

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

**Supplementary Report to EXECUTIVE  
22nd September 2003**

FROM THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

FOR ACTION

NAME OF WARDS  
TOKYNTON  
WEMBLEY CENTRAL

**REPORT TITLE : SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO WEMBLEY DEVELOPMENT  
FRAMEWORK: CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND APPROVAL AS SUPPLEMENTARY  
PLANNING GUIDANCE**

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 On 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2003, the Executive will consider the Wembley Development Framework for adoption as Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- 1.2 The consultation period for the Framework document expired on the 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2003, which was clearly stated in the letter, and the results of that consultation set out in a report to Executive. The Framework document has been amended to address appropriate comments.
- 1.3 A number of comments, however, arrived after the deadline, and this report sets out the substantive comments received.

## **2.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE CONSULTATION DEADLINE**

- 2.1 Comments have been received from the Greater London Authority (GLA), Barton Willmore, who are acting on behalf of the owners of the RE International site, also called the South Way site, and from the London Borough of Harrow.
- 2.2 The GLA have written, noting that their earlier comments had been generally addressed and endorsing the document as an Opportunity Area Framework to the Mayor's draft London Plan.
- 2.3 While RE International welcomed the emergence of the Framework in principle, they raised a number of concerns. The more general comments related to:
  - Matters of procedure
  - The extent of the consultation period
  - The role of the document as SPG
  - Referencing the planning submission by REI in the document
  - Reference to demands on specific sites
  - The master plan as a delivery mechanism

These points mainly relate to matters of procedure which are set out in the Framework document, or greater emphasis of the RE International site. The master

plan applies to the area as a whole and does not single out particular sites for guidance. The production of an agreed master plan for the area will enable planning applications for individual sites to come forward which should accord with the master plan. It is not appropriate for planning applications to be determined before the master plan has been approved.

- 2.4 There were a number of detailed comments which have been noted but do not warrant changes to the Framework.
- 2.5 The London Borough of Harrow acknowledges that the development of the stadium and surrounding area is one of the “most important regeneration initiatives in NW London”. They suggest that this must be achieved sustainably by maximising use of public transport which is an important principle of the Framework.
- 2.6 In terms of retail, Harrow considers the additional wording, particularly in relation to the integration of development with the town centre to be “helpful”. They are still concerned about the extent of potential car-borne traffic for the development but welcome the major improvements to the stations.
- 2.7 Lastly, concerns were expressed that views to the Stadium would not be compromised with high buildings competing with the structure.

### **3.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That there are no further changes to the Framework Document

**Richard Saunders**  
**Director of Environment**

**Chris Walker**  
**Director of Planning**