

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

EXECUTIVE
22nd September 2003

FROM THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

FOR ACTION

NAME OF WARDS
TOKYNGTON
WEMBLEY CENTRAL

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

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Wembley Development Framework sets out the Council's planning requirements for the production of a master plan for the area surrounding the new English National Stadium, including the Comprehensive Development Area. It provides a more detailed interpretation of Brent's vision document – Our Vision for a New Wembley and of Wembley related policies within the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, as modified following the Inspectors Report.
- 1.2 This report updates Members on the changes made to the Development Framework, in consultation with our partners the GLA and LDA and seeks approval to adopt the Framework as Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- 1.3 The report also summarises the results of the broad public consultation round which was undertaken in 2001, which included our partners and other stakeholders involved in the now defunct Wembley Task Force, and the consultation rounds in March 2003 and August/September 2003

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Executive notes the responses of the public consultation exercise.
- 2.2 That the Executive adopts the attached Wembley Development Framework (Appendix C) as Supplementary Planning Guidance pursuant to the emerging Unitary Development Plan
- 2.3 That Executive notes that this must be read in conjunction with the Adopted and Emerging Unitary Development Plan.
- 2.4 That Executive authorises the Director of Environment to publish an illustrated version, with any minor editorial amendments as necessary.

3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The Council's financial commitment associated with the production of the document will be met by the existing budget of the Planning Service. Detailed costs will depend on the nature of the final document and it is intended that these may be shared with our partners.

4.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no additional staffing requirements arising as a result of the recommendations of this report.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Development Framework has a number of positive environmental implications. It seeks the redevelopment of the area to create a destination that is principally served by public transport, minimising the need for car borne travel. Additionally, the Framework promotes the regeneration of Wembley based on the principle for a mixed use development, including residential, to create a sustainable development where people can live, work and find recreation within the same area, reducing people's need to travel.

6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The framework for the planning system is contained within the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 54A of the Act requires that an application be determined in accordance with the Council's Plan (UDP) unless other material planning considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The principles of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) are recognised in central government publications (Planning Policy Guidance 1 and 12) as a way of covering detailed issues that support and supplement the policies within the Council's UDP.
- 6.3 Unlike the Unitary Development Plan SPG is not a statutory document but is a material consideration in determining planning applications and appeals.
- 6.4 The weight afforded to SPG when making decisions is increased if it derives out of and is consistent with the UDP and has been subjected to public consultation, and subsequently formally adopted by the Executive.
- 6.5 At present, the UDP is the adopted UDP 1996. However, as the Revised UDP 2000-2010 is about to be adopted shortly (and will then replace the 1996 Plan), it is appropriate to refer to the policies in the Revised Plan in the Framework document. Therefore, the Framework will only carry full weight once the Revised UDP is formally adopted. Prior to this, it will still carry some weight, as it would still be a material consideration. Some of the amendments that have been made to the Framework stem from the further proposed modifications to the Revised UDP (on which there is a separate report on this agenda). These relate to how development east of Wembley town centre would need to be considered. In adopting the Framework as SPG the Council cannot prejudge the outcome of the publication of

these further modifications and would need to consider any objections to these on their merits. If any proposed modifications which form the basis for amendments to the Framework were in the event not incorporated in the Revised UDP when adopted, then the passages in the Framework which contained amendments would carry little, if any weight.

- 6.6 Accordingly, the preparation of the Wembley Development Framework is not a legal requirement, but its adoption as Supplementary Guidance, will give greater weight to the Council's development objectives in the consideration of any planning applications. Its purpose is to provide detailed guidance on development within the Framework area and to guide the master plan process to achieve a comprehensive approach to the land around the National Stadium. The Framework will form a 'material consideration' in the assessment of any planning application.

7.0 DETAIL

Background statement

- 7.1 In December 2000, Members were asked to approve a draft copy of the Wembley Development Framework for consultation. This was duly undertaken, and the results of this exercise are set out below. The process of approving the Framework, however, was temporarily stalled while the financing of the stadium was under consideration. Additionally, and following the UDP Inquiry, the Council received the Inspectors report, which influenced aspects of the delivery of the Framework. Finally, and in response to the need for a more robust policy position, the Framework was required to take account of a study examining the link with the town centre. Changes have subsequently been made to accommodate this and other comments, and these are set out in more detail in paragraph 7.8 below. In general, however, the issues addressed by the Framework have remained largely unchanged.

Extent of consultation

- 7.2 The public consultation was initially conducted for a six-week period, between the 19th February and the 31st March 2001. Just under 200 documents with a covering letter inviting comments were sent out to residents, businesses and Councillors. A summary sheet, outlining the purpose of the document, the vision for the area and the principles for development accompanied the framework document. A copy of the summary sheet/leaflet is appended (see Appendix A).
- 7.3 Following the initial consultation, a small number of residents associations and businesses requested further copies of the Framework and leaflet to assist them in their consultation exercise. Additionally, a short presentation was made to the Wembley Area Consultative Forum on 20th March 2001.

Summary of responses: 2001

- 7.4 There were 19 responses received mainly from Landowners and organisations with a direct interest in the area. A summary list of respondents and their comments is attached at Appendix B.

7.5 The main points arising from the consultation can be grouped as follows:

Phasing

- A number of comments related to the perceived requirement to complete the development in one go. However, although the Framework requires a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the Comprehensive Development Area, the Framework has always recognised that phasing will be likely. It is listed as a requirement of the master plan in Chapter 7. What the Framework does require, however, is that a high quality public realm linking the stadium to the stations is provided as part of the first phase of development, including a high quality High Road link.. Additionally, and depending on the content of the first phase, it will also be important for the initial sites to meet accessibility criteria for all transport modes both in the interim, as well as final planned circulation and movement routes. This may well involve commitment to the provision of improved transport infrastructure in parallel with an implementation programme.

Listed Buildings

- Concern was expressed by landowners at the position taken within the document regarding the listed buildings. This was considered to be too onerous. The suggested alternative was to set out the criteria that would need to be met, as laid out in PPG 15, whereby alternative approaches to the existing structures would be considered, including alteration or demolition. English Heritage, on the other hand, sought the strengthening of the guidance and the inclusion of the footprint of all the listed buildings within the Framework drawings. The Councils position accords with Government planning guidance as set out in PPG 15, but recognises that the future context of a new high density urban quarter is considerably different to the lakes and open character that was the original setting in the Empire Exhibition of the 1920's. Whilst the Arena continues to be well used, the long term viability of the use of some of the other listed buildings and structures is questionable.

Transportation

- Concern was expressed about a number of transport related issues including comments on the potentially constraining nature of the Council's car parking standards, that the document placed too much emphasis on road users, and that the scale of infrastructure requirements might discourage potential developers. The Council's car parking standards reflect the high public transport accessibility of the area and the requirement generally to reduce the reliance on car borne transport. The document, however, recognises that an element of car parking will be required for regenerative purposes and to serve a significant retail element in the scheme. The scale of infrastructure requirements will be proportional to the scale and content of development proposals.

Retail

- There were a number of comments relating to retail development, in particular the proposed location of any retail use and the size and nature of this element. The Framework needs to demonstrate that a scheme with any significant retail or leisure element will not conflict with national planning guidance. This requires such uses to be developed according to a sequential approach, i.e. that

sites in town centres should be developed before edge of centre and then out of town sites. Development within the Framework area will be considered to be an extension of the town centre providing that the seamless link with the High Road forms part of the proposals.

Planning obligations

- Comments have generally been about the scale of the S106 obligations and the prematurity of quoting potential figures within the document. The scale of the planning requirements will inevitably relate to the scale of the development proposed and the content of the scheme. For developments that contain high trip generating uses, the requirements for transport infrastructure will be more significant and may incorporate improvements to the access roads, junctions and connections to the North Circular. It is considered useful to quote the figures produced as part of the feasibility work by the Task Force consultants because these give some indication of the possible magnitude of the improvements that may be required. As with the stadium planning brief the Council considers it useful to quote the figures produced.

Update

- 7.6 Following the announcement in 2001 of delays to the Stadium project, the revised draft Development Framework was put on hold. Work subsequently recommenced after news that the new English National Stadium would go ahead and when the Council had received the Inspectors comments on the UDP Public Inquiry, which took place in May 2002. These were received in November 2002, and clarify positions on some of the key policies affecting Wembley, with potential implications for the Framework.
- 7.7 One of the main changes affecting the framework is the recommendation by the Inspector to relax our requirement for a single planning application for the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA). This was required in order to provide a co-ordinated setting for the stadium, including addressing the significant level changes across the site. Additionally, a single application would have provided a more straightforward means to identify the infrastructure requirements arising from the development and the contributions required to implement them. The Inspector, however, has recommended that the co-ordination of development should be secured through a master plan guiding one or a number of planning applications for the framework area. The master plan, which in this instance is being driven by the major land owner in the CDA, will demonstrate how the different sites within the area will be developed.
- 7.8 There have been a number of other changes to policy context since the development Framework was originally produced, including:
- the publication of the Wembley Vision document which sets out the Councils aspirations for Wembley
 - the formation of the Greater London Authority, the London Development Agency and Transport for London. These are all key agencies for the regeneration of Wembley and have been consulted in the revisions to the framework.

- Wembley Plc sold their interests in the land surrounding the stadium to Quintain plc, and the Council is in discussions with this company over the redevelopment of their land and adjacent sites.
- The commissioning of a feasibility study to link the two areas of regeneration focus – the town centre and the area surrounding the stadium.

Revised Framework 2003

7.9 The Framework has been amended where appropriate to take account of the comments resulting from the consultation round in March this year, subsequent discussions with our partners and the latest wide ranging consultation round at the end of the summer. A copy of the revised document is attached at Appendix C.

7.10 The major changes are:

Section	Sub Heading	Change
1 Introduction	Introduction	Rewritten and shortened with reference to the delivery mechanism – the master plan
2 Background	Background	Shortening section,
	Planning Policy context	Reference to PPG 13 and Mayors Draft London Plan. Now reflects Inspectors comments on UDP and proposed modifications. Reference to the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, the Examination in Public of the London Plan and the Panels recommendation,
3 The vision	Vision	Incorporating text from Vision document
	Principles for Development	Strengthen principles of designing out opportunities for crime.
4 Land uses	Preferred Uses	Reflect vision document
	Retail	Adding paragraph on the need for retail, and the considerations in applying the sequential test.
	Residential.	Proposed design should avoid conflict with stadium operation
	Development Scenarios	Addition to land use section A further section on Delivery and timing.
5 Physical structure	General	Minor reordering of chapter
	Street structure	Clarity on street furniture within public realm. Additional points for consideration on Olympic Way section Removal of bridge link proposal from Olympic Way to concourse – too prescriptive. Rewriting of High Road link section
	Built form and visual structure	Clarity on views.
6 Transport infrastructure	Strategy, policies & proposals	Reference to new policy guidance, travel plans
	Highways	Minimising temporary traffic management during events.
7 Requirements	Requirements	Changes to reflect inspectors comments

		that the Framework informs a master plan
	The master plan	Clarity on purpose, and form of master plan
		Clarity on areas and the related requirements
	Planning Applications	Insert information on parts of framework area fall within an indicative floodplain and may require Flood Risk Assessments.
	Section 106	S106 requirements will be related to scale of development proposed.
	Land Acquisition Approach	Incorporation of a new section on land acquisition
	Phasing	New sub heading on phasing.

There are also a number of minor changes.

- 7.11 The current version of the document has been consulted on widely, both within the Council, and with certain key stakeholders. This has involved regular meetings with key agencies including the Greater London Authority, London Development Agency and Transport for London, and ongoing pre-application discussions with the major developer throughout the year. As a result the Development Framework now more accurately reflects the evolution of policy guidance and current development proposals. Nevertheless a further round of formal consultation was undertaken at the end of the summer and the comments received summarised in Appendix D and changes (where appropriate) incorporated into document.

Next steps

- 7.12 On Executive's agreement to the recommendations, the document will be published and will be distributed to the major landowners, the master planners and interested parties as Supplementary Planning Guidance. This will be in the public arena from the date of approval and will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.

8.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

8.1 Details of Documents:

- (i) Brent's Replacement Unitary Development Plan: Revised Deposit Draft 2000
- (ii) Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15)
- (iii) The UDP Public Inquiry Inspectors Report 2002
- (iv) The Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit version of the UDP 2001, June 2003

Appendices to Report

- A. Summary Leaflet
- B. Summary of Consultation Responses
- C. Wembley Development Framework: Final Revised Draft v 21
- D. Summary of Consultation Responses 2003

8.2 Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Robin Buckle, Brent Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex HA9 6BZ, Telephone: 0208 937 5249
E-Mail robin.buckle@brent.gov.uk

Richard Saunders
Director of Environment

Chris Walker
Director of Planning