no objections so far.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including design, scale and appearance. Officers then clarified the following key point:

- The depth of the headhouse had been determined by the HS2 functional requirements for the fan room and the ventilation stacks were the minimum size in both area and height.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the report.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 7, Against 0)

**5. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 7.40pm.

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair