



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 16 June 2021 at 6.00 pm

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

1. **Declarations of interests**

None.

2. **Minutes of the previous meetings**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meetings held on 28 April 2021 and 24 May 2021 be approved as accurate record of the meetings.

3. **20/3965 - Building & land rear of 1 The Tudors**

PROPOSAL:

Variation of condition 3 and 4 (development built in accordance with approved plans) and 9 and 10 (widening of driveway), to allow minor material amendments as follows:

- the building to be narrowed by 300mm on the west-north-west to east-south-east plane;
- change of pedestrian access into house from ramped access at front, at lower ground floor level, to stepped access to ground floor at garden side of building;
- amendment to driveway width and refuse collection arrangements
- to planning permission 19/1545, granted 3rd July 2019, for Demolition of existing shed and construction of a two bedroom, two storey dwelling house consisting of a part-basement ground floor and first floor, with associated landscaping, parking, and refuse/cycle storage.

RECOMMENDATION:

Resolve to grant the Minor Material Amendment.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

That the Head of Planning and Development, or other duly authorised person, 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 they are 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.

Damien Manhertz, Planning Team Leader South, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions.

The Planning Team Leader South advised that, since the publication of the agenda, an email had been received outlining a number of concerns in relation to the application regarding disabled access, amenity space, landscaping, bin storage and refuse collection, all of which had been addressed in the report. He then advised that a further email had been received from Councillor Chan, ward member for Kensall Green, advising that he objected to the application in its current form and supported the objections made by local residents.

Charlie Hill, objector, then raised several concerns including:

- The removal of the ramp would mean that the house would fail to meet accessibility standards for disabled occupants.
- The driveway, with the bins located as proposed, would not be wide enough to allow all but narrow cars to pass.
- There would be a further loss of landscaping, including a loss of trees.

In response to questions from members, Charlie Hill made the following points:

- The original permission was not acceptable. The driveway, with the bins located as originally proposed, would not be wide enough to allow cars to pass safely and there would be a loss of trees and a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- The proposal would have an adverse impact on the privacy and security of neighbouring properties due to the increased access to Doyle Gardens.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

Paul Lyu then raised several concerns including:

- The use of theoretical data to imply that vehicular access was possible with refuse bins placed in the alleyway was incorrect. A needed far greater clearances to pass through the alleyway without damage.
- Bins would be placed out the night prior to collection and as such block access overnight and would often be returned incorrectly leading to prolonged blocked access.

In response to questions from members, Paul Lyu made the following points:

- The occupiers of 2 The Tudors had access rights to their property. The occupiers used their garage on a daily basis, and the alleyway also provided access to a driveway in its back garden. The proposal would make access difficult.
- Refuse bins were currently collected from front gardens and driveways. This had proved to be an acceptable arrangement.

Peter Kyte, the agent, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- The changing of the main entrance would result in the removal of a proposed ramp, which would declutter the architecture and improve the design.
- The available width in the alleyway was 2.05m. Such a width had previously been accepted and consented by the local authority for vehicular access into the site.
- Future residents would place refuse bins at the site entrance on collection day, with the resultant width available for cars to pass also being 2.05m.
- The dimensions of a typical family car (BMW Series 1 and 2) have been provided in relation to the alleyway, which proved it could pass between the waste bins at the site access and the downpipes further into the site.

In response to questions from members, Peter Kyte made the following points:

- The changed pedestrian access into the house from ramped access at the front, at lower ground floor level, to stepped access to ground floor at garden side of building would not affect neighbour amenity. Any minor amendments to allow for disabled access would be relatively easy.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including highways and servicing and neighbour residential amenity. Officers then clarified a number of key points including:

- Unless the narrowing of the driveway at the entrance and placing of refuse bins at the collection point, for waste collection days only, was deemed acceptable in the overall context of the proposal, works would not be permitted to begin.
- While it was possible to condition the development to be car free, vehicles could still use the alleyway to access neighbouring properties. Parking provision was not deemed to be an issue as the development was in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and there was adequate on-street parking nearby. Overall, the variation of condition was considered acceptable with regards to highways and servicing.
- If the refuse bins were to be placed at the front of the development, it would block the access for those using the pavement on the days of the week when the bins were in place.
- It was accepted that the refuse bins may not be returned to the same position on collection day, and that the bins may be out for more than one day. However, the arrangement was common practice in the locality and was deemed safe.
- Access for emergency services would be provided through a number of access means. These included an intercom system with a keypad linked to each occupier. A fireman's key switch would allow access for emergency vehicles, and a key protected manual release would be incorporated in the case of a power cut.
- It was considered that any car that was planning to traverse down the alleyway would be equally able to travel through the initial part of the alleyway, with care, when refuse bins were present. It was accepted that larger vehicles would not be able to access the driveway through the alleyway.

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.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

DECISION: Refused planning permission contrary to the officers' recommendations due to concerns over the space that would be available at the entrance of the driveway on the days of the week bin collections take place.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 3, Against 5)

4. 20/2788 - St Catherine's Church Hall & St Catherine's Church, Neasden Lane, London

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of fire damaged community centre and erection of a new two storey community centre and church hall building with roof terrace attached to St Catherine's church, creation of new vehicular access, bin store enclosure, alteration to boundary and associated landscaping.

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 and Development or other duly authorised persons is delegated authority to agree the exact terms thereof in line with the Heads of Terms as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning and Development or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning and Development, or other duly authorised person, 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 they are 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.

Damien Manhertz, Planning Team Leader South, introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered members' questions. The Planning Team Leader South

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

clarified that an Arboriculture Method Statement would be required by condition to ensure trees were either retained or compensated for through replacement tree planting or financial contribution to tree planting off site. A detailed landscaping plan would also be required by condition to ensure the proposed landscaping was maximised and of high quality. The Planning Team Leader South also confirmed that twelve cycle spaces would be provided which was welcomed in light of the survey carried out amongst regular users of the hall which found 20% of visitors travel by bicycle.

Rob Harrison, the applicant, then addressed the Committee on several matters including:

- The old Church Hall was often fully booked and the Community Café space within the church was approaching full usage by the time of the Church Hall fire in 2018.
- In early 2019 a community consultation day was held, during which it was made apparent that users wanted a facility with a range of different spaces available. These included a grand hall, meeting rooms, a café and a garden area.
- Those that were involved in the community consultation day were invited back to give their thoughts on the basic plans for the community centre. They felt their voice had been heard and the proposal was what they were looking for.
- The proposed business model was to take on a balance of income generating bookings that would cover the running costs of the building so that other facilities could be made available to the local community at low or zero cost.

In response to questions from members, Rob Harrison made the following points:

- The possibility of holding events of up to 150 people was welcomed. Such events would likely be concerts or theatre performances. Historically the hall had been used for small-scale community activities.
- A gas heating system was proposed after consultation with relevant professionals. The applicant was committed to ensuring the development was as sustainable and energy efficient as possible.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised several issues including trees and biodiversity, parking provision, transport, fire safety, environmental health and the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 June 2021

relationship with neighbouring sites. Officers then clarified a number of key points including:

- An Arboriculture Method Statement would be required by condition to ensure trees were either retained or compensated for through replacement tree planting or financial contribution to tree planting off site. It also noted the protection afforded to bats and nesting birds as required by legislation.
- The Transport Management Plan provided stated a maximum capacity of 150 users. With no off-street parking provided, pressure falls on the surrounding residential areas. A car parking management plan was therefore recommended to be secured through condition for the site to ensure that parking for large events can be managed on the site and in the local area.
- The Travel Plan survey identified that 53% of respondents travel less than 15 minutes to the site, so the facility was considered to have a predominantly local catchment. This would make it easier to promote sustainable modes of travel to the site. The site was well connected by public transport, and local public transport infrastructure was set to be improved as part of the Neasden Growth Area Masterplan.
- A preliminary fire statement had been provided to support the proposal. It was recommended that a condition be attached requiring the submission and approval of a fire statement prior to any development taking place on site.
- Overall there were not considered to be any significant neighbour amenity issues with the proposal. Residential properties were relatively far away, and the existing site had been in use for a number of years without any issues.

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 the prior completion of a S106 legal agreement and the conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 8)

5. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
16 June 2021

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER
Chair