

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Wednesday 17 August 2022 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor S Butt (Vice Chair) and Councillors Akram, Dixon, Kabir, Mahmood and Seelan.

1. **Apologies for absence and clarification of alternative members**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Begum who was substituted by Councillor Kabir.

2. **Declarations of interests**

Councillor Butt advised that he had been present at a meeting in 2021 where initial plans for Item 4 – Rokesby Place development were discussed. The Committee agreed this was not a conflict of interest, therefore Councillor Butt remained and fully participated in the meeting.

3. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 13 July 2022 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

4. **22/1400 – Car Park next to 34 and Land next to 31 Rokesby Place, Wembley, HA0**

PROPOSAL

Development of car park next to 34 Rokesby Place to create 2 x four bedroom dwellings with associated cycle and refuse storage, landscaping and reconfigured car parking area providing five new car parking spaces.

RECOMMENDATION~:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as detailed in the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated 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.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

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

Victoria McDonagh, Team Leader, North Area, Development Planning Team introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the site was on a private residential car park to the northern side of 34 Rokesby Place with approximately 12 parking spaces referred to as Site A. Site B, adjacent to 31 Rokesby Place was predominantly soft landscaping with 2 informal parking spaces and clothes drying facilities for residents. CGI slides were shown to the Committee to give greater context as to how the proposed development would look upon completion. The Committee were advised that the proposed development would see 2 x 4 bed homes on Site A with communal amenity space. Site B would see additional car parking and further enhancements to the remainder of the amenity space. There was no supplementary report to consider, however comments had been received from the Rokesby Residents Association in relation to fire safety concerns.

As no Committee questions were raised at this point, the Chair invited Zahida Khan (as an objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application.

Ms Khan introduced herself to the Committee and explained that she was representing her disabled mother who had been a resident of Rokesby Place for a number of years. Ms Khan shared the family's concerns as follows -

- The informal car parking area was frequently used by carers and other health professionals who supported Ms Khan's mother's daily health needs. The family were concerned that the loss of these parking spaces to make way for the new development would have a detrimental effect on residents who required visitors to support their needs and could potentially impact the care received.
- Further concerns were raised that in general terms if there was limited parking, family and friends would not be able to visit residents, leaving the most vulnerable residents without their support network leading to wider negative impacts on resident's emotional and physical health.
- Ms Khan advised the Committee that speaking as a wheelchair user herself, it was not conceivable to simply park in surrounding areas, as not all roads and pavements were accessible and safe for wheelchair users. The parking spaces currently used were the only ones that provided a safe level space to park and independently access Rokesby Place.
- Ms Khan raised concern that consideration had not been given to the private disabled parking spaces that had been approved by the council for 31 and 34 Rokesby Place. In addition to this there were concerns that there had been a general lack of consultation with regard to identifying the needs of disabled residents in line with the Equality Act 2020.
- Residents felt that the fire statement was too generic and requested further information from officers as to whether the plans complied with current regulations.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

- Ms Khan added that on the officers report it had stated that Anti Social; Behaviour (ASB) was unlikely to be an issue as the area was overlooked, however Ms Khan informed the committee that the area was already overlooked and there were longstanding issues with ASB.
- Upon summarising the issues raised Ms Khan asked that the Committee listened to the real authentic experiences of the residents living in Rokesby Place rather than basing their decision entirely on officer written reports that many residents felt did not reflect reality, particularly in terms of ASB and accessibility for disabled residents/visitors. In addition to this residents felt that there was limited public benefit to the proposed homes and that this did not sufficiently outweigh the harm that would be caused to existing residents of Rokesby Place. On this basis Ms Khan felt that the proposed application should be refused.

The Chair thanked Ms Khan for her contribution and invited Committee members to ask any questions or points of clarification they may have in relation to the issues raised. In response to questions from members Ms Khan responded with the following points:

- Ms Khan clarified that the approved designated disabled bays were in front of 31 and 34 Rokebsy Place. The carers and other health professionals who visited daily used the parking spaces on Site A which would be lost if approval was given to the proposed new homes.
- In response to a Committee question as to whether there were any other adaptations that could be made to support accessibility for disabled residents, Ms Khan replied that there has been no specific consultation with residents regarding this yet.
- Ms Khan confirmed she understood the need for more family sized homes in the borough, however their development should not be to the detriment of existing residents particularly those with additional vulnerabilities.

As no further questions were raised the Chair invited the next speaker Nila Gor, Rokesby Residents Association (objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Ms Gor represented the Resident's Associations' concerns as follows:

- Rokesby Place currently had 274.1 sqm of amenity space that was highly utilised and enjoyed by residents. Residents were concerned that the application proposed that 208.3 sqm of the current amenity space was concreted over to create a car park, resulting in only 65.8 sqm of amenity space being left which would be located next to a communal bin store.
- The suggested amenity space would be very small and in extremely close proximity to the proposed new and existing homes, residents felt that this posed an unacceptable impact on privacy and security.
- Residents felt that the proposed car park would create excess noise, light and vehicle pollution due to the close proximity to homes.
- Residents disagreed with the ecology report that they believed minimised the ecology of the area, as residents had observed bats and hedgehog populations locally. In addition to this residents were concerned that there would be a loss of mature trees if the application were approved.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

- Residents had unanswered questions regarding the addition of double yellow lines in Rokesby Place and the actual number of parking spaces that would be available both on and off street.
- Questions around fire safety were raised with queries regarding whether there was adequate turning space and access for a fire vehicle and whether a pumping appliance would be able to reach within 45 m of all points inside the dwellings.
- ASB continued to be a concern and had been historically acknowledged by the police and the council.
- In summarising resident's concerns Ms Gor requested that the application was deferred to allow the issues raised to be addressed in full.

The Chair thanked Ms Gor for her representations and queried whether the construction of family homes on Site A would discourage ASB as there would be less concealed spaces for ASB to take place. Ms Gor accepted this may be a benefit to the proposal, however incidents of ASB were prevalent throughout Rokesby Place and not exclusive to Site A.

As members had no further questions the Chair invited Lucy Howes, Maddox Associates (as the agent) to address the Committee (online). Ms Howes introduced the application, drawing the Committee's attention to the following key points:

- The application site proposed two parts shown as Site A and B on the plans. Site A comprised of an informal car park with an estimated 12 spaces and low grade planting. Site B comprised of a green lawn and 2 informal car parking spaces. Neither Site A or B were protected in planning policy terms, although it had been acknowledged that the wider residents of Rokesby Place used the lawn area for clothes drying.
- The proposed application sought to complement the character of the area through the provision of 2 high quality family sized homes in a priority housing area at 100% London Affordable Rent.
- Both homes exceeded minimum space standards alongside the provision of high quality private and communal amenity space.
- The loss of the lawn area in Site B was mitigated by the newly enhanced communal amenity space that would provide seating and play facilities for future and existing residents.
- Nine new trees would replace the existing trees on site with additional soft landscaping to enhance the biodiversity of the site.
- The scheme was fully compliant with the requirements in Policy SPD1 in terms of overlooking, privacy and daylight/sunlight.
- The site benefitted from a high PTAL 4 rating that supported the proposal being a car free development due to the excellent local transport links. Further supporting the sustainability objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- The applicant acknowledged the loss of the informal parking spaces on Site A and B, however 5 spaces would be re-provided.
- In addition to this a parking survey undertaken in support of the application identified that there would be sufficient re-provision of car parking within the site to accommodate the number of vehicles that required spaces, with surrounding areas having the capacity to accommodate overspill parking.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

- New residents would be restricted from applying for parking permits within the existing CPZ in the vicinity of the site.
- The Committee were informed that the proposal aligned with the Brent Local Development Plan to deliver new affordable homes at sustainable locations and on that basis requested that members approved the application.

Committee members raised queries regarding the level of public consultation, consideration for designated disabled parking and the fire safety risk assessment. Ms Howes clarified the following points in response to the queries raised:

- The applicant felt there had been a good level of public consultation and opportunities for residents to engage as there had been a dedicated consultation website and a newsletter drop to local residents.
- There was currently no dedicated disabled parking on Site A as it was an informal parking area, as the application was not classified as a major development there was no requirement to provide dedicated disabled parking.
- It was confirmed that there was a fire risk assessment in place for the application.

As no further questions were raised, Councillor Ketan Sheth, in his capacity as local ward councillor, was then invited to address the Committee (online). In addressing the Committee Councillor Sheth highlighted the following key points for consideration:

- Although the need for housing was acknowledged Councillor Sheth felt that the application lacked planning merits as well as local support, particularly from the elderly, disabled and vulnerable residents of Rokesby Place that would be detrimentally affected should the application be approved.
- Councillor Sheth felt the loss of amenity space for existing residents was unacceptable and would not be adequately mitigated by the small amount of amenity space that was proposed to replace it.
- Residents felt that the officers parking assessment was inaccurate and the loss of parking spaces would result in many residents, their carers and visitors unable to access Rokesby Place by car.
- Residents rejected the report's assumption that hedgehogs were unlikely to be present in the current amenity area, as they had been observed regularly by a number of residents. In addition to this the loss of mature trees would only add to the negative ecological impacts as a result of the development.
- The report suggested that potential harm caused by this application was justified as two new four-bedroom Council homes would be delivered. The residents do not feel that the limited benefits outweighed the potential harm to existing residents and ecology on the site.
- The application had originally stated that the new homes would be for social rent, however this had now been altered to London Affordable Rent.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

- In summarising his position in support of Rokesby Residents, Councillor Sheth requested that the application was refused as it stood and consideration should be given to Condition 3 of the report to provide the properties at social rent rates.

As a follow up question from the Committee, Councillor Sheth was asked to clarify whether he supported the views of the residents in terms of their rejection of the officers parking assessment based solely on what residents had told him or if he had any first hand experience of the parking issues that supported residents claims that the assessment was incorrect.

Councillor Sheth confirmed that the residents had daily experience of the existing parking issues on Rokesby Place and surrounding roads. In addition to this Councillor Sheth had visited the area many times as a ward councillor and witnessed the lack of availability of street parking, adding that he hoped the Planning Committee would seriously consider the parking issues, particularly in terms of the potential impact on disabled residents.

As members had no further questions for Councillor Sheth, the Chair invited members to ask officers any questions or points of clarification they may have in relation to the application. The Committee raised queries in relation to designated disabled parking bays, amenity space, fire safety, ecological assessments and flood risk. In response to the issues raised by the Committee the following responses were provided:

- Officers advised that due to the small scale of the application there was no duty to provide designated disabled parking spaces for the proposed development and confirmed that any future designated disabled parking spaces in front of 31 and 34 Rokesby Place remained unaffected by the proposed application. In terms of exploring any further adaptations to the kerb and surrounding access to the existing designated disabled bays, the Committee were advised that this was a highways issue that would be picked up outside of Planning Committee.
- In consideration of broader accessibility issues officers agreed to make amendments to condition 15 (hard and soft landscaping scheme) to include the need for consideration to be given to disabled access from within the application sites to the site boundaries, and opportunities to enhance the soft landscaping provision within the private gardens of the new homes.
- Officers advised that the application resulted in the loss of 12 car parking spaces within the car park - Site A and 2 informal spaces within Site B. Five parking spaces would be re-provided within Site B resulting in an overall loss of 9 spaces within the site. However, based on the parking surveys submitted with the application which noted that 3 of these spaces were parked in overnight, the proposal would result in a net gain of 2 spaces.
- Officers confirmed that a Fire Statement had been prepared by independent fire risk consultants, the report confirmed that the location of the fire service vehicle would ensure that the hose length from the fire service vehicle to any point within any room in the dwellings would not exceed 45m. A fire hydrant would be provided within 90 m of the entrance of the dwellings and that as such the overall services and

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

appliance access to the dwelling would be fully compliant with Policy D12A of the London Plan 2021.

- In response to a Committee question regarding the revised area of amenity space, officers advised that Site A would include a new communal amenity space with a proposed rain garden, play trail, amenity grass land and seating. In addition to this there would be 3 new trees and hedge planting. The remaining open space within site B would be enhanced with the re-provision of rotary clothes dryers, seating and informal play equipment. Plans of the proposed application were shown to inform greater visual context of the revised amenity space. Whilst it was acknowledged there would be a net loss of green space, it was felt that the enhancements made to the communal amenity space coupled with the benefits of providing 2 family sized homes outweighed the limited loss of space.
- Officers added that Barham Park was also in close proximity to Rokesby Place at a distance of 120 m to existing homes and 240 m from the new homes.
- Officers confirmed there would be boundary fencing to secure the back of the site.
- In response to a Committee query regarding flood risk the Committee were advised that in line with BSU14 minor schemes should make provision of an appropriate Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) scheme where feasible. Site A and the majority of Site B were in areas identified as low risk of flooding. Sections of Rokesby Place were liable to surface water flooding that extended to small elements of Site B. The drainage strategy submitted demonstrated an improvement in drainage from the current site to achieve a peak flow output of 0.6 l/s for a 1 in 100 year flood event which was in line with greenfield rates. This would be achieved through permeable hard landscaping as well as soft landscaping provision. The scheme also included water butts for irrigation to allow run off from the roof to be re-used.
- The Local Lead Flood Officer had reviewed the Drainage Strategy and found the proposals acceptable.
- Officers advised that in response to queries around the ecological impact assessment there were no structures on site that could be of use to roosting bats. Hedgehogs using the site for foraging and commuting would be supported via condition to include passage gaps for hedgehogs on boundary and any internal landscaping boundaries.
- In response to a Committee query regarding the level of rent of the new properties, officers advised that the properties would be set at London Affordable rent levels, it was recognised that this was higher than social housing rates, however it was highly comparable and accepted as genuinely affordable.

As there were no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report with amendments to condition 15 (hard and soft landscaping scheme) to include the need for consideration to be given to disabled

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

access from within the application sites to the site boundaries, and opportunities to enhance the soft landscaping provision within the private gardens of the new homes.

(Voting on the recommendation was as follows: For 6, Against 2.)

5. **22/0626 – 69 Hardinge Road, London, NW10 3PN**

PROPOSAL

Proposed conversion of single dwelling house into two self contained flats, associated internal alterations, subdivision of rear garden, removal of rear outbuilding, partial removal of side extension, installation of refuse storage and cycle storage in front garden, front boundary treatment, associated hard and soft landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION~:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as detailed in the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated 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.

Lena Summers, Planning Officer, South Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the application proposed the conversion of a single dwelling house into two self contained flats, 1x 1 bed flat and 1x 3 bed flat. Member's attention was drawn to the supplementary report that detailed further objections that had been received from residents who had previously objected. The objections related to the impact of the construction work, the principle of the development, parking and bin and cycle storage. These points had been addressed by officers in the Committee Report consultation section. In addition to this a further condition would be discussed with the Committee with regard to the dwelling not being used as an HMO.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

As no questions were raised by members, the Chair invited Mr Anthony Modeste (objector) to address the Committee (online) in relation to the application. Mr Modeste introduced himself as the home owner of the neighbouring property to 69 Hardinge Road then shared his concerns as follows:

- Historically the residents of 69 Hardinge Road had not adhered to the planning laws or building regulations in relation to previous work carried out on the property.
- The quality of work completed had reportedly been to a poor standard Mr Modeste drew member's attention to the photos he had provided to the Committee that demonstrated the quality of work previously undertaken.
- Concerns was shared that the poor quality of work impacted upon neighbouring properties and potentially their value.
- Due to the poor work that had been previously undertaken, Mr Modeste felt there was encroachment on to the party wall of his property.
- Due to concerns that the applicant was not being transparent with his intentions for the adaptations to the property, Mr Modeste was concerned that the property could become an HMO.
- Mr Modeste felt that the proposed changes to the property would not encourage families to the area as families would not want to live in flats. Mr Modeste raised concerns that this could have a knock on effect on house prices in the area.
- In summarising the concerns raised, Mr Modeste urged the Committee to refuse the approval of planning permission.

The Chair thanked Mr Modeste for his contribution to the Committee before assuring Mr Modeste that if planning permission were approved and building regulations were subsequently not adhered to, enforcement action could be taken by the local authority. In addition to this the Committee were reminded that any effect on housing value was not a material planning consideration.

The Chair then invited Mr Jordan Raoul (objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Mr Raoul introduced himself as the nephew of the previous speaker Mr Modeste, he also resided at the neighbouring property to 69 Hardigne Road. Mr Raoul shared his concerns as follows:

- If planning permission were approved it would uncharacteristically change the suburban family orientated character of the area.
- Additionally the architectural character of the area would change, setting a precedent for more family sized homes to be converted in to smaller dwellings. Concerns were shared that this would be in conflict with Brent's Local Plan to build more family sized homes.
- The existing party wall had been obstructed by the poor quality work previously undertaken by the applicant at 69 Hardinge Road.
- Mr Raoul queried how the PTAL 3 rating would be affected if there were an influx of people due to more developments such as the one applied for being constructed, encouraging overcrowding to the area and putting more pressure on local transport.

The Chair thanked Mr Raoul for his contributions to the meeting before inviting the final speaker on the item, Mr Mark Pender, PPM Planning (applicant's agent) to

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

address the Committee (online) in relation to the application. Mr Pender raised the following key points:

- The applicant had addressed the reasons for refusal of the previous application that was refused on the grounds that it did not provide adequate external amenity space.
- A communal garden had been part of the original plans, however this had been dismissed due to issues of privacy and overlooking from the ground floor flat.
- The revised scheme presented to Planning Committee remedied both issues. Each flat now had a private garden in excess of required standards. The 1 bed ground floor flat garden measured 22m² (20m² was the requirement) and the garden for the family unit measured 59m² (50m² was the requirement).
- As a result of providing private gardens for each flat, the privacy issue had been removed.
- In conclusion, taking account of the appeal decision and Policy BH11 of the Brent Local Plan 2022, the principle was acceptable. The inspector's concerns related to private amenity space and privacy concerns had been successfully addressed and on this basis the Committee were encouraged to approve Planning permission.

As there were no Committee questions for the agent, the Chair invited Committee members to ask officers any clarifying questions they may have. Officers had one query regarding how the council would stop either of the flats becoming HMO's. In response officers confirmed that a condition would be imposed limiting both dwellings from becoming HMO's. If the applicant wanted to use either dwelling as an HMO a separate planning application would have to be made. If either dwelling was found to be used as an HMO without going through planning permission procedures, enforcement action would be taken.

As there were no further questions from members and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and additional conditions that were verbally updated within the meeting, to ensure the demolition of the existing outbuilding and to prevent the properties from being converted into small HMOs without planning permission.

(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous.)

6. 22/1177 – 135 Salusbury Road, NW6 6RJ

PROPOSAL

Erection of a new commercial building to provide flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class E), together with soft and hard landscaping, cycle and car parking and associated works.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

RECOMMENDATION~:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as detailed in the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated 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.

Lena Summers, Planning Officer, South Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the application site was located to the rear of the NW Works within Quadrant Business Centre, which comprised of 58,000 sqm of commercial floor space and 12 residential units. The site was currently being used as a car park and was not situated within a Conservation Area. Member's attention was drawn to an amendment to one of the conditions to allow the applicant to start the foundations work before the materials were submitted.

As there were no questions for the officers at this stage, the Chair invited Mr Peter Rhodes OBE (objector) to address the Committee (online) in relation to the application. Mr Rhodes introduced himself and informed the Committee that he was representing 9 of the flat owners/residents of Quantic House, the residential building located within NW Works. It was noted that the 2 flats not represented were owned by the applicant. The following key points were shared:

- Residents felt there had been a lack of consideration and consultation with Quantic House residents, particularly in light of them sharing the same vehicular and pedestrian gated access off Salusbury Road.
- Quantic House had experienced serious security issues that residents feared would be exacerbated if the new development was approved. The issues involved unauthorised distribution of the gate codes by non-residential personnel, this had resulted in multiple thefts and attempts to break in to resident's cars on the Quantic House car park.
- Residents were concerned that the additional distribution of the gate codes required during the construction phase of the development and to the future commercial tenants would undoubtedly exacerbate the security risk to the residents of Quantic House and their property.
- Waste issues were highlighted as a problem for residents as commercial tenants were using the Quantic House residential rubbish

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

storage, causing an overflow to the private waste disposal area. The erection of a new development in NW Works and the presence of additional tenants would worsen the issue.

- Residents were unhappy with the loss of 18 car parking spaces for the business centre due to concerns that this would increase unauthorised parking in the Quantic House Private car park.
- In summarising residents' concerns, the Committee heard that residents felt that the applicant would not satisfy Policy D3, subsection 4 of the London Plan and would breach BT2 of Brent's Local Plan. On the basis of the issues raised, the Committee were asked to reject the application due to the detrimental impact the development would have on the existing residents of Quantic House.

The Chair thanked Mr Rhodes OBE for his representation, as the Committee had no questions, the final speaker Mr Lewis Westhoff, ICENI Projects, (agent) was invited to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. The following key points were shared with the Committee:

- The Committee heard that since the applicant acquired the site in 2019 approximately £2.5 million had been invested in improving the area, the scheme formed part of the applicants Queens Park property portfolio and would complement the existing buildings on site.
- It was noted that the scheme aimed to provide sustainable commercial workspace with sustainable materials being utilised where possible, this included the use of timber frames, reclaimed bricks and roof tiles, PV panels and the use of openable windows for increased natural ventilation.
- In addition to the use of sustainable materials the scheme would promote sustainable travel by providing cycle parking and electric vehicle charging.
- The scheme would create approximately 35 new jobs and have no adverse impact on the neighbouring properties or existing tenants of Quantic House.
- The scheme was fully policy compliant with council design guidance and BRE daylight/sunlight requirements.
- The Committee were assured that there was currently surplus parking available, therefore the loss of 18 parking spaces would not adversely affect commercial users or residents as there would still be sufficient spaces.
- On the basis that the scheme would provide high quality, sustainable commercial space without negatively impacting the local area, it was requested that the Planning Committee approve the application.

The Chair thanked Mr Westhoff for addressing the Committee and asked members if they had any questions or points of clarification they would like to raise. Mr Westhoff provided the following responses to the questions raised:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

- It was confirmed that the site was listed as 135 Salusbury Road as this was where the access point was located historically the site had been referred to as Quadrant Business Centre.
- Although the current site was hardstanding and there would be no net loss of bio diversity, the applicants recognised the limited opportunities to enhance greening as there was limited capacity due to the space needed to create a vehicular turning head within the development and roof space was also limited due to the PV panels on the roof. Positively the plans featured a centralised seating area where there would be some existing trees and planters added where possible.
- In response to a query regarding light pollution in to rear facing gardens, the Committee were advised that lighting in the commercial units used would be on timers therefore after office hours there would be no issues of light spill.

As there were no further questions for the agent, the Chair invited Committee members to ask any questions or points of clarification they may have to the officers. Members had queries related to greening and the concerns raised by neighbouring residents in relation to safety. The following responses were provided by officers:

- Following a member question regarding how the scheme could enhance the appearance of greening, the Committee were advised that the trees in Winchester Garden, to the North of the site would be retained and added visible greening to the scheme. Members were shown a CGI and photos to give visual context of the greening.
- Cllr Kabir made a suggestion to consider the colour of the building and its materials to overcome the lack of green planting proposed.
- The case officer noted that no planting was proposed due to the constraints of the site and the Chair highlighted that he considered the design of the building was acceptable.
- In addition to this members noted that during their site visit there was consideration of green walls and additional planting and the area of proposed planters on site is shown in the CGI.
- In response to the concerns raised by residents in terms of unauthorised access to the gated residential area, officers confirmed that they had noted their concerns and the times and conditions around entry of construction workers to the site would be managed via a construction management plan. General access remained a private matter for consideration of the estate management.

The Chair thanked officers for their responses and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report

(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous.)

7. Any Other Urgent Business

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 August 2022

None.

The meeting closed at 8:11pm.

COUNCILLOR KELCHER

Chair