

Appendix Two

Revised Wembley Masterplan and Investment and Infrastructure Framework Representations and the council's proposed responses

15 June 2009

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM001	John N Hambury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Wembley must have a leisure centre with gym, 30m swimming pool, sports hall, affordable café & bar in a single building to promote the integration of cultural and demographic diversity. b) Wembley Leisure Centre must be near to Wembley Park Station 	<p>a)& b) The evidence gathered from a detailed study of the infrastructure needs of existing and future residents has identified the need for a minimum of a 25m 6 lane swimming pool, a new sports hall and 2 gymnasiums. This is clearly set out in Section 3.1 under the heading 'Indoor Sports Facilities'. The desire to have all of these facilities located in a single building is supported and an indicative location, close to Wembley Park has been shown on the land use concept (Section 3.1) and within the North West District Brief (Section 4.1). However, the Council is not a major landowner in the Masterplan area, therefore it cannot fully control the location and character of such facilities.</p>	No Change Necessary.
RWM002	Martin Francis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Concerned transport strategy is improving access for cars b) Disagrees with reconnection of North End Road c) Supports variety of green spaces and greening Wealdstone Brook d) Supports variety of play spaces and "passive" parks e) Inadequate answer to comments from Quintain and GOL regarding premature adoption of masterplan prior to Core Strategy. f) LBB must seriously take Quintain's statement on unrealistic delivery plan. g) The masterplan ignores the current economic crisis and future pressure on future government finances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The overarching focus of the transport strategy (stated in Section 3.2 under heading 'A Strategy for Movement and Connection') is to put pedestrians and cyclists at the top of the hierarchy of road users. b) The re-connection of North End Road to Bridge Road is one of a number of recommendations taken from the transportation study that will need to be implemented if the area is to function successfully in the future. As well as easing vehicular traffic it will allow more legible connections for pedestrians and cyclists alike. c) Support Noted d) Support Noted e) The Council is continuing with the current timetable for adoption of the Masterplan because, despite the economic downturn, there are still significant development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No Change necessary b) No Change necessary c) No Change necessary d) No Change necessary e) No Change necessary f) No Change necessary g) No Change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
			<p>pressures within the area. It is considered critical that the Council has guidance in place that sets out the expectations for community infrastructure and development parameters, otherwise it may be difficult to realise the wider benefits of piecemeal development.</p> <p>f) The Council regards Quintain as a partner in bringing forward the regeneration of this area. Therefore serious consideration, as part of regular consultation with Quintain has been undertaken. The Council's IIF demonstrates that the masterplan is completely infrastructure deliverable</p> <p>g) The Masterplan is designed to be a document for the long term regeneration of Wembley. Although the current short term economic climate is somewhat pessimistic, development is likely to gather pace in years to come. If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that many of the future benefits would come forward. While the Council will seek government funding over the 20 years+ development period and a multi-million pond development, this will be very modest.</p>	
RWM003	Keith Thompson	<p>a) The plan has the right overall vision and tries to address the needs in the area</p> <p>b) Phased approach is needed for implementation as when suitable specific proposals are received and finance clearly available</p>	<p>a) Support noted</p> <p>b) Section 5 of the Masterplan sets out an indicative phasing plan for development in the long term.</p>	<p>a) No Change necessary</p> <p>b) No Change necessary</p>
RWM004	S Tang	<p>a) North End Road should remain closed.</p> <p>b) The roads on event day are closed off trapping residents in.</p> <p>c) Engineers Way should remain opened.</p> <p>d) Buses 92 and PR2 should keep moving during and after events.</p> <p>e) A road should be kept open at all times</p>	<p>a) The re-connection of North End Road to Bridge Road is one of a number of recommendations taken from the transportation study that will need to be implemented if the area is to function successfully in the future.</p> <p>b) One of the significant benefits of re-connecting North End Road is that it will</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) No change necessary</p> <p>d) No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
			<p>enable residents and businesses to move much more freely on event days.</p> <p>c) There is no intention to close Engineers Way for vehicular movement, but the aspiration is to use traffic calming measures in order to significantly enhance the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>d) The intention will be to keep bus routes moving as much as possible on event days. The opening up of North End Road will help to facilitate this.</p> <p>e) The re-connection of North End Road will make it possible to maintain a route for east-west movement at all times.</p>	e) No change necessary
RWM005	Adrian Calnan	a) Two way traffic would require a new junction at Fourth Way/ Fifth Way - how this might impact on businesses in the areas.	a) It is envisaged that junction improvements and the re-introduction of two way movement will enable businesses to function more efficiently, allowing easier movement around the industrial estate and out to the wider area. Proposals to enhance the pedestrian environment will make the area more attractive for current businesses and future investors in the area.	a) No change necessary
RWM006	Stephen Halliwell	a) Not clear those contained in the masterplan are ambitions rather than actual plans. The document is unlikely to be adopted by developers	a) The Masterplan is designed as a flexible guidance document which should be a material consideration for anyone looking to develop within the area. The plans are an indicative representation of the form of development that is likely to come forward. The IIF demonstrates that the ambitious plans are deliverable and affordable to developers.	a) No change necessary
RWM007	Harvey Pollins	<p>a) A consultation should be listened to.</p> <p>b) There should be lots of consultations with local residents associations.</p> <p>c) Questions source of funding for those grand schemes.</p>	<p>a) The aim of this process is for the Council to be transparent in its approach to consultation and give a formal response to all representations.</p> <p>b) The Council has undertaken two consultation periods in which a range of different meetings and events have been organised, including those with local residents associations.</p> <p>c) Funding for the range of community</p>	No change necessary b

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p><u>Opening North End Road</u></p> <p>d) The majority of residents in North End Road are not in favour of the road being open.</p> <p>e) On event days there will be substantial traffic congestion in the Bridge Road area and all routes to and from it.</p> <p>f) If it is opened it is likely that the residential properties in the road will be devalued. Questions if the Council considering compensating the home owners.</p> <p><u>Building additional Hotels</u></p> <p>g) There should be consultation with the current hoteliers before going ahead. The existing hotels currently have plenty of vacancies.</p> <p><u>Wembley Masterplan Budget and Deliverability</u></p> <p>h) Quintain have stated publicly that, in their opinion, the Wembley Masterplan is undeliverable for the budget available.</p> <p><u>Wembley LIVE / Swimming pools</u></p> <p>i) Concerned that the council tax payers will end up having to pay for these facilities.</p>	<p>infrastructure will come from a range of different sources, including developers, regional and central government. See comments on RWM001.</p> <p>d) Disagree - Only 70 (less than a quarter) out of 328 residential units registered their objections in this round of consultation.</p> <p>e) Most of the traffic using Stadium car parks on event days uses Great Central Way and traffic is diverted back to Great Central Way during dispersal.</p> <p>f) This is no evidence to support this assertion and is not a consideration just as appreciation of valuation by improving Wembley will not be returned to the Council.</p> <p>g) A hotel study is being carried out to look at the current and future hotel market. Current hoteliers in the area are being consulted. The Council is currently experiencing considerable planning interest in new hotels in the Wembley area indicating that the private sector considers this type of development to be attractive in Wembley.</p> <p>h) The Council's IIF demonstrates that the Masterplan is completely infrastructure deliverable. The Masterplan is designed to be a document for the long term regeneration of Wembley. Although the current short term economic climate is somewhat pessimistic, development is likely to gather pace in years to come. If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that many of the future benefits would come forward.</p> <p>i) The Masterplan is clear about funding sources in Section 5.0 "Implementation. The Infrastructure and Investment Framework also indicates the possible sources of funding and</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>j) Suggests that the consultation phase should be extended to allow more interaction between local residents' associations, businesses and Brent Council.</p> <p>k) The Wembley Masterplan will take many years to complete. Believes that the Wembley Masterplan should be right and supported locally - not another "Chalkhill disaster" on a much larger scale.</p>	<p>timescale. It shows that the gap between requirements and funds only appears at the end of the development period post 2017 and is relatively modest in relation to the scale of development. This does allow the Council to seek other sources of funding given that any Council commitments will of necessity be within its own affordability criteria.</p> <p>j) The Council has carried out two phases of consultation and has provided sufficient opportunity to consider local views.</p> <p>k) It may not be possible to get complete local support on all issues but most residents do want better retail and other facilities in the area.</p>	
RWM008	Ms J Daniel	<p>a) Dislikes clear balconies where clutter can always be seen</p> <p>b) Public transport has hugely been improved. More use of public transport should be encouraged rather than making roads accessible to cars.</p>	<p>a) The nature of materials and management of individual buildings is not within the scope of a masterplan document.</p> <p>b) The public transport improvements that have already been undertaken have dramatically enhanced accessibility in the area. To build upon the improvements to train and underground stations the Masterplan recommends significantly enhanced bus services throughout the area. There is still a need to make places more accessible for vehicles, because they are still a large part of everyday life, however this plan aims to make public transport a much more attractive option than use of private cars.</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p>
RWM009	Metropolitan Police Authority (CgMs)	<p>a) 3.1 - Recommend to change the wording to "Quintain's Stage 1 scheme will provide a number of new facilities that will serve the Masterplan area as a whole (e.g. health centre and employment portal) but there are other types of community facilities that are deficient, including <u>policing facilities</u>, in this locality and this will need to be addressed.</p> <p>b) Eastern Lands District -The Masterplan should comply with Policy 3B.4 of the London Plan to allow social</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Currently the Council's view is that social and other infrastructure can be delivered within the Masterplan area not including the land currently designated as Strategic Industrial Location. Some employment land - the First Way Area and Watkin Roads for example is allocated for a mix of uses and it meets the requirement of the London Plan. However it is not necessary to</p>	<p>a) Sentence added in Section 3.1 "The increase in population and intensification of development may require additional policing facilities/floor space</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		infrastructure and facilities to reuse surplus employment land. Suggest the wording: The district comprise an area of concentrated employment use and will continue to be so. <u>However it is considered that the potential for alternative uses such as social infrastructure (which includes policing facilities) should be recognised where it can be demonstrated the existing use is not required, or has been adequately replaced in the locality</u>	designate any further land east of the First Way area for non-employment uses. This land is not considered surplus for demand for industrial warehousing uses.	in order to ensure continued effective policing of the area. b) No change necessary
RWM010	Mrs Zarate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Fears the masterplan has nothing for families. b) The area would sole consist of ugly, overcrowding and poorly constructed tower blocks designed by 3rd rate architects. c) Reckons residents' voice will be ignored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Masterplan proposes a range of residential accommodation, including a significant amount of family housing (Section 3.1 under heading 'Residential uses') with associated facilities and children's play space, sports and other community facilities. b) Section 3.6 'Design Quality and Ambition' sets out a range of principles that will need no be considered whilst assessing any new development within the area. There are a range of measures prescribed within Section 5.3 'Delivering Design Quality' that will ensure that architects will be challenged to deliver great buildings. c) The aim of this process is for the Council to be transparent in its approach to consultation and give a formal response to all representations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No change necessary b) No change necessary c) No change necessary
RWM011	Rami	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The design of all the buildings in the area must be co-ordinated b) Proposes another station near IKEA and Tesco 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The fundamental purpose of the Masterplan is to co-ordinate development in order to achieve the desired objectives and overall vision for Wembley. b) The requirement for a new station has not been assessed as it is outside of the scope of this document. The Council will continue to seek, through its Core Strategy, improvements to orbital transport routes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No change necessary b) No change necessary
RWM012	Oliver L Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A cinema and an ice rink should be considered b) An indoor sports complex for badminton, basketball, indoor soccer should be included. c) Priority should be given to sports facilities for young 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is a cinema already proposed as part of Quintain's Stage 1 proposals. There may be potential for an ice rink as the masterplan recognises the need for other large scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No change necessary b) No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		people.	<p>visitor attractions in suitable locations.</p> <p>b) Section 3.1 under heading 'Indoor Sports Facilities' states the requirement for a new sports hall in which such activities could take place.</p> <p>c) Section 3.1 under heading 'Open Space' sets out the requirements for open space, particularly in relation to play space and facilities for young people.</p>	c) No change necessary
RWM013	Derek Conway	a) Masterplan should be re-named as it runs alongside words as holocaust and genocide.	a) The word 'Masterplan' is recognised by central government and the built environment professions as the most appropriate term for such a document. The structure of this document has been informed by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment's document entitled 'Creating Successful Masterplans' (CABE, 2008)	a) No change necessary
RWM014	Viviana Lignelli	a) The whole bus route seems to be limited to improve Wembley and surroundings with no one route reaching Central London.	a) As most bus journeys are local and the best chance of getting people to switching journeys from car is by improving orbital routes, the masterplan concentrates on improving local and orbital route. These nevertheless connect to routes such as the 18 that runs to Central London. Note that fast radial train routes to Central London are already very good.	a) No change necessary
RWM015	Natural England	<p>a) It needs to refer to all Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation within and adjacent to the Masterplan Area to ensure that ecological corridors between these sites are maintained, created and enhanced.</p> <p>b) Open Space Strategy for Wembley - Propose to include an additional core principle: the need to increase natural areas within the development and ensure that open spaces are designed to encourage biodiversity.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted</p>	a) & b) Sentence included "The need to increase natural areas within the development and ensure that open spaces are designed to encourage biodiversity will also be a principal consideration." Ecological corridors will be maintained in the

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
				masterplan area.
RWM016	Irene Sharp/Jade Sharp	Propose the following facilities to create a community atmosphere: a) A community hall b) An Olympic sized swimming pool with baby and toddler facilities c) Facilities to teach canoeing and scuba diving d) A gym and a decent supervised area for young children to play e) A large health centre with a minor accident unit. f) A community infant school for workers and new residents	a) Section 3.1 under 'Other Community Facilities' there is a requirement for 370m ² of community space per 100 residents. This would include facilities such as community halls. b) c) d) The evidence gathered from a detailed study of the infrastructure needs of existing and future residents has identified the need for a minimum of a 25m 6 lane swimming pool with a learner pool, a new sports hall and 2 gymnasiums. e) There will be a health centre provided as part of Quintains approved proposals. f) Section 3.1 under 'Education' states a requirement for up to 4 forms of entry primary school within the area.	No change necessary
RWM017	Transport for London	a) Welcomes LBB's approach of actively seeking to engage TfL in the masterplanning process. b) Segregation of users may be necessary for safety and accessibility reasons c) A level of service will need to be established to inform the design and specification of walking and cycling routes. d) The masterplan should seek to promote more sustainable modes of travel and demand management for movement of both people and goods. e) LBB should explore the possibility for an estate management company to oversee travel plan measures and manage a site wide consolidation strategy for servicing and delivery. f) TfL Freight Unit could advise on specific freight and delivery techniques. g) Requests that car parking charges and leasing of parking spaces be added to the proposed funding streams for public transport improvements. h) Welcome discussions with LB Brent on the proposed "Investment and Development Framework", Transport Strategy Review and further transportation studies.	a) Noted b) Shared surface areas within the Masterplan have been restricted primarily to the more minor, internal street network, with the exception of the intersection of Olympic Way with Fulton Road and Engineers Way. c) The Council intends to do more detailed design work outside of the masterplan. d) Charges made as a result of the possibility of a hub is set out. e) Noted f) Noted g) The Council is considering a trip generation based standard charge to assist public transport improvements. This will be part of the amended SPD on s106 standard charge. h) Noted	a) No change necessary b) No change necessary c) No change necessary d) See Section 3.2 e) Bullet added in Section 3.2 under 'Servicing' f) Bullet added in Section 3.2 under 'Servicing' g) No change necessary h) No change necessary
RWM018	Palmbest Ltd (dpp)	Palmbest Ltd (subsidiary of Bestway (Holdings) Ltd) owns the Canon Trading Estate.	a) Agree b) Test and plan checked	a) Text added 'indicative land use

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Seeks to ensure that the land use diagram on p103 is indicative and that the land uses, which the text supports in the First Way District, apply to any site coming forward within the district. b) Scale and Massing- Discrepancies between the indicative building heights plan and the text for the First Way. c) The text should make it clear there will be flexibility in building heights - 10-12 storeys to be allowed along First Way. d) The document should clarify whether the perimeter blocks are to be semi-private or semi-public space which does not need public access. e) Seeks flexible type of landscaping for their site - not just hard landscaped only f) Seek assurance that there is no requirement for a building to span the site boundary as indicated in the indicative block plan. g) Timetable and Staged implementation: Requests flexibility in phasing development proposals h) Development proposals coming forward early should not prejudice future proposals for adjoining sites. i) Delivering the Infrastructure: seek flexibility regarding the location of the proposed roads j) <u>Masterplan and IIF</u> - Land owners should be rewarded with lower s106/infrastructure payments for the reduced profitability and viability of schemes. k) <u>Masterplan and IIF</u> Further information required on delivery of infrastructure requirements and likely impacts on landowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Already noted that heights are indicative d) Private and semi private spaces will be determined when individual buildings are designed. e) The open space diagram is indicative. It is designed to show a spread of different types and characters of open space across the area. It is recognised that there will be both hard and soft landscaping in most of the areas. f) There is no requirement for a building to span the site boundary. g) The Staged implementation is purely indicative. It represents a prediction of how development may come forward, but development is entirely dependent on landowners. h) Individual applications will have to pay attention to the aspirations of the Masterplan and how the district, and therefore adjacent sites, will develop in the future. i) The roads and blocks are indicative at this stage - the key point is that more east-west routes are provided. j) The Council has produced an updated IIF table as part of its core strategy and will be consulted on in May 2009. k) This pre-supposes that the Masterplan "reduces profitability. The s106 requirements are considered reasonable by the Council. Viability is an issue that is always taken into account. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> spread' b) No change necessary c)No change necessary d) Sentence added 'These spaces could have a level of public access depending on use and management' e) No change necessary f)No change necessary g)No change necessary h) No change necessary i) No change necessary j) No change necessary k)No change necessary
RWM019	KH Wembley Trust No.2(DP9)	<p>Owners of Kelaty House, First Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The masterplan should be delayed or adopted as interim guidance (limited weight) until the Core Strategy is adopted b) Page 27 - Support the aspirations to increase hotel provision. c) Page 32, the statement "the Council recognise....affordable housing" should recognise that the level of Section 106 will 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Council is continuing with the current timetable for adoption of the Masterplan because, despite the economic downturn, there are still significant development pressures within the area. It is considered critical that the Council has guidance in place that sets out the expectations for community infrastructure and development parameters, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No change necessary b) No change necessary c) No change necessary d) Sentence amended "This transitional

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>be reduced if developments are expected to provide subsidised workplace and affordable housing.</p> <p>d) P.32 - First Way District - "Transitional" area should focus on residential uses such as hotel and student accommodation with ancillary modern business/creative workspace rather than light industrial or warehousing adjacent to residential uses.</p> <p>e) P.33-Support the relocation of waste and recycling facilities. Clarification needed on the meaning - "funded by development"</p> <p>f) P.34 -The policy should acknowledge that student accommodation could be provided institutions outside Brent but accessible by public transport.</p> <p>g) P.35 -To achieve the numbers of residential units, high density housing development should be promoted.</p> <p>h) P.35 - should note London Plan Density Matrix is not a definitive cap; believe that the areas along First Way are not suitable for a large quantity of family housing - should change Table 1: Household size sought in New Development by Tenure (P.36)</p> <p>i) P.35 -To fund the aspiration of the masterplan, high density should be allowed to make development viable.</p> <p>j) P.38 - Details needs on open space locations and delivery.</p> <p>k) 3.2 Movement Infrastructure - needs clarification on changes to road layout/system and how to fund and deliver them.</p> <p>l) 3.2, Movement Infrastructure - welcome flexible approach to car parking.</p> <p>m) 3.5, Scale, Height and Massing - object to the use of the term "Strategic views", should use "local views" instead.</p> <p>n) P.64, object to the Indicative Building Heights plan as London Plan 4B.9 states Boroughs "should not impose unsubstantiated borough-wide height restrictions". Believe the masterplan should identify key nodal points for high/mid/low rise development backed up with townscape analysis. Feel that Kelaty House could comfortably accommodate buildings taller than that set out on the indicative plan.</p>	<p>otherwise it may be difficult to realise the wider benefits of piecemeal development.</p> <p>b) Support noted</p> <p>c) Viability of a scheme as a result of planning requirements is always taken into account when assessing benefits and requirements</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) Relatively high density housing is promoted but this must also be of an appropriate scale and massing. The Masterplan does not promote density as an end in itself</p> <p>h) Family housing is most in need in the borough and should be part of a mixed and balanced community. Dwelling layout can facilitate family housing.</p> <p>i) The Masterplan does not rule out high density development, it sets out a range of principles by which it must be assessed.</p> <p>j) & k) The new IIF sets out the details of what is required and the masterplan details approximate locations. Both open space and road planning will be considered at more detailed stages.</p> <p>l) Noted.</p> <p>m) Agree.</p> <p>n) The heights are not unsubstantiated but follow recommendations from consultants, on analysis of townscape, reasonable densities and protection of views.</p> <p>o) Floorspace calculations are based on</p>	<p>development will be able to provide a unique environment containing residential work/live spaces, student accommodation, modern business and light industrial uses with ancillary office space, and a degree of sensitively designed residential accommodation."</p> <p>e) "of the site or through Section 106 contributions from other development" inserted after "funded by developments.."</p> <p>f) Text amended.</p> <p>g) No change necessary</p> <p>h) No change necessary</p> <p>i) No change necessary</p> <p>j) No change necessary</p> <p>k) No change necessary</p> <p>l) No change</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>o) P.101, District Four: First Way - question how the estimated new floorspace potential 123,000 sqm was reached.</p> <p>p) P.102, not clear on the intentions regarding a new road layout.</p> <p>q) P.103, more details on the proposed route - "a broader east/west street will run through the middle of the area enabling greater connectivity to the Eastern Lands District".</p> <p>r) P.103, disagree the statement "the First Way District is little more isolated from the rail system than other districts and, as such, will require the provision of adequate parking" as PTAL will change as a result of the introduction of new bus routes.</p> <p>s) P.103, re: land use objectives - support residential development, hotel/commercial and student accommodation.</p> <p>t) P.104, Kelaty House should be identified as a tall building opportunity site (12+ storeys).</p> <p>u) P.105 Architectural Quality - moderated s106 aspirations and lower affordable housing will need to be permitted if higher building costs is a direct consequence.</p> <p>v) The introduction of new roadways will reduce the quantum of developable land on certain sites - flexibility on building heights and affordable housing should be allowed to make schemes viable.</p> <p>w) 5.1 ,Infrastructure - question on achievability as no mention made to the current economic climate.</p> <p><u>IIF</u></p> <p>x) Object to the increase in developer payments to cover the shortfall</p> <p>y) More info is needed on the delivery mechanisms proposed and who will be responsible for funding the masterplan. What BSF, GAF and DCSF stand for? What is the distinction between two delivery mechanisms, "developer" and "development".</p> <p><u>Transport Strategy Review</u></p> <p>z) The Masterplan is premature and further transport strategy</p>	<p>measurement of the building envelope base on an analysis and uses on building forms, heights, appropriate densities and protection of views.</p> <p>p) The indicative road layout within the First Way District will be designed to broadly reflect the existing land ownership in order to create a much more permeable and legible street network.</p> <p>q) No further details are proposed at this stage</p> <p>r) The statement reflects current condition which is unlikely to change.</p> <p>s) Support noted.</p> <p>t) Part of Kelaty House site is designated as a tall building of 11 - 12 storeys.</p> <p>u) &v)The IIF demonstrates that only part of the costs of infrastructure will be provided by S106 reflected by the application of the Council's Standard Charge. The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>w) See responses to RWM062(c),(d) & (e)</p> <p><u>IIF</u></p> <p>x) The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>y) A glossary included in the IIF</p> <p><u>Transport Strategy Review</u></p> <p>z) See responses to RWM063(c)</p>	<p>necessary</p> <p>m) Term amended to "short and long term views"</p> <p>n) ,o), p & q)No change necessary</p> <p>r) No change necessary</p> <p>s) No change necessary</p> <p>t) No change necessary</p> <p>u) No change necessary</p> <p>v) No change necessary</p> <p>w)Further images included to clarify the indicative road layout.</p> <p>x) No change necessary</p> <p>y) Text amended</p> <p>z) No change necessary</p> <p>aa)No change necessary</p> <p>bb) No change necessary</p> <p>cc)No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>and further transport analysis should be undertaken and considered.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>aa) The Masterplan should wait the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>bb) The information on the delivery mechanism is unsubstantiated and weak</p> <p>cc) Absolute flexible is needed on matters such as affordable housing, land use, building heights and section 106 requirements to make schemes viable.</p> <p>dd) Lack of evidential basis for some key land use and building height statements.</p> <p>ee) Infrastructure and Investment Framework lacks clarification on the delivery mechanism proposed.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>aa) See responses to RWM062(v)</p> <p>bb) See responses to RWM062(q)</p> <p>cc) The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage</p> <p>dd) See responses to RWM062(q)</p> <p>ee) See responses to RWM062 (s), (b) & (c)</p>	<p>dd) No change necessary</p> <p>ee) No change necessary</p>
RWM020	Forest Healthcare (DP9)	<p>Owners of Empire House, Empire way</p> <p>a) The masterplan should be delayed or adopted as interim guidance (limited weight) until the Core Strategy is adopted.</p> <p>b) pp.33-34, 3.1 Civic and Community Use - more details needed on the type of alternative and complementary healthcare facilities and "other types of community facilities that are deficient in this locality and need to be addressed". A healthcare needs survey is required.</p> <p>c) Believe there is a large demand for shelter/supported housing and adult care homes with nursing.</p> <p>d) 3.1, Residential Uses, believe the masterplan should support other forms of sheltered housing such as adult care homes with nursing, not just on the elderly.</p> <p>e) 3.2, Movement Infrastructure - welcome flexible approach to car parking.</p> <p>f) 3.5, Scale, Height and Massing - object to the use of the term "Strategic views", should use "local views" instead.</p> <p>g) P.64, object to the Indicative Building Heights plan as London Plan 4B.9 states Boroughs "should not impose unsubstantiated borough-wide height restrictions". Believe the masterplan should identify key nodal points for high/mid/low rise development backed up with townscape analysis. Question why Empire House is not included in this</p>	<p>a) Disagree. See responses to RWM062(v)</p> <p>b) Where possible and appropriate, sites will be identified as the Masterplan area develops and the population increases pressure on health infrastructure. This increasing provision will be available for all residents of Brent.</p> <p>c) The Masterplan addresses the broader requirement for affordable housing.</p> <p>d) See above.</p> <p>e) Support noted.</p> <p>f) Agree.</p> <p>g) Overall notional building heights have been indicated to help establish an appropriate proportion and relative street scale dependent upon the local character within individual district.</p> <p>h) Floorspace calculations are based on</p>	<p>a) - (i) No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>indicative plan.</p> <p>h) P.81, District One: North West - question how the estimated new floorspace potential 166,000 sqm was reached.</p> <p>i) 4.1, Core Objective, believe health centre would be compatible as a consequent of providing direct access to the retail centre for mobility impaired people.</p> <p>j) 4.1, Accessibility, Circulation and Transport - there should be a diagram of street hierarchy/shared surfaces.</p> <p>k) 4.1, Empire Way - should indicate a land take is required for the junction improvement.</p> <p>l) 4.1, Land use - object to the imposed restriction on land use for Empire House. Other uses such as an adult care home should not be precluded.</p> <p>m) 4.1 Local Architectural Quality - moderated s106 aspirations will need to be permitted if higher building costs is a direct consequence.</p> <p>n) 5.1 ,Infrastructure - question on achievability as no mention made to the current economic climate.</p> <p>o) Flexibility is needed on matters such as affordable housing, land use, building heights and s106 to generate sufficient land values to deliver the key objectives of the Masterplan.</p> <p>p) The growing demand for care homes should be reflected in the masterplan policy statement - reckons there is a shortfall of approximately 419 care home places in Brent. A typical 50 place care home with nursing will employ 50 full time staff.</p>	<p>measurement of the building envelope base on an analysis and uses on building forms, heights, appropriate densities and protection of views.</p> <p>i) All developments within the Masterplan area will need to be DDA compliant and will provide an accessible environment for all.</p> <p>j) Agree.</p> <p>k) This issue has addressed in independent transport studies.</p> <p>l) Land use projections are notional for guidance. The Masterplan is flexible enough to consider all use proposals.</p> <p>m) The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>n) See responses to RWM002(e)</p> <p>o) The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>p) Where possible and appropriate, sites will be identified as the Masterplan area develops and the population increases pressure on health infrastructure. This increasing provision will be available for all residents of Brent.</p>	<p>j Diagram included.</p> <p>k)-p)No change necessary</p>
RWM021	Carey Group Plc (Montagu Evans)	<p>a) The approach to create a buffer zone is considered inappropriate. The visual buffer should be the areas are seen and those detract from the overall perception of the area by visitors. Access routes to the stadium need to be enhanced.</p> <p>b) Carey's land which is on the eastern approach to the Stadium should be released from the employment land designation in preference to other lands which do not provide same level of opportunity for enhancing the area.</p> <p>c) Believe their amount of land ownership could make a significant contribution towards the creation of an</p>	<p>a) The Council considers that buildings can create a buffer between residential and "industrial uses" to reduce noise and other conflicts. The screening an improvement of access routes is also important.</p> <p>b) & c) Strategic Industrial Locations are protected by the London Plan and the Council will seek to retain and enhance the existing employment offer and environment within such locations.</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		attractive eastern access corridor and a mix of uses together with land fronting the River Brent.		
RWM022	Invista Real Estate (Montagu Evans)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reckon the masterplan should allow residential uses on the upper floors of building that are in appropriation locations off Olympic Way and adjacent to the new openspace. b) The masterplan should require the creation of a distinct building line along Olympic Way to maintain the 20m wide route rather than diluting it with smaller buildings and open spaces. This will reinforce the processional character of the route without diminishing views of the stadium arch. c) Olympic Way - a smaller permanent enclave of leisure uses can serve the local community and visitors beyond event days - the number of pocket parks should be reduced to create one or two intimate hubs where a number of bars a, restaurants and cafés can be concentrated to complement the retail street. d) The masterplan should be less prescriptive about the dimensions of the pocket parks - they need to be smaller and preferably fewer in number. e) The masterplan should be more flexible rather than trying to determine the size, location and number of pocket parks. It should promote the principle of creating a series of landscaped spaces, either set back or orientated differently. An open space strategy for Olympic Way is suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Agree subject to appropriate location in planning term. b) 20m wide procession route will be maintained. c) Disagree. More opportunity for the provision of wider uses and interpretation/landscape design. d) There is no prescription or dimension for the pocket parks. They should be of a size appropriate to the scale of the building for which they provide the setting. e) See above. 	No change necessary
RWM023	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support the core objectives and purpose of the Masterplan (page 7-8)- the commitment to produce innovative, high quality and sustainable development on the site and to provide new open space and parks for all + to reduce flood risk, enhance ecology and for the River Brent and Wealdstone Brook to be integral features of any new development. b) Page 15 - The map outlining the physical constraints of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support noted. b) The Masterplan encourages the opening up and 	No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>Masterplan area should be updated to include the areas in culvert areas. Where development is proposed next to a culverted section, the developer would be expected to deculvert the river and enhance the channel.</p> <p>c) Page 16 - support wording in the section - The River Brent. Suggest adding “the work of the River Brent restoration project could be furthered using development i.e. through design of developments and planning obligations.”</p> <p>d) Page 22 - Masterplan Block Layout Map should show the River Brent and Wealdstone brook in culvert, and the ponds adjacent to the Wealdstone Brook, where would support habitat creation.</p> <p>e) Page 39 - Open Space. There are some sections which appear to show hard edged schemes and buildings close to the watercourses. The EA would not accept any scheme providing less than eight metre setback from the watercourse.</p> <p>f) Page 39 - ‘Open Space Concept Map’ should show culverted areas as area of opportunity to re-create green linkages.</p> <p>g) Page 43-45 - welcome that the Masterplan has tried to vastly increase wildlife and biodiversity in the area. Positive to see the opening up of the Wealdstone Brook has been identified.</p> <p>h) Strongly support the reference to the use of roof space. Guidance for more information that can be viewed at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk/greenroofs.</p> <p>i) Section 3.4 Public Realm, Streetscape, and Public Art- Green roofs and walls could be incorporated into the landscape design to enhance the public realm and also provide additional habitat and surface water attenuation benefits.</p> <p>j) Page 61 Hard surfaces - there may be the opportunity to provide permeable surfaces which could provide attenuation and water quality improvements.</p> <p>k) Page 66 Roof-scape - green roofs will also provide benefits for biodiversity and surface water flood risk reduction.</p> <p>l) Section 3.8 Flood Risk Strategy - support the recognition of the flood alleviation role that the Wealdstone Brook has.</p>	<p>naturalisation of the brook.</p> <p>c) Support noted. Where appropriate, financial leverage gained through S106 agreements will be used to enhance the natural environment of the Masterplan area.</p> <p>d) Agree</p> <p>e) Agree.</p> <p>f) Agree.</p> <p>g) Noted.</p> <p>h) Noted</p> <p>i) Noted</p> <p>j) Agree. The Masterplan supports this.</p> <p>k) Noted.</p> <p>l) Agree.</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>As rightly stated in the Masterplan all sites within flood zones 2 and 3 should firstly apply the Sequential Test and Exceptions Test (where required). The next step is to take a Sequential Approach to the layout of uses on the site. This section should outline that Flood Zone 3b (the functional floodplain) is only suitable for water compatible or essential use. Surface water FRAs will be required on all sites over one hectare, not only those in Flood Zone 1. Sites less than one hectare should meet the requirements of the London Plan and development control recommendations contained within LB Brent's SFRA.</p> <p>m) Page 72 - support the section on SUDS.</p> <p>n) Section 3.9 Sustainability and Climate Change - keen to see the water efficient technologies that will be adopted.</p> <p>o) Page 77 - support the comments on sustainable building design and the use of living walls and roofs and water recycling.</p> <p>p) Page 78 - welcome the intention to follow the waste management hierarchy.</p> <p>q) Page 79 - support the comments on enhancing biodiversity</p> <p>r) District specific recommendations - All districts, as part of the landscaping or site layout should be required to include space for the provision of SUDS systems on site. These may be multi-faceted areas i.e. paving areas, green space areas that also provide surface water attenuation.</p> <p>s) Page 93 District 2 - Re:The Wealdstone Brook- the areas within this district should be identified and enhanced or restored as part of any development proposal.</p> <p>t) Page 95 District 3 - Opportunities should be maximised to improve the Wealdstone Brook environment, therefore the sentence should be amended to reflect this; 'to enhance and/or restore the Wealdstone Brook'.</p> <p>u) Page 97 District 3 - The new footpaths should meander in and away from watercourses to provide a more dynamic experience for users. Footpaths set directly against the bank top form a break between river and land habitats. It is important to have a continuous transition between these habitats to maintain the integrity of the river corridor for</p>	<p>m) Support noted.</p> <p>n) Noted</p> <p>o) Noted</p> <p>p) Noted</p> <p>q) Noted</p> <p>r) As part of more detailed landscape proposals, SUDs will be implicit in the detailed design.</p> <p>s) Agree</p> <p>t) Agree</p> <p>u) Agree. This will be developed through detailed landscape design work.</p> <p>v) Noted</p> <p>w) Agree and will happen.</p> <p>x) Noted</p> <p>y) Noted</p> <p>z) Noted</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>movement of wildlife.</p> <p>v) Page 102 District 4 - support that green links prevalent in the masterplan.</p> <p>w) Page 107 District 5 - Re: green links and enhancements - on site provision is preferable and could be achieved as development sites come forward.</p> <p>x) Page 108 - support the widespread use of green/brown roofs.</p> <p>y) Page 117 - support the reference to public parks, the restoration of the Wealdstone Brook, habitat creation and green and brown roofs.</p> <p>z) Section 5.3 Delivering Design Quality - EA are keen to get involved at pre-application stage for any of the sites.</p>		
RWM024	Wembley National Stadium Limited	<p><u>Masterplan</u></p> <p>a) Changes to movement infrastructure can have a significant impact on the operation of the National Stadium. Request confirmation that LBB will follow MVA consultancy's recommendations for further consideration, and that WNSL will be part of any further review.</p> <p>b) "Long/middle distance views" are no more than approx. 5 miles distant. They should be rectified as a large number of locations within the Greater London area (and wider) that enjoy views.</p> <p>c) Front Cover: The Stadium's arch illustrates the importance of the relationship between the Stadium and future development in the area, hence the relationship should be expressed formally.</p> <p>d) The National Stadium and its effective and viable future operation should be expressly referred to as a key driver to the area. Suggest LBB insert the following text in the "Introduction" on page 3 or "The Vision" on page 5 or on page 6, "The Council recognises the major importance that the National Stadium plays locally, across London and nationally. As a major venue for world class events generating millions of national and international visitors each year, providing the borough with regular, high profile and positive television and media exposure, the National Stadium is an iconic landmark, a large employer and a</p>	<p><u>Masterplan</u></p> <p>a)The Council recognises the significant impact that new development could have on the operation of the National Stadium, hence we have developed some of the recommendations within Section 3.2</p> <p>b)The Council recognises the importance of the views of the Stadium from across Greater London and the guidelines on height within the document are based on a firm understanding of these views. If there are any views that WNSL believes are particularly important the Council would be happy to consider them as part of this process.</p> <p>c)The importance of the Stadium for the regeneration of the area has been identified within the document. However the relationship between the Stadium and future development will be emphasised.</p> <p>d) Agree.</p>	<p><u>Masterplan</u></p> <p>a) see section 3.2</p> <p>b)No change necessary.</p> <p>c)See amendments below</p> <p>d)Change to 2nd para, pg 6 to include "The National Stadium plays an important role locally, regionally and nationally. It is a major venue for world class events, and attracts millions of l visitors each year. It is an iconic landmark, a large employer and a significant revenue generator for current and future local businesses.</p> <p>e) Amendment to Section 1.2 to</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>significant revenue generator for current and future local businesses.</p> <p>e) The economic and community regeneration and vitality sought by the Masterplan is inextricably linked with the successful operation of the National Stadium. There cannot and must not be any conflict between the future development envisaged by the Masterplan and the effective continued and future operation of the National Stadium. Otherwise, the risk is that both will fail, with extremely detrimental effects on the local economy. It is acknowledged therefore that whilst balancing the needs of all the wider local community the Masterplan must recognise as a primary aim, the need to provide a long term infrastructure, planning and development environment in which the National Stadium can continue to effectively and viably operate.”</p> <p>f) 1.3, Page 7, the end of the second paragraph should insert, “The significance of the National Stadium for regeneration in the Masterplan area is recognised and the owners and/or operators of the National Stadium are considered to be amongst the key stakeholders in the area”.</p> <p>g) In the paragraph entitled “Reasons why an extended Masterplan is required...”, LBB should insert a second bullet point:- “Both the National Stadium and the surrounding supporting facilities will need continuous support and the assurance of effective operations to maintain world-class venue status “</p> <p>j) 1.3, Page 7, should move reference to the National Stadium up the list of core objectives and amend bullet point, “To support the National Stadium as a world-class venue, with wide economic benefits for both current and future neighbours.</p> <p>k) 1.5, Page 9, the core principles at Section 3” - should insert, “Have due regard to the effective operation of the National Stadium”</p> <p>l) WNSL have significant operational concerns regarding the proposed replacement of the Pedway in relation to access, safety and security and crowd management. 2.2, page 13,</p>	<p>d) There is a full understanding that for a successful place to be created any new development must balance its own infrastructure requirements with the requirement to enable the Stadium to continue to operate as successfully as it currently does.</p> <p>f) The Council recognises the vital role that the Stadium plays in the regeneration of the area and the Stadium operators will always be considered as a key stakeholder.</p> <p>g)The maintenance of effective operations of the Stadium is considered to be critical for the success of the area.</p> <p>j) Noted</p> <p>k)This section is explaining the general structure of the document and therefore this level of detail is not necessary.</p> <p>l) Noted</p>	<p>include: “The Masterplan seeks to provide a long term infrastructure, planning and development environment that will enable comprehensive and sustainable regeneration whilst allowing new and existing business, including the National Stadium, to operate with increased success.”</p> <p>f) See above amendment. Sentence included in Section 5.3 stating “All major landowners and key stakeholders, including the Stadium Operators, should be consulted on all major developments.”</p> <p>g) Bullet inserted: “The continued successful operation of the Stadium and the Arena will reinforce Wembley’s role as a major Visitor Destination.”.</p> <p>J) sentence moved up the list and amended to state “To enable</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>should insert "Whilst it runs contrary to one of the fundamental principles of urban design - creating animated and useable spaces at street level - it is recognised that any replacement solution must meet all the safety and other long term effective operational needs to maintain a viable world-class National Stadium venue."</p> <p>m) 2.2, page 13- The paragraph relating to the National Stadium should come before the paragraph on the arena to , and replace the paragraph with:- "The new National Stadium, designed with Foster & Partners architects, was completed in 2007 at a total cost of circa £750 million. It is a world class football Stadium and events facility and has been designed specifically to provide an unparalleled visitor experience."</p> <p>n) 2.2, page 16 - replace paragraph beginning "Wembley will play..." with "The National Stadium will play a significant and high-coverage role in the 2012 London Olympics, hosting the quarter, semi and final stages of the football tournaments. It will host the prestigious Champions League Final in 2011 and is also the centrepiece of England's bid for the 2018 World Cup Finals: other international sports competitions and events also have the National Stadium in mind as a potential future venue. The National Stadium provides, and will increasingly provide, a significant economic benefit both to London and specifically the local area and Borough. On event days up to 5,000 people work directly at the National Stadium, and the banqueting, event, and hospitality facilities ensure year-round employment and commercial supply/service opportunities."</p> <p>o) 2.2, page 17, "Potential Changes to the Stage 1 Application", insert wording "The Council may also encourage development of the eastern part of the Stage 1 site for large scale visitor attractions, subject to agreement with the owners and/or operators of the National Stadium that the operation of those attractions would not detrimentally impact upon the current and future operation of the National Stadium, particularly in</p>	<p>m) Noted</p> <p>n) Although it is recognised that the Stadium will be the host of many of the events, it will be the wider facilities throughout Wembley that will enable them to function successfully.</p> <p>o) The Council agrees with the general sentiment of the statement; however the exact wording is not in keeping with the approach of the document.</p> <p>p)agreed</p> <p>q) The Council acknowledges that the Stadium owner/operator will need to be consulted on issues that may impact upon Stadium operations.</p>	<p>the National Stadium, the Arena and other existing businesses to co-exist harmoniously with current and future neighbours."</p> <p>k) no change necessary.</p> <p>l) sentence added at the end of para.</p> <p>m) suggested amendments incorporated.</p> <p>n)Some amendments made to the relevant para.</p> <p>o) Sentence added: The Council may also encourage the development of the eastern part of the Stage 1 site for large scale visitor attractions, Relevant stakeholders, including the National Stadium will be consulted upon proposals. The Council would also need to be satisfied that any displaced event day coach or car parking would be satisfactorily provided for elsewhere.</p> <p>Replacement parking</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>relation to event days and with regard to parking, traffic and access in particular. Both, the Council and the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium would also need to be satisfied and agree that any and all displaced event day coach or car parking would, at a minimum, be satisfactorily provided for elsewhere. Replacement parking proposals would require comprehensive and detailed traffic assessments in consultation with the Council and the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium”.</p> <p>p) 2.3, page 22, line 4, amend “glimpses” for “views” for more appropriate emphasis of the National Stadium as a visible landmark.</p> <p>q) 3.1, page 26, should change sentence 4/5 to:”...The Council will support changes of use on land to the east of Olympic Way for major visitor attractors, providing that it is not on designated Strategic Industrial Locations (Strategic Employment Land within Brent’s UDP) and agreement with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium that the operation of those attractions would not detrimentally impact upon the current and future operation of the National Stadium, particularly in relation to event days. Full feasibility and impact studies in consultation with the Council and the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium will be necessary to establish the transport and parking implications of such development, together with appropriate mitigation or improvement measures”.</p> <p>r) 3.1, page 35 - WNSL seek to ensure that views of the National Stadium are protected as they are vital to the National Stadium's business identity. Suggest: "...protection of views" insert "...the adequacy of noise insulations measures..." and add additional first bullet point - “Protection of the National Stadium’s landmark status, and the maintenance of short, medium, and long distance views of the National Stadium.”</p> <p>s) 3.1, page 40 - Olympic Way is a major access route to and from the National Stadium. WNSL suggest: insert at end of first paragraph,” This will need to take full account of the</p>	<p>r) Noted</p> <p>s) Agree</p> <p>t) Following the comprehensive strategic</p>	<p>proposals would require comprehensive and detailed traffic assessments. The Council will fully consult on proposals that impact upon Event Day operation with relevant stakeholders, including the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium.</p> <p>p) amended</p> <p>q) Sentence amended ‘Full feasibility and impact studies will be necessary, in consultation with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium, to establish the transport implications of such development. Although such development is often regarded as generating significant amounts of vehicular traffic, evidence from Stadium event movements suggests a high level of public transport use. Consultation with appropriate</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>effective and safe crowd management of the National Stadium events and the sensitive relationship between pedestrians and the new public transport provisions".</p> <p>t) 3.1 to para 3.3, page 46-58 - concerned that the transport strategy within the Masterplan has not been fully considered and that further consultation is required. P.47 - Suggest: insert "The Council recognise that changes to traffic, access, and parking arrangements, particularly in relation to vehicular movement, junction improvements and car parking are significant to owners and operators of the land in or adjacent to the Masterplan Area and therefore the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium should be fully consulted as a key stakeholder on all changes and reviews. All changes will be subject to rigorous transport assessments and all necessary venue security considerations will be taken into account".</p> <p>u) 3.2, page 51 - The removal of the Pedway has access, crowd management and safety and security implications that should be formally considered.</p> <p>i. Suggest LBB add to the first sentence "the need to accommodate vehicular movement, to enable successful operation and day-to-day functioning of businesses and residents, and the particular servicing and operational needs of the National Stadium."</p> <p>ii. Replace the first bullet with :-"In consultation and agreement with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium, to find a fully operationally acceptable access solution in both the short and long terms to the National Stadium from Olympic Way to allow the removal of the existing Pedway, releasing the spaces under the ramp to contribute to Olympic Way."</p> <p>iii. Add additional bullet point:-"Provision of acceptable short, medium and long term servicing and event day access routes and strategies for National Stadium operations."</p> <p>v) 3.2, page 55 - WNSL welcome the reference to the event-day parking restrictions.</p> <p>w) Parking strategy within the Masterplan area can have</p>	<p>transport assessment this section will be fully reviewed.</p> <p>u) Agree.</p> <p>v) noted</p> <p>w) noted</p> <p>x) The Council understands the operational</p>	<p>stakeholders, including the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium should also be undertaken.'</p> <p>r) Sentence amended to say "protection of Important Views of the National Stadium and providing appropriate living conditions (daylight, sunlight, privacy, overlooking, noise insulation etc.)."</p> <p>s) sentence added "Stadium Event Day crowd management and the relationship between pedestrians and the new public transport provisions non-event days should inform the design process."</p> <p>t) sentence added "The Council recognise that changes to traffic, access, and parking arrangements, particularly in relation to vehicular movement, junction improvements and car parking are significant to owners and</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>significant impacts on the efficient operation of the Stadium . Para 1, Page 56, suggest: insert wording:- "This will of course be subject to a rigorous Transport Assessment, in consultation with <u>Key stakeholders...</u>"</p> <p>x) 3.3, page 58. Insert "The Council recognise that changes to Olympic Way could have significant impacts on owners of the land, including the owners and/or occupiers of the National Stadium, with regard to crowd management, safety and security and access and therefore the owner and/or occupier of the National Stadium will be consulted and engaged as <u>Key stakeholders</u> in the formulation of the transport strategy in the Masterplan and any subsequent reviews".</p> <p>y) 3.5, page 63. Suggest: insert/replace the text in the second paragraph with:- "...all applicants (particularly those on Olympic Way) must demonstrate a clear understanding of the relationship between the proposed development and the presence and business identity created by the National Stadium, and the need to avoid any adverse visual impact having regard to Strategic Views".</p> <p>z) Page 64. Suggest: add to end of first paragraph, "It should be noted that buildings in excess of 15 storeys and up to 20 storeys will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, and then where the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the development will have no adverse visual impact on or of the National Stadium as a major national landmark from short, medium and distant viewpoints and Strategic Views".</p> <p>aa) 3.5, page 65 Scale and Massing</p> <p>i. -"The scale and height of buildings must: " Suggest: add an additional bullet point:- "Respect existing short, medium and long distance and Strategic Views of the National Stadium as a major national landmark, and avoid any adverse visual impact to the National Stadium."</p> <p>ii. Last sentence to be extended..." Consideration should also be given to the English Heritage/CABE "Guidance on Tall Buildings", 2007, and <u>the intentions,</u></p>	<p>concerns that WNSL may have in relation to event day crowds. Full consultation will be conducted when detailed proposals come forward.</p> <p>y) noted</p> <p>z)The previous section clearly states that the impacts on views of the stadium will be a primary consideration in assessing applications, therefore it is not considered necessary to continually reiterate this point.</p> <p>aa)i)noted ii) noted</p> <p>bb)Agree</p>	<p>operators of the land in or adjacent to the Masterplan Area and full consultation will be conducted as the proposals come forward"</p> <p>u) i) & ii) sentences added and amalgamated. iii) sentence added "Provision of acceptable short, medium and long term servicing and event day access routes and strategies for all occupiers in the Masterplan area".</p> <p>v)No change necessary</p> <p>w) Sentence amended</p> <p>x)Sentence added "The Council recognises that changes to Olympic Way could impact upon the owners of the land, particularly in relation to crowd management, security and access. All detailed proposals will be subject to rigorous analysis and consultation."</p> <p>y)Sentence amended</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p><u>conditions and implications of the Quintain Stage 1 Building Heights Parameters/Constraints Plan</u>".</p> <p>bb) 3.6, page 66, Design Quality and Ambition - Suggest: amend paragraph 2, from "fundamentals of good design..." to fundamentals of <u>"exceptional"</u> design.</p> <p>cc) P.66 - "Innovation, quality, and beauty". Suggest: amend wording, "As an international destination and <u>home of the iconic National Stadium, Wembley...</u>"</p> <p>dd) P.67. Insert additional bullet point:-"Recognise the iconic status and exceptional design of the National Stadium and refer to the relationship the proposed development will have with it"</p> <p>ee) P.88. Suggest: amend first sentence "... and walking along Olympic Way is as much a part of the visitor experience of Wembley as seeing the Stadium."</p> <p>ff) P.89 - the exceptional design standards should apply to all development on Olympic Way not just to landscaping. Suggest amend third paragraph:-"The standard of landscape <u>and urban design...</u>"</p> <p>gg) P.90, bullet point one. Suggest: amend to "The Council believes that the removal of the Pedway and its replacement with a better means of high volume visitor access between Olympic Way and the National Stadium is essential to the improvement of the southern part of Olympic way and the removal of a poor street environment. However, Pedway removal and replacement can only take place in consultation with and full agreement with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium as a Key stakeholder recognising the complex access, safety, security and crowd management issues involved."</p> <p>hh) P 93. Suggest: replace the second and third bullet points with "... building heights in excess of 15 storeys up to 20 storeys will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, and then where the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the development will have no adverse visual impact on or of the National Stadium as a major national landmark from short, medium and distant viewpoints, and Strategic Views and no adverse noise</p>	<p>cc) Agree</p> <p>dd) Noted</p> <p>ee) Noted</p> <p>ff) Agree</p> <p>gg) Noted</p> <p>hh) Noted</p> <p>ii) The Council aspires to the very best of architecture through the whole of the Masterplan area. The point of this section is to identify buildings that have a extra role to play in the legibility and identity of an area.</p> <p>jj) Noted</p> <p>kk) Noted</p> <p>ll) Noted. Consultation with the Stadium operator is already emphasised in a number of other locations.</p> <p>mm) Noted</p>	<p>to state "All applicants, (particularly those on Olympic Way), should demonstrate a clear understanding of the relationship between the proposed development and the presence and sense of identity created by the National Stadium, and other emerging development currently permitted in outline"</p> <p>z) No change necessary.</p> <p>aa) i) Bullet amended to state "Respect existing short, medium and long distance views of the National Stadium as a major national landmark, in particular the processional view along Olympic Way; ii) Bullet amended to state 'To find a fully operational access solution to the National Stadium in both the short and long terms that will allow the removal of the existing Pedway,</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>impact from events at the National Stadium”.</p> <p>ii) P.94. WNSL are concerned that other sites, not within this list of sites where "exceptional buildings reflecting the highest standards of design" will be expected, have the potential to have an adverse impact on the Stadium.</p> <p>jj) P.103. Re: Changes to coach parking. Suggest: insert at the end of the third bullet point "...and be the subject of a rigorous Transport Assessment with review by the operators of the National Stadium and any other Key stakeholders".</p> <p>kk) P108. Re: Coach parking in Eastern Lands area Suggest: insert "...transport studies, agreed in consultation with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium..."</p> <p>ll) P113. Suggest amendment to para 3 “The Pedway replacement scheme, when agreed in conjunction with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium and implemented, will lead to....”and insert at end of 3rd para "...with the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium and other key stakeholders..."</p> <p>mm) P114. Suggest: amend Paragraph 2 to read “Appropriate improvements will be undertaken as part of any Pedway replacement scheme to mitigate any impact in the short, medium and long term and will be subject to rigorous Transport Assessments with review by the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium as a Key stakeholder.”</p> <p>nn) P115. Suggest: insert new first sentence at final paragraph of Phase 2 “The beneficial economic and regeneration impact of the National Stadium on the Masterplan area and the Borough cannot be overstated and therefore the Council is committed to supporting its world-class venue status. Due to the quantum and cumulative impact of surrounding development at the end of this Phase, it is imperative for the National Stadium’s operations, as well as neighbouring businesses and residents, that the bulk of the major infrastructure should have been delivered”.</p> <p>oo) P118. Suggest replace “Removal of the Pedway” with “Pedway replacement scheme”.</p> <p>pp) Page 119-121. Suggest: add owner and/or operator of the National Stadium to list as a Key stakeholder to help create</p>	<p>nn) Noted</p> <p>oo) Agree</p> <p>qq) Noted</p>	<p>releasing the spaces under the ramp to contribute to Olympic Way.’</p> <p>bb) amended</p> <p>cc) amended</p> <p>dd) sentence added to first bullet “There should be a broad recognition of the iconic status of the National Stadium and reference to the relationship the proposed development will have with it.”</p> <p>ee) Sentence added.</p> <p>ff) Wording added.</p> <p>gg) Bullet amended “The Council believes that the removal of the Pedway and its replacement with an improved access arrangement between Olympic Way and the National Stadium is essential to greatly enhance the southern part of Olympic Way and remove what is currently a poor street environment. Such proposals will necessitate close consultation with the</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>a credible and realistic policy base, and should be consulted on all major applications and policy reviews in order to enable the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium to protect its key operational concerns when considering the adverse impacts of future development.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure and Investment Framework</u></p> <p>a) P.14. The draft Stanton Williams report does not appear to refer to the removal of the Pedway. LBB should clarify how the Stanton Williams report applies, and how it relates to the conclusions of the MVA consultancy Transport Strategic Review.</p> <p><u>Transport Strategic Review</u></p> <p>a) Page (i). concerned that the Masterplan does not adequately address this point "the majority of movement impact will be felt prior to the completion of Stage 1... there is an immediate need to address Stage 1"</p> <p>b) Page (ii). Concerned that the Masterplan does not adequately address this point ""The reconnection [North End Road to Bridge Road] is currently indicated for Stage 2 of the masterplan i.e. beyond 2014. Our remodelling work suggests however, that there are benefits in making the connection earlier certainly before the full extent of Stage 1 is built out..."</p> <p>c) Page (iii) & Para 3.4, pages 3.7. Replacement of the Pedway should be considered in much greater detail and that the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium should be engaged as a key stakeholder in order to ensure that key operational concerns on access, security and safety and crowd management can be accommodated in a replacement scheme.</p> <p>d) Page (iv); Para 9.4.4, page 9.9 & Para 10.4.11, page 10.4 Re: coach parking provision, reconnection of the North End Road & Event Day Management. The owner and/or operator of the National Stadium should be consulted on all such proposals and engaged as a key stakeholder in any further consultations/ reviews of sub-strategies in order to ensure the effective operation of the National Stadium in relation to traffic, access, and car and coach parking on event</p>	<p>IIF</p> <p>a) It appears in the final draft.</p> <p><u>Transport Strategic Review</u></p> <p>a)- Further detailed work has been conducted on the implications of the proposed level development on the area. The evidence suggests that the area can succeed and even thrive providing that a rigorous strategy is implemented from the outset.</p>	<p>owner and/or operator of the National Stadium and other key landowners."</p> <p>hh) Bullet added "All taller buildings will only be permitted where the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the development will have no adverse visual impact on National Stadium"</p> <p>ii) No change necessary.</p> <p>jj) Sentence added</p> <p>kk) Sentence amended "The Council may support the relocation of Stadium coach parking facilities within this District, subject to robust transport studies and full consultation with relevant stakeholders, the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium., and if the appropriate pedestrian connections can be created.."</p> <p>ll) Revision of entire Section undertaken.</p> <p>mm) Revision of</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>days. Page (iv). WNSL request the Council's response to this statement-"As presented, and taken at face value, the masterplan's deliverability in transport terms is questionable...The resultant traffic forecasts have proved to be significant and give cause for concern".</p> <p>e) Para 9.1.3, page 9.1. WNSL request the Council's response to these statements "...the transport strategy needed to support the masterplan is in the infancy of its development. Whilst some thought has clearly been given to most aspects of a potential strategy, detail is lacking in many areas and there is still much work [sic] needed to present a fully integrated approach". "...would emphasise the importance of addressing them (problems) in a collaborative way with inputs from designers, planners and transport experts".</p> <p>f) Para 10.1.4, page 10.1. Statements support WNSL's view that the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium should be engaged as a Key stakeholder in any further transport consultations/reviews.</p>		<p>entire Section undertaken.</p> <p>nn) Revision of entire Section undertaken.</p> <p>oo) Wording amended.</p> <p>pp) Sentence added under Consultation Procedures "All major landowners and key stakeholders, including the owner and/or operator of the National Stadium, should be consulted on all major developments."</p> <p>IIF</p> <p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>Trans Review</p> <p>a) -f) Section 3.2 & Section 5 both under review in light of the transportation study.</p>
RWM025	Highways Agency	a) P.55, 3.2 Movement Infrastructure -Car Parking: LBB should ensure parking levels in areas away from the transport modes would not exceed the maximum parking standards as set out in Annex 4 of the London Plan. Suggest the underlined insertion - "Provision of parking must be in line with <u>the maximum standards set out in the London Plan Annex 4</u> and UDP Policy PS15 - Parking for Disable People"	a) Agree	a)wording added
RWM026	Fleming	a) Re: site at 5 Olympic Way. Support Council's general	a) Support noted	a)No change

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
	Development UK Ltd (Indigo)	<p>aspirations of the area and the comprehensive approach for development.</p> <p>b) Tough economic conditions affect viability such as affordable housing, family market housing and s106 contributions.</p> <p>c) The market should decide the locations suitable for family market housing</p> <p>d) High density scheme is unlikely suitable for significant amount of family market housing</p> <p>e) Upper limit on the height should not be defined; it should be left to an impact assessment on views and neighbouring properties.</p> <p>f) There is shortfall to meet the total infrastructure costs. Since the uncertainty in the current housing market, further charge on the top of the current s106 provision may make developments unviable.</p> <p>g) Potential projects, e.g. North End Road Reconnection, in I&IF should have sufficient evidence to show they are deliverable and viable.</p> <p>h) Support the semi public space and the provision of under5s playspace on site while off-site provision for older children.</p>	<p>b) The Council will take a balanced view on Section 106 agreements in order to deliver development.</p> <p>c) It is the Council's aspiration to deliver a full range of housing tenures that will meet the needs of existing and future residents. Given the nature of different localities within the Masterplan area, some districts will be more suitable than others for family housing.</p> <p>d) There is a clear need for family housing within the borough and as one of the core growth areas Wembley must provide a proportion of this requirement.</p> <p>e) The heights set out in the Masterplan give an indication of the level of development that will be appropriate based on thorough analysis conducted by the Council. They are not intended to be a cap on heights.</p> <p>f) The viability of individual developments will be fully considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>g) The further work carried out by Council's consultants and set out in its new IIF shows that this scheme is deliverable and viable.</p> <p>h) Support noted</p>	<p>necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) No change necessary</p> <p>d) No change necessary</p> <p>e) No change necessary</p> <p>f) No change necessary</p> <p>g) No change necessary</p> <p>h) No change necessary</p>
RWM027	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	<p>Re: Brent Infrastructure and Investment Framework (IIF)</p> <p>a) It is necessary to caveat with an explanation of how the IIF shall be applied in conjunction with the Planning Obligations SPD and Circular 2005/05 which explains "standard charges and formulae should not be applied in blanket form, regardless of actual impacts." The financial contributions sought should in all instances be "fairly and reasonably related in scales and kind to the proposed development".</p> <p>Re: Draft Wembley Masterplan - December 2008</p> <p>a) P.34, para 3, 2nd sentence- "Residential accommodation for students will be suitable in areas of high public transport accessibility". Amend the sentence to acknowledge the</p>	<p><u>IIF</u></p> <p>a) The Council has demonstrated that the s106 Standard Charge is fairly and reasonably related in scale: the Council's IIF also shows the charges that relate to population growth and that the s106 secures only part of the infrastructure requirements. Note that Brent s106 Standard Charge has been effective for over a year and its application does not prevent successful development of land.</p> <p><u>Masterplan</u></p> <p>a)Noted</p> <p>b) The previous section allows for student</p>	<p><u>IIF</u></p> <p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) Sentence amended "Residential accommodation for students will be suitable in areas of high public transport accessibility, but the Council will seek a balance between the needs for student</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>significant shortfall for student accommodation in London.</p> <p>b) P.35 - insert " Student housing can relieve pressure on regular market housing, and is therefore appropriate in the Masterplan Area".</p> <p>c) P.64 para 1 - There is an overarching need to facilitate high landmark buildings (in appropriate locations) in the Masterplan Area. Suggests LLB insert "The intention is for these high buildings to become important local and national landmarks, synonymous with both Wembley and the UK as a whole. -</p>	<p>accommodation within the Masterplan area, therefore it is not considered necessary to reiterate this point.</p> <p>c) Noted</p>	<p>accommodation and other types of residential development."</p> <p>c)No change necessary</p> <p>d) Sentence inserted.</p>
RWM028	Peaceridge Ltd (Savills)	<p>a) 1.1 The New Masterplan -Support the range of uses that will be encouraged in the area, incl hotel, leisure, commercial, residential and retail uses.</p> <p>b) 1.3 Core Objectives - support the encouragement of new hotels.</p> <p>c) 1.4 Purpose of the Masterplan - Support the purpose of providing a flexible development framework and the encouragement of sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>d) 2.1 Area and Surroundings -Dexion House is owned by Peaceridge Ltd, amendment should be made to the map.</p> <p>e) 2.3 Policy Context - support the promotion of tourist accommodation, mixed use developments and high quality design</p> <p>f) Support a land mix that integrates with resident and employment uses on the fringes of the area.</p> <p>g) Page 27, amend section 3.1 Hotels and conferencing, to add, "Hotels and other types of visitor accommodation make a significant contribution towards generating employment and business opportunities through their operation and in supporting a range of other services and facilities such as shops, food and drink establishments and entertainment and leisure venues."</p> <p>h) Support he recognition for more hotel space in appropriate locations.</p> <p>i) Page 28, amend 3.1 Leisure /Entertainment/Culture to state, "A mix of uses, including residential, commercial and visitor accommodation will be encouraged to support and sustain the establishment of a strong evening</p>	<p>a) Support noted.</p> <p>b) Support noted</p> <p>c) Support noted</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Support noted</p> <p>f) Support noted</p> <p>g) Sentence inserted.</p> <p>h) Support noted</p> <p>i) Sentence inserted.</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) No change necessary</p> <p>d) Amendment made</p> <p>e) No change necessary</p> <p>f) No change necessary</p> <p>g) Amendment made</p> <p>h) No change necessary</p> <p>i) Sentence inserted.</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>economy, which will also act to create employment and business opportunities in the area”.</p> <p>j) 3.1 Support the proposal of a new retail street.</p> <p>k) 3.1 Support new and modern Grade A office space ideally on Olympic Way in the long term.</p> <p>l) 3.1 Object to the blanket protection of office space, e.g. existing office buildings along Empire Way are unattractive and unsuitable for modern office use. Amend Office Accommodation section to state, “The Council will limit the loss of office space where appropriate. However, the Council accepts that other town centre uses can be considered as alternatives to offices where they create and/or support employment and business opportunities to the wider area. Where it is proposed to replace office space with alternative uses, the Council will require developers to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The office space is not fit for purpose; or • It is not viable to re-provide the office space; and • Existing office space of similar or of a higher quality. <p>m) 3.1 Density - support masterplan paying due regard to London Plan Density Matrix.</p> <p>n) Amend the Housing Mix section to state, “The Council will seek to deliver an appropriate housing mix taking into account that town centre locations are not always appropriate for family housing. As such the Council will enter into agreements with developers to enable the delivery of family housing in more appropriate locations in the Borough.</p> <p>o) Should remove table one and all references to percentages of housing and affordable housing as the masterplan shouldn't introduce new policy.</p> <p>p) Support the statement that the Council will seek the maximum amount of affordable housing in line with the London Plan, subject to viability and the achievement of other planning objectives.</p> <p>q) Should include formulas for the calculation of play space and the evidence which they are based on.</p> <p>r) Under Open Space - should include a statement supporting</p>	<p>j) Support noted</p> <p>k) Support noted</p> <p>l) Overall, the principal aim of the Masterplan is to provide as many jobs as possible for existing and developing community. Therefore the Masterplan requires the protection of the existing employment space and the provision of new space. However the Masterplan is flexible and will consider a broad and flexible approach to the provision of much needed jobs.</p> <p>m) Support noted.</p> <p>n) Disagree. The Council considers the proposes locations in the Masterplan are suitable for family housing as the proposed associated facilities, children's play space, schools, sports and other community facilities would meet the needs of residents living in family housing units.</p> <p>o) Disagree. This table is provided for information and a broad representation of existing of Council policy.</p> <p>p) Support noted</p> <p>q) The formulas is based on the advice from Natural England</p>	<p>j) No change necessary</p> <p>k) No change necessary</p> <p>l) No change necessary</p> <p>m) No change necessary</p> <p>n) No change necessary</p> <p>o) No change necessary</p> <p>p) No change necessary</p> <p>q) No change necessary</p> <p>r) -bb)No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>imaginative open space provision such as roof gardens and terraces.</p> <p>s) Objects the “open space concept” map showing the majority of the Dexion House site as open space.</p> <p>t) Objects to the 0.5 parking space/residential unit target and suggest amendments - “In line with the London Plan, the Council will require less than 1 space per residential unit. Car free housing will be encouraged in developments that have high accessibility to public transport.</p> <p>u) Object that new high buildings are considered appropriate only in a few locations. LBB should remove the diagram entitled “indicative building heights” and amend the Building Heights section to state, “The Council recognises that high buildings helps....environments. New high buildings are will be considered appropriate only in a few locations where they satisfy fundamental design principles and planning policy, around Wembley Park Station and around the intersection of Fulton Road and Olympic Way. The diagram us not indeed to set uniform heights in every block and the quality of individual designs of buildings will be a key factor in determining acceptable heights. Delete “This illustration is intended to give a broad outline of the Council’s assessment of the desired and deliverable development heights.”</p> <p>v) 3.9 Sustainable and Climate Change - object to the expectation that Dexion House will be connected to a CCHP network subject to the sustainable infrastructure study becoming publicly available.</p> <p>w) 4.1 District One :North West - Re:Core objectives. Believe the Masterplan fails to address that Empire Way is a primary route through the area, should amend it to state, “A vibrant and attractive Empire Way that connects with neighbouring areas and promotes Wembley as a destinations. Improvements to the landscape quality on Empire Way and gradual and comfortable change in building scale”.</p> <p>x) 4.1, under Empire Way section, believe a flexible and design led approach to building heights onto Empire Way</p>	<p>r) Agreed.</p> <p>s) The Masterplan shows the indicative layout. Design will change overtime.</p> <p>t) Target included after broad consultation</p> <p>u) There are appropriated locations for taller buildings which are a function of considered streetscape design and appropriate location relative to neighbours.</p> <p>v) Long term sustainable development can only be delivered through the application of community energy system</p> <p>w) The Masterplan has noted the role of Empire Way and requires the retention of its broad proportion.</p> <p>x) Agree</p> <p>y) Noted.</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>should be taken, thus amend the text, “ For the development running south of Fulton Road....built frontage of 4–6 storeys including appropriate heights, whilst allowing....Although the uses will still be different (hotels, office and some residential), they....A range of high quality commercial ,residential and visitor accommodation will improve the viability and attractiveness of Empire Way.</p> <p>y) 4.1, under Land Use, should amend it to state “To complement the hospitality offer along Olympic Way, existing hotel accommodation will be enhanced along Empire Way, subject to the protection of local office space new hotel accommodation will be supported along Empire Way.”</p> <p>z) 4.1, under Scales and massing, objects to the inclusion of specific building heights since the height thresholds are too rigid and current and granted building heights fronting Empire Way already exceed 4-6 storeys.</p> <p>aa) 4.1, under Local Architectural Quality, should include Dexion House within the list of key development sites.</p> <p>bb) 5.0, Implementation and Delivery, should amend masterplan and IIF to state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The type of developments to be expected to contribute towards each of the items set out in the Section 106 Strategy. • Formulae to calculate the level of s106 expected from developments • A statement that reflects the guidance set out in para B5 of Circular 05/05. 	<p>z) All of the illustrations are indicative of the character and sense of place that the Council is aiming to achieve. The production and structure of this document is based on CABE’s guidance document “Creating Successful Masterplans”. The definition of a Masterplan within this document includes: ‘defines heights, massing and bulk of buildings’, ‘shows how the streets, squares and open spaces of a neighbourhood are to be connected’ and ‘determines the distribution of activities /uses that will be allowed’ amongst a range of other criteria.</p> <p>aa) All sites are recognised for their potential.</p> <p>bb) The council is exploring how a more equitable levy may be raised on all development in proportion to the trips that different uses generate. This method of securing transport infrastructure contributions will be assessed and introduced through either amendment of the council's S106 standard charge SPD or</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
			through the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy.	
RWM029	Quintain Estates and Development PLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Still too much emphasis on the physical and design aspects, and too little on finance and delivery. b) The draft Infrastructure and Investment Framework should be central to the document c) The document remains too prescriptive , in particular regarding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Block layout ii. Building height iii. Orientation, quantum and disposition of green space iv. The sitings of some trees v. Re-masterplanning of permitted development, etc. should incorporate flexibility to acknowledge funding gap. d) Masterplan should not be finalised until transportation principles are fully addressed (esp the North End Road Reconnection) e) P35- p38 "Residential Uses" - too prescriptive. It should be reworded to be capable of responding to the market demands. f) Clarify if a revised Sustainability Appraisal has been issued. g) The draft Masterplan should not be associated with the UDP and should not be issued as SPD in advance of an adopted Core Strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The IIF addresses this balance. b) Because the IIF will need to be more regularly amended and is central to the Council's whole Core Strategy, it remains a separate document c) All of the illustrations are indicative of the character and sense of place that the Council is aiming to achieve. The production and structure of this document is based on CABE's guidance document "Creating Successful Masterplans". The definition of a Masterplan within this document includes: 'defines heights, massing and bulk of buildings', 'shows how the streets, squares and open spaces of a neighbourhood are to be connected' and 'determines the distribution of activities /uses that will be allowed' amongst a range of other criteria. d) The Council has finalised its initial transportation work and completed its assessment of North End Road reconnection e) It is important to set out the mix of residential uses that meets the Council's affordable housing needs and supports a private housing mix that contributes to a mixed and balanced community. f) No changes have been made to the Sustainability Appraisal. g) Need to give up-to-date guidance for land owners, developers and the public to guide new developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) No change necessary b) No change necessary c) No change necessary d) No change necessary e) No change necessary f) No change necessary g) No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM030	Brent Green Party	<p>The economic context</p> <p>a) Believe that the Masterplan's dependence on the development of building retail, hotel and office space is undermined by the present financial crisis and recession. The Masterplan and other regeneration projects should be put on hold until such an analysis has been completed - eg.the downturn in the building industry, the over-supply of office space and hotels in the locality.</p> <p>b) The Masterplan's assumption that Section 106 monies paid by developers will pay for items such as a swimming pool, Wembley Live! and the works to join the North End Road to Bridge Road. Quintain have stated publicly that, in their opinion, the Wembley Masterplan is unrealistic, undeliverable and unaffordable.</p> <p>c) Supports the Government Office for London's demand for "strong and convincing evidence on realism and deliverability of the Masterplan's aspirations".</p> <p><u>A realistic economic approach</u></p> <p>d) Green technologies and employment projects such as those in the Green New Deal aimed at developing a strong low carbon economic sector in Brent could be sited in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>e) The recession necessitates the Council taking action on employment as a way of underpinning the local economy.</p> <p>f) Energy-efficiency and local energy-production programmes like passive solar-heating, photo-voltaic panels, aero-generators and biogas units could be started now. Local council action will be a vital component of making these projects happen and help tackle unemployment and the Council's climate change strategy.</p> <p>g) Support calls by the Wembley Community Association and others for urgent, realistic action to be taken in the short-term rather than reliance on grand schemes in the long-term.</p> <p>h) Advocate the building of more family homes with access to play space to reduce the Council's waiting list for accommodation.</p> <p><u>Environmental Issues</u></p>	<p>The economic context</p> <p>a) The Masterplan is designed to be a document for the long term regeneration of Wembley. Although the current short term economic climate is somewhat pessimistic, development is likely to gather pace in years to come. If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that many of the future benefits would come forward.</p> <p>b) The IIF demonstrates that only part of the costs of infrastructure will be provided by S106 reflected by the application of the Council's Standard Charge.</p> <p>c) The IIF document provides this evidence.</p> <p><u>A realistic economic approach</u></p> <p>d) The Masterplan promotes new green technology</p> <p>e) The land use strategy is underpinned by the creation of jobs. The first principal land use objective in Section 3.1 states "Bring forward development that will prioritise employment uses and deliver 10,000 new jobs."</p> <p>f) Section 3.9 states clearly a whole range of measures that must be considered at the outset of any new development. An in depth study was undertaken to assess the best possible options for incorporating sustainable infrastructure, which has been firmly embedded within this section of the document.</p> <p>g) Section 5 of the Masterplan sets out a likely timescale for development of the area, starting immediately and the necessary infrastructure that will need to be delivered at each stage.</p> <p>h) Section 3.1 under 'Residential Uses' clearly states the Councils requirements for family</p>	No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>i) Welcome the Masterplan's emphasis on improving the local environment in particular the naturalisation of the environs of the Wealdstone Brook, tree planting lining the roads, the creation of a number green open space, green roofs,</p> <p>j) Strongly advocate the incorporation of a variety of children's play areas for team games, football nets, basket ball pitches, bike tracks, roller blade courses, fixed play equipment, natural play spaces and areas for investigative play and growing plants and vegetables</p> <p>k) Among the open spaces there should be wildlife areas.</p> <p>l) The development should include microgeneration,, installation of solar water heating, installation of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems, water recycling and waste recycling systems for all businesses and dwellings.</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>m) Concerned that the Masterplan seeks to introduce a flow system for motor traffic. Opposed to making access easier for motor vehicles</p> <p>n) Opposed to the reconnection of North End Road to Bridge Road because this will increase traffic flow and congestion and have a detrimental impact on the residents of North End Road.</p> <p>o) Strongly support improved public transport links</p> <p>p) Call for accessible public transport from all parts of the borough to the new Civic Centre.</p> <p>q) Strongly support defined cycle routes and cycle parking facilities.</p> <p><u>Consultation Procedure</u></p> <p>r) Concerned that residents were not given a fair opportunity to make an informal response to the consultation. Suggests future documentation on consultations should be displayed prominently in a 'Planning/Consultation Area' at Libraries and One Stop Shops.</p>	<p>housing based on a firm understanding of the current and likely future needs.</p> <p><u>Environmental Issues</u></p> <p>i) Support Noted.</p> <p>j) The plan sets out areas for Play. Detailed planning of what is contained with the area will be dealt with at detailed application stage. Many of the things listed will be incorporated into the open space provision.</p> <p>k) Noted</p> <p>l) Section 3.9 states clearly a whole range of measures that must be considered at the outset of any new development. An in depth study was undertaken to assess the best possible options for incorporating sustainable infrastructure, which has been firmly embedded within this section of the document.</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>m) The overarching focus of the transport strategy (stated in Section 3.2 under heading 'A Strategy for Movement and Connection') is to put pedestrians and cyclists at the top of the hierarchy of road users. There is still a need to make places more accessible for vehicles, because they are still a large part of everyday life, however this plan aims to make public transport, walking and cycling much more attractive than use of private cars.</p> <p>n) The re-connection of North End Road to Bridge Road is one of a number of recommendations taken from the transportation study conducted by professional transport engineers and planners, it will need to be implemented if the area is to function successfully in the future.</p> <p>o) Support noted</p> <p>p) The transportation strategy will enable the</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
			<p>new Civic Centre to be fully accessible from public transport walking and cycling.</p> <p>q) Support noted</p> <p><u>Consultation Procedure</u></p> <p>r)The Council considers that the consultation exercise was indeed comprehensive. The further consultation exercise allowed other local resident and amenity groups within Wembley to make their representations. It also allowed existing consultees who had made representations in August/September a further opportunity to comment. The 8 week consultation period was extended to ensure residents had the opportunity to comment after the request made at the Wembley Area Consultative Forum.The updated Masterplan was put on the Council's website, a letter was directly sent to more than 760 addresses. A public meeting was held on 13 January 2009, as well as presentations to the Wembley ACF on 28 January 2009. Separate meetings had been held with key landowners in the area, representatives of Danes/Empire Courts and representatives of Wembley Community Association. Articles were put in the Brent Magazine and Wembley Way. Public notices and articles also appeared in the Wembley Observer and other local newspapers. All above channels allowed a number of opportunities for discussion and representations to be made on the proposed masterplan.</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM031	Cllr Muhammed Butt	<p><u>Sherrins farm</u></p> <p>a) Brought to the attention that some people have concerns about the proposed foot bridge and the type of developments whether it will be residential or mixed use and whether or not the school will be involved to bring some sporting facilities to the area.</p> <p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>b) Finds that a bit hard to accept the concerns that some people were not consulted, as it was advertised in the local papers and in the Brent magazine and through the ACF in Wembley.</p> <p><u>Economic climate</u></p> <p>c) Appreciates the plan is a long term vision, but has reservation on achievability as impacted by the present economic climate.</p> <p>d) Believe terms and conditions should not dictate the deliverability of the Masterplan. LBB needs to make sure that the organisations / developers are able to deliver and not end up with half built developments</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>e) Agrees the need for a clear transportation framework within the Wembley area linking all parts of Wembley on event/non event days.</p> <p>f) The transportation should be linked with all the routes and local stations and should extend to outside Wembley for people who work outside Wembley.</p> <p>g) Questions how to control car use into and out of Wembley and what impact of the increase of traffic will be on the local area</p> <p>h) Questions how new businesses will be able to attract customers if insufficient parking spaces are provided.</p> <p><u>North End Road</u></p> <p>i) LBB should consult the ward councillors and residents of North End Road consulted before decision is made. Reckons the businesses and the possible new hotel/student accommodation block would benefit greatly to the detriment of local residents</p> <p>j) There are concerns that North End Road could become a</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Agree</p> <p>c) &d)The Council considers that the majority of its infrastructure expectations are minimum requirements for the Masterplan to deliver a long term successful and sustainable community. The text of the Masterplan has been revised to include greater clarity on financial coordination and viability. The Masterplan is designed to be a document for the long term regeneration of Wembley. Although the current short term economic climate is somewhat pessimistic, development is likely to gather pace in years to come. If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that key infrastructure and many of the future benefits sought would be delivered in a co-ordinated way.</p> <p>e) Support noted</p> <p>f) Agree. Masterplan recommends significantly enhanced bus services throughout the area. The Council will establish dialogue with TfL to implement the recommendations put forward by consultants on bus strategy and travel demand management</p> <p>g) See responses to RWM062(i)</p> <p>h) Local public transport will provide efficient servicing of the area for the potential customers.</p> <p>i) The Consultants' Reports on the junction capacity assessment confirm that the scheme layouts will operate satisfactorily with the predicted traffic volumes arising from the development of the Masterplan area. All the proposals are subject to Council Committee approvals and planning consents.</p> <p>j) The Wembley masterplan also proposes a new</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) No change necessary</p> <p>d) No change necessary</p> <p>e) No change necessary</p> <p>f) No change necessary</p> <p>g) No change necessary</p> <p>h) No change necessary</p> <p>i) No change necessary</p> <p>j) No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>rat run to North Circular Road and Harlesden etc.</p> <p><u>Hotels & Accommodation</u></p> <p>k) Queries if there seems to be a focus on hotel accommodation while large local hotels are struggling to keep going despite a new stadium in the area.</p> <p>l) More family houses should be built instead of apartment blocks.</p> <p>m) There is no progress on the old Unisys building which has been vacant for about 10+ years</p> <p>n) Approximately 20,000 people on housing waiting list while waiting time is between 7 and 15 years for 3,4 & 5 bedroom. LBB should have a strategy or a plan for houses to be built.</p> <p>o) There is waiting time of between 7 to 15 years for 3 , 4 & 5 bedroom properties for the people on Brent's housing waiting list, it would be better if we could try to build the larger type properties instead of flats and apartments.</p> <p><u>Business / Community</u></p> <p>p) LBB needs to make sure that different types/diverse hub of businesses and high street names are attracted into the area and not end up with high street full of takeaway shops and pound value shops.</p> <p>q) Should also try to attract creative industries into the area.</p> <p>r) LBB needs to make sure that some kind of affordable community centre is provided that the town hall will not be relied on for providing community space.</p>	<p>two way road system in the area. Accessing the North Circular Road from South Way will provide for most efficient route. Most of the traffic using Stadium car parks on event days uses Great Central Way and traffic is diverted back to Great Central Way during dispersal.</p> <p>k) Long term hotel growth is needed as predicted. Developers will not provide them if there is no market.</p> <p>l) The Masterplan sets out a reasonable mix</p> <p>m) This is not part of the Masterplan area.</p> <p>n) The Masterplan sets out a reasonable mix. It will not be commercially viable to build only houses in the Masterplan area.</p> <p>o) The Masterplan sets out a reasonable mix.</p> <p>p) This is the purpose of the quantum and shape of the new shopping street.</p> <p>q) It is part of the Masterplan proposals.</p> <p>r) This is set out on the Council's IIF document</p>	
RWM032	Mr Nitesh Patel	<p>a) Expresses gratitude to those involved in coming up with the vision and the masterplan</p> <p>b) Propose a "Masterkey" to the Masterplan - It is necessary for a World Class Visitor/Tourist Attraction by a group who have proven the ability to create and ideally who are already present in the area.</p> <p>c) Urges the completion of major parts of Wembley Masterplan ie. Civic Centre, hotels, Retail Boulevard, open spaces, infrastructure and transport improvement and the "Major Visitor Attractions" before the 2012 Olympics.</p>	<p>a) Support noted</p> <p>b) The Council supports the development of world class visitor attractors but their promotion is beyond the scope of the Masterplan.</p> <p>c) The Council would like to see completion of key parts of the Masterplan but this is dependent largely on the market delivery and this is likely to be slow in the current recession.</p>	<p>a) No change necessary</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) No change necessary</p>
RWM033	College of North West London	<p>a) Concerned that the masterplan will be adopted prior to the resolution of feasibility study of North End Road.</p>	<p>a) b) & c) A feasibility study has been carried out by independent consultants to examine the</p>	<p>a) , b) & c) No change necessary</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Each of alternative solutions is likely to have impact that will affect not only on CNWL but also on residents and businesses. c) CNWL urge delay of adoption until a possible solution, which is both practical and affordable, is identified. 	<p>costs, deliverability and buildability on different junction and ramp designs. The consultants' conclusions are that the reconnection is both physically and technically deliverable. It is also affordable and costs considerably less than the Council's original budgets. More over the analysis of the junctions shows that the reconnection is essential to ensure that none of the junctions is overloaded by the development coming forward</p>	
RWM034	J.A Brindle	<p>Extremely concerned about the plan to open up North End Rd. Detrimental to quality of life:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The traffic will be dreadful every day throughout each day and particularly on event days. b) Increased traffic will bring more people, more noise, more rubbish, more risk to safety and could lead to significant health needs, particularly to increased stress levels c) it will be a noisy, polluting atmosphere with the huge number of tall new buildings being built and will add to more danger for pedestrians d) Urges not to let the masterplan go ahead and make lives change for the worse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Wembley masterplan also proposes a new two way road system in the area. Accessing the North Circular Road from South Way will provide for most efficient route. Most of the traffic using Stadium car parks on event days uses Great Central Way and traffic is diverted back to Great Central Way during dispersal. b) & c) Brent Council will monitor the level of traffic generated and impose restrictions if necessary. Mechanical road sweepers will more easily clean the through road than a dead end. The new ramp structure will include 2m wide footways either side of the carriageway. Tree planting for new developments will be required in the area to improve air quality and biodiversity. d) The Council is continuing with the current timetable for adoption of the Masterplan because, despite the economic downturn, there are still significant development pressures within the area. It is considered critical that the Council has guidance in place that sets out the expectations for community infrastructure and development parameters, otherwise it may be difficult to realise the wider benefits of piecemeal development. 	a), b) & c) No change necessary
RWM035	Des Keenan	a) States that the proposed plans are excellent after having	a) Support noted	a), b), c) & d)No

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>studied and listened to the proposals.</p> <p>b) Believes that some residents who seemed not having attended any meetings or bothered to read any documents or circulars sent to them by Brent Council, awoke to the fact that North End Road was to be re-opened at the Wembley Park end. Declined to join the group as their objections were clearly self-interested.</p> <p>c) Reckons the proposed re-opening of the North End Road is not aimed at providing a short-cut to the North Circular Road, but allowing traders on the Wembley Trading Estate access to the Wembley/Harrow area during events. This is absolutely essential</p> <p>d) Presumes the hoteliers clearly want to keep out competition. Reckons it is inadvisable to exclude such competition at this stage. It would be the proper time to lodge objections when planning applications are received. By that time it will be clearer if there is a necessity for them or not.</p>	<p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Agree</p> <p>d) Agree</p>	change necessary
RWM036	Thames Water	The Masterplan should encourage developers to make early contact with the utilities companies to ensure adequate services can be provided. Suggest the following paragraph is included in the Utilities section: "Water and wastewater infrastructure capacity both on and off the site to serve the proposed new development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed will lead to overloading of existing water and sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the statutory undertaker, then the developer needs to contact the undertaker to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development."	Agreed	Text amended to incorporate the suggested paragraph.
RWM037	Cllr Peter Corcoran	<p>a) Wembley Stadium is the catalyst for all development in the Masterplan area and it is a fitting goal to present the stadium in a world class environment.</p> <p>b) Fully supports the need for new development around the stadium but development should not detrimental impact on</p>	<p>a) Noted. See responses to RWM024</p> <p>b) Support noted.</p> <p>c) Noted. See responses to RWM024</p> <p>d) The Masterplan has included a number of new openspaces.</p>	<p>a) Amendment made. See RWM024</p> <p>b) No change necessary</p> <p>c) Amendment made.</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>local business and the local community.</p> <p>c) Safety at the National Stadium should be of the utmost concern when deciding the mass and structure of buildings in this area - eg. the evacuation procedures are not hampered by a lack of public space.</p> <p>d) LBB should demand a healthy provision of public open space and to resist the reduction of it during the planning stages.</p> <p>e) A strong transport strategy must be in place to ensure a safe travel plan</p> <p>f) Urges to ensure that Chiltern rail and TFL can continue to provide passenger capacity as their business grows.</p> <p>g) Fully supports residents' opposition to opening North End Road.</p> <p>h) The North End Road area should be protected from tower blocks proposals and is more suitable for low level quality structures.</p> <p>i) Fully agrees and supports residents' wish not to have new crossings as it would very likely increase crime in their area.</p> <p>j) Urges restraint when developing the Masterplan. Slowly and safely is the way forward.</p>	<p>e) The Masterplan Transport Strategy Review report issued in November 2008 presented a technical review of the transport elements of the Draft Wembley Masterplan. The report raised some questions regarding the Masterplan's deliverability in transport terms. A further study comprising a bus strategy, a travel demand management strategy and a highway corridor assessment has been completed since then. The conclusion of the studies carried out by the Council's consultants is that the level of development is deliverable with the junction improvements itemised. It does require continued improvements to bus services and to cycling and walking routes and a series of travel demand management measures. These can reduce further the proportion of trips that are predicted to be made using public transport, cycling and walking....</p> <p>f) Brent Council will continue to engage with public transport operators in service improvements.</p> <p>g) Objection noted. The reconnection will prevent the existing and future residents and businesses of the Masterplan being trapped in the North West District on stadium event days. More importantly, it is also required to maintain a fair spread of traffic on the junctions into and out of the Masterplan area, ensuring that new development does not worsen traffic conditions. The proposed rerouteing of bus PR2 running on North End Road will maintain east west public transport movements on event days. It will bring more benefits than disbenefits.</p> <p>h) Noted</p> <p>i) Noted</p>	<p>See RWM024</p> <p>d) No change necessary</p> <p>e) No change necessary</p> <p>f) No change necessary</p> <p>g) No change necessary</p> <p>h)</p>

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM038	Ann Brennan and Dermot McCabe	<p>a) Object to the Mastreplan as the consultation has been inept- Local residents and businesses were not involved in the conception and have not had the chance to adequately understand the plan put before them. An advertised exhibition and relevant documents were not available.</p> <p>b) The plans should be put on hold until the Council have made a full impact assessment of the economic recession on the local economy & the viability of a retail and hotel lead development</p> <p>c) Concerned that council tax payers will end up paying the bill for Wembley live and swimming pools etc</p> <p>d) The traffic plans should be revisited - The reconnection of North End road needs to be reassessed on cost and impact upon local residents.</p> <p>e) Concerned that the masterplan will be adopted prior to the resolution of feasibility study of North End Road. Each of alternative solutions is likely to have impact that will affect residents and businesses.</p> <p>f) Urges delay of adoption until a possible solution, which is both practical and affordable, is identified.</p>	<p>a) See responses to RWM030(r)</p> <p>b) See responses to RWM062(d)</p> <p>c) See responses to RWM062(r)</p> <p>d) e) & f) See responses to RWM033</p>	No change necessary
RWM039	JA Turner	<p>a) The masterplan should be redrawn unless supporting information can demonstrate how the vast and ambitious plans for Wembley can be delivered.</p> <p>b) LBB should halt the masterplan's progression until the traffic Studies are sufficiently tested to give residents confidence on how traffic flows and volumes will be affected by the new framework.</p>	<p>a) See responses to RWM062(f)</p> <p>b) See responses to RWM062(i)</p>	No change necessary
RWM040	Salil Whalas	<p>a) Against building more office space as current offices are not full.</p> <p>b) The Masaterplan should be more deliverable and achievable</p> <p>c) The Masterplan contents do not show enough traffic mitigation measures being carried out.</p> <p>d) Requests delay to the process to enable residents to comment.</p>	<p>a) See responses to RWM062(m)</p> <p>b) See responses to RWM062(c),(d)&(e)</p> <p>c) See responses to RWM062(i)</p> <p>d) See responses to RWM030(r)</p>	No change necessary
RWM041	Sanjiv Ahluwalia	<p>a) LBB should review the process due to poor consultation and the change in economic circumstances.</p> <p>b) North End Road reconnection will be detrimental to local</p>	<p>a) See responses to RWM030(r) and RWM002(g)</p> <p>b) See responses to RWM062(f)</p>	No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		people, financially prohibitive and cause congestion on Bridge Road, Empire Way and Wembley Park Drive.		
RWM042	M.A. Lawe	a) Poor consultation	a) See responses to RWM030(r)	No change necessary
RWM043	Mr P Fatanif	a) LBB should halt the masterplan's progression until a recession impact assessment on local economy is carried out. b) Concerned that the masterplan will be adopted prior to the resolution of feasibility study of North End Road. Alternative solutions should be sought.	a) Disagree. See response to RWM002(g) b) See responses to RWM033	
RWM044	Lilian Zhui	a) LBB should halt the masterplan's progression b) Poor consultation. Local people should be consulted on what they need as a community.	a) Disagree b) See responses to RWM030(r)	No change necessary
RWM045	W. Alis	a) LBB should halt the masterplan's process. b) Traffic impact assessment should be carried out on how traffic flows and volumes will be affected by the new framework. c) Family housing/houses, which is needed, will have effect on the sense of community. d) North End Road reconnection would cost millions of pounds and compromise the safety and peaceful environment. e) The reconnection should be considered alongside the Academy application as a material factor.	a) Disagree b) See responses to RWM062(i) c) The Masterplan proposes a range of residential accommodation, including a significant amount of family housing with associated facilities and children's play space. It will not be commercially viable to build only houses in the Masterplan area, which for the most part will be mixed in use and with ground floor commercial uses to meet employment and other objectives. Community facilities such as community centres, public open space as included in the IIF would help create a sense of community. d) See responses to RWM062(f) e) A non existing structure cannot be a material consideration.	No change necessary
RWM046	Mrs S Gadhia	a) Poor consultation.	a) See responses to RWM030(r)	No change necessary
RWM047	Saifur Rahman	b) LBB should halt the masterplan's progression until a recession impact assessment on local economy is carried out and Brent's climate change strategy is in place.	b) See responses to RWM002(g)	
RWM048	Exotic Ltd	a) LBB should halt the masterplan's process. b) Traffic impact assessment should be carried out on how traffic flows and volumes will be affected by the new framework.	a) Disagree b) See responses to RWM062(d)	No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		c) There is no rush for the plan as there are sufficient planning policies and guidance in place.	c) See responses to RWM062(v)	
RWM049	12 Elmside Road	a) LBB should halt the masterplan's process. b) Believes traffic impact and astronomical costs should be assessed fully.	a) Disagree b) See responses to RWM062(i) & RWM062(e)	No change necessary
RWM050	A.M. Thorpe	a) Poor consultation b) Cannot see how local people would benefit from the proposals - congestion will get worse and a huge bill to pay for. c) More time is required to respond to the economic situation. d) Needs more homes but not flats laid empty as many are now.	a) See responses to RWM030(r) b) See responses to RWM062(i) and RWM062(r) c) See responses to RWM002(g) d) See responses to RWM062(j)	No change necessary
RWM051	B.C. Patel	a) Reconnection of North End Road will be a mistake and a waste of money. b) Traffic mitigation requires more thought - LBB should have a presentation or exhibition solely on the traffic implications of the Masterplan.	a) See responses to RWM143(c) b) See responses to RWM062(i)	No change necessary
RWM052	Mrs O'Dea	a) Objects to the opening up of North End Road - LBB needs to review the deliverability. b) The Masterplan should be less aspirational and more deliverable. c) Should delay the adoption for carrying more consultation.	a) See responses to RWM c),d) & e) b) See responses to RWM062(i) c) See responses to RWM030(r)	No change necessary
RWM053	30 Forty Lane	a) Reconnecting North End Road will create more traffic problems.	a) See responses to RWM062(f)	No change necessary
RWM054	Brent News	b) Consultation with residents should be extended.	b) See responses to RWM030(r)	
RWM055	Sandro Pesce	a) The Masterplan seems to be unrealistic for local residents.	a) See responses to RWM062(i)	No change necessary
RWM056	Christine Leahy	b) Disagrees with the reconnection of North End Road c) Shouldn't seek for more hotels and office spaces as enough empty spaces currently exist.	b) See responses to RWM143(c) c) See responses to RWM062(l), (m) & (o)	
RWM057	24 Durand Way	a) Reckons the plan will hinder regeneration progress rather than help it in current economic crisis. b) Flavours a scaled down scheme likely to be implemented in the short and medium term. c) Concerned about traffic plans which seems to forget residents and businesses. d) Disagrees to reopen North End Road.	a) See responses to RWM062(v) b) See response to RWM002(g) c) See responses to RWM062(i) d) See responses to RWM143(c)	No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM058	11 Midholm	a) Poor consultation b) Plan undeliverable and not viable particularly on hotels/offices. c) North End Road should not be opened up d) Traffic plan should be revisited.	a) See responses to RWM030(r) b) See responses to RWM062(l), (m) & (o) c) See responses to RWM062(i) d) See responses to RWM063(c) e) See responses to RWM062(q)	No change necessary
RWM059	T Tamura	e) Concerned that the council tax payers will end up paying for facilities like Wembley Live/swimming pools. f) More houses and less apartments are needed.	f) See responses to RWM062(g)	
RWM060	L George	Demands the Masterplan to be more economically realistic and deliverable.	See responses to RWM002(g) & RWM062(c), d) & e)	No change necessary
RWM061	A.T.Coles	a) Poor consultation - more time is needed for residents' input. b) Objects to the North End Road reconnection. c) Lack of family housing proposed d) Lack of strategy to deal with traffic generated by these plans	a) See responses to RWM030(r) b) See responses to RWM062(i) c) See responses to RWM062(g) d) See responses to RWM063(c)	No change necessary
RWM062	Wembley Community Association	<u>Inadequate consultation</u> - a) Lack of engagement with local people in the formation of the Masterplan at the earliest stage b) Bad consultation process. <u>Deliverability - Unviable Plan</u> c) The plan should be more economically realistic and take account of the current economic climate. d) LBB should halt the masterplan's progression until a recession impact assessment on local economy is carried out and Brent's climate change strategy is in place. e) LBB should demonstrate with evidence, the deliverability of the Masterplan's aspirations.	a) Disagree. The concept masterplan was discussed at the Wembley Consultative Forum and Brent Youth Parliament prior to the first round of public consultation. b) See responses to RWM030(r) c) d) & e) The Council considers that the majority of its infrastructure expectations are minimum requirements for the Masterplan to deliver a long term successful and sustainable community. The text of the Masterplan has been revised to include greater clarity on financial coordination and viability. The Masterplan is designed to be a document for the long term regeneration of Wembley. Although the current short term economic climate is somewhat pessimistic, development is likely to gather pace in years to come. If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that key infrastructure and many of the future benefits sought would be delivered in a co-ordinated way. The Infrastructure and	a) - v) No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p><u>North End Road - keep in closed</u></p> <p>f) Opening the road would compromise residents' and children's safety, increase noise levels to unacceptable levels, increase pollution and have a detrimental impact on local residents' quality of life</p> <p>g) It would lead to a drop in the value of people's homes</p> <p>h) It should be a material consideration for the Academy application.</p>	<p>Investment Framework also indicates the possible sources of funding and timescale. The IIF shows that the gap between requirements and funds only appears at the end of the development period post 2017 and is relatively modest in relation to the scale of development. This does allow the Council to seek other sources of funding given that any Council commitments will of necessity be within its own affordability criteria. The Masterplan promotes the regeneration of Wembley based on the principle a sustainable development.</p> <p>f) The Council will, at more detailed planning stages, need to undertake a safety audit of such works. Only the top end of North End Road is proposed to be reconnected. The new ramp structure will include 2m wide footways either side of the carriageway. The bottom end will remain as cul-de-sac. However if the road is used for more than just local access, the Council can bring forward a number of measures that could reduce its impact on local people, such as width restrictions for heavy good vehicles (excluding buses), traffic calming measures such as speed humps and configuration of junctions to reduce its value as a through -route. Temporary traffic management on event days will be reviewed to reduce through traffic into North End Road. Tree planting for new developments will be required in the area to improve air quality and biodiversity.</p> <p>g) This is no evidence to support this assertion and is not a consideration just as appreciation of valuation by improving Wembley will not be returned to the Council.</p> <p>h) A non existing structure cannot be a material</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>expense of some apartments.</p> <p><u>Hotel and office provision - demonstrate demand</u></p> <p>l) Question LBB's enthusiastic attitude to future hotel provision while large local hotels are struggling to keep going.</p> <p>m) Shouldn't seek for more office spaces as enough empty spaces currently exist.</p> <p>n) Unutilised Wembley Arena - Lesson for the Council for not flexible enough to cope with fluctuation in the leisure market.</p> <p>o) A feasibility study on hotel and office demand should be carried out prior to the masterplan approval.</p>	<p>It will not be commercially viable to build only houses in the Masterplan area, which for the most part will be mixed in use and with ground floor commercial uses to meet employment and other objectives.</p> <p>l) The Masterplan has considered the GLA's advice that there is demand for 44,000 more hotel rooms within London. Based on good public transport network, prospective visitors attractions planned in Quintain Stage 1 proposals and all forthcoming high profile international sporting events, the Council is currently experiencing considerable planning interest in new hotels in the Wembley area indicating that the private sector considers this type of development extremely viable in Wembley. Local major hotels may be currently facing some short term financial difficulties; If the Council was to base the aspirations of this document on the current economic climate, it is unlikely that many of the future benefits would come forward</p> <p>m) One of the primary aims of the Masterplan is to provide a significant increase in the broader employment potential in Wembley. To this end the office space proposed will be tailored to provide accommodation for high end company headquarters, existing local businesses and also affordable space for creative industries and new evolving companies. We should not close off the idea of a new office market emerging over the longer term as new retail, café and other facilities emerge to attract new occupiers</p> <p>n) The Arena is well used. More than 180 days in 2009 have been booked for events at Wembley Arena. Actually, it has received bookings up to 2011</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>p) Development should be “phased” to allow operators to demonstrate viability.</p> <p><u>Public Facilities</u></p> <p>q) Concerned that community facilities proposed e.g Wembley Live, Olympic size swimming pool and a new Civic Centre are designed for attracting people into the area and not for the local community. Request a more realistic list of public facilities that will benefit local residents.</p> <p>r) Concerned that local council taxpayers will have to pay for those facilities and running costs and “road improvements” if developers refuse to pay for them.</p> <p><u>Sherrins Farm</u></p>	<p>o) Section 5.0 “Implementation & delivery” of the Masterplan indicates a general pattern of development. The geographical sequence of development is not designed to be overly prescriptive and the Council will assist the development of all suitable sites.</p> <p>p) The Council understands the concerns expressed. However the creation of high quality, well lit pedestrian and cycle bridges will enable existing residents to access the variety of new facilities that will be delivered in the Masterplan Area and could potentially lead to significant enhancements of the existing open space.</p> <p>q) &r)The Masterplan is clear about funding sources in Section 5.0 “Implementation”, citing: Section 106 Planning obligations, Central Government funding, Growth Area Funding, the GLA, TFL and other agencies including Council funding. The Infrastructure and Investment Framework also indicates the possible sources of funding and timescale. The summary table attached as Appendix 4 of the Executive Committee Report 06.04.09 shows that the gap between requirements and funds only appears at the end of the development period post 2017 and is relatively modest in relation to the scale of development. This does allow the Council to seek other sources of funding given that any Council commitments will of necessity be within its own affordability criteria</p> <p>s)&t)The Council understands the concerns expressed. However the creation of high quality, well lit pedestrian and cycle bridges will enable existing residents to access the variety of new facilities that will be delivered in the Masterplan Area and could potentially</p>	

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		<p>s) Concerned about the proposed footbridge and its uses. t) Should address the plans that the Stadium may have about utilising the park.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>u) Current Masterplan process should be halted and reviewed. v) No rush for the plans as there are sufficient planning policies and guidelines in place.</p>	<p>lead to significant enhancements of the existing open space.</p> <p>u) Disagree. v) The council intended to bring forward an Area action Plan covering the whole of the Wembley Regeneration Area in order to give more up-to-date planning guidance. This would have come towards the end of the LDF programme which has been delayed. Recent indications from landowners indicate that we cannot wait that long and more up-to-date guidance is required as a matter of urgency. An SPD can be produced in the meantime that can help guide development and provide the community with an opportunity to shape that development. Development will not start on many sites for some years and will not be completed for twenty or more. The 2004 Masterplan was less concerned with environmental sustainability and was not informed by the new amended version of the London Plan. The updated Masterplan puts social, economic and environmental benefits at the heart of a new, more sustainable plan. It also supports and provides a spatial expression of Brent's 2007 Vision for Wembley</p>	
RWM063	Danes and Empire Court Residents Association	<p>Objects to the North End Road Reconnection because</p> <p>a) The increased traffic inevitably comprising a high number of heavy vehicles would detrimentally alter the quiet cul-de-sac environment. b) There would be more air and noise pollution and risk of road accidents.</p>	<p>a) &b) Only the top end of North End Road is proposed to be reconnected. The bottom end will remain as cul-de-sac. Brent Council will monitor the level of traffic generated and impose restrictions if necessary. The new ramp structure will include 2m wide footways either side of the carriageway. Tree planting for new developments will be required in the area to improve air quality and biodiversity.</p>	<p>a),b),c), d) & e)No change necessary</p>
RWM064	Resident of Danes and Empire Courts			
RWM065	L Batt			
RWM066	Mr & Mrs Foster			

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM067	Rabia Hussain	c) Concerned that the Masterplan had not been assessed by Brent traffic consultants.	c) The Wembley Masterplan Transport Strategy Review report November 2008 issued by Council's transport consultants presented a technical review of the transport elements of the Draft Wembley Masterplan. A further study comprising a bus strategy, a travel demand management strategy and a highway corridor assessment has been completed since then. A feasibility study has been carried out by independent consultants to examine the costs, deliverability and buildability on different junction and ramp designs. The conclusion of the studies is that the level of development is deliverable with the junction improvements itemised. The scheme layouts will operate satisfactorily with the predicted traffic volumes arising from the development of the Masterplan area. It does require continued improvements to bus services and to cycling and walking routes and a series of travel demand management measures. These can reduce further the proportion of trips that are predicted to be made using public transport, cycling and walking.	
RWM068	Miss D Brown			
RWM069	Mrs K Patel			
RWM070	Rakesh Radhakrishna			
RWM071	Ashish Misal			
RWM072	Rene Kovac			
RWM073	S Jager			
RWM074	Jarmiane Lyston			
RWM075	Judith Brindle			
RWM076	Mr Greenwood			
RWM077	M Pall			
RWM078	Mathew Coelelo			
RWM079	Khaled Halcin			
RWM080	Okero T			
RWM081	Toyin Ajayi			
RWM082	Smita Seth			
RWM083	Ivan Ivanov	e) The unjustifiable cost in the region of £10m to the council taxpayers.	e) Brent consultants' conclusions are that the reconnection is both physically and technically deliverable. It is also affordable and costs considerably less than the Council's original	
RWM084	Laide Francisco			
RWM085	Judit Kasuba			
RWM086	C Swasm			
RWM087	Piotr Polemborski			
RWM088	Rachel Oyewusi			
RWM089	Ann Finesilver			
RWM090	49 Empire Court			
RWM091	54 Empire Court			
RWM092	Marie Helenntula			
RWM093	63 Empire Court			
RWM094	J.S. Ebest			
RWM095	Carol Baptiste			

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM096	Nanouche Mayambu		budgets. The improvements will be funded through Section 106 contributions from developers which Brent Council will negotiate through the planning processes	
RWM097	Prameela Nair			
RWM098	83 Empire Court			
RWM099	S.Mohamed Rasic			
RWM100	Arabella Little			
RWM101	Upamali Pereva			
RWM102	M.Dushi			
RWM103	Sandhya Gupta			
RWM104	Devi Raval			
RWM105	96 Empire Court			
RWM106	Gautam Awekar			
RWM107	104 Empire Court			
RWM108	Oku Shale			
RWM109	117 Empire Court			
RWM110	M.Sudha			
RWM111	Maggi Willis			
RWM112	M.Ademakinwa			
RWM113	Mr & Mrs Pickering			
RWM114	B.Rausaye			
RWM115	Mr & Mrs Singh			
RWM116	Anne.R.Servano			
RWM117	P.Stonehouse			
RWM118	K.J.Joseph			
RWM119	Lydia Atkinson			
RWM120	E.P.Franks			
RWM121	Kun Jama			
RWM122	Kawdceq			
RWM123	Angela Dugdale			
RWM124	205 Empire Court			

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
RWM125	206 Empire Court			
RWM126	212 Empire Court			
RWM127	213 Empire Court			
RWM128	217 Empire Court			
RWM129	229 Empire Court			
RWM130	220 Empire Court			
RWM131	230 Empire Court			
RWM132	3 Greenhill Way	a) Traffic impact studies need to be sufficiently tested. b) Reopening the North End Road would waste millions of pounds and compromised the safety of children and students. c) The proposal needs to be considered as a material factor for the Academy application	a) See response to RWM63(c) b) See response to RWM63(e).The new ramp structure will include 2m wide footways either side of the carriageway that ensures safety for pedestrians. When the new building on the current Crescent House site is ready, the College of North West London will move out from Arena House which is on the top end of North End Road. It is anticipated that Arena House would be vacated (no students) before the reconnection is complete. c) A non existing structure cannot be a material consideration.	a), b) & c) No change necessary.
RWM133	Festim			
RWM134	1 The Paddocks	a) Concerned who is going to pay for everything. b) The current Masterplan should be more economically realistic to reflect the current economic climate.	a) & b) See response to RWM62(b)	a) & b) No change necessary
RWM135	T.M.Forslee			
RWM136	2 Greenhill Way	a) Regeneration must not happen to the detriment of local people. b) Questions on the viability of the Masterplan c) Issues on traffic, quantity and quality of new homes have not been answered.	a) Brent Council will negotiate through its planning processes to require developers to minimise the impact on the local community and to carry out tasks that will provide community benefits through Section 106 contributions from developers. b) See responses to RWM132 c) Traffic issue - see response to RWM063(c). Details on quantity and quality of housing are covered in 3.1, residential use of the Masterplan.	a),b) &c) No change necessary
RWM137	Daniel Saitariu			
RWM138	Mrs.C.Oliver	a) The plan appears to be over ambitious and non-deliverable. The Council should focus on what is deliverable, review	a) See responses to RWM132	a) No change necessary

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		and update it accordingly.		
RWM139	Bakab Al-Hajani	The current Masterplan process should be halted because of a) Community needs should be looked at b) Bad consultation	a) The IIF sets out the population generated by all of the new development and broadly what needs these would give rise to. Over 10,000 homes will accommodate around 25,000 people. The IIF has estimated the costs of provision of facilities to cover these needs. b) Disagree. The Council considers that the consultation exercise was indeed comprehensive as described in the responses to RWM30(r) and carried out twice. It allowed a number of opportunities for discussion and representations to be made on the proposed masterplan.	a) & b) No change necessary
RWM140	Ronnie Schemlob	The current Masterplan process should be on hold because of a) Not enough work done to fully assess the traffic impact and costs of what is planned b) Unrealistic plans.	a) Disagree. See responses to RWM063(c) b) Disagree. See responses to RWM132	a) & b) No change necessary
RWM141	Z.Ahmed			
RWM142	H.Vaja	The current Masterplan process should be halted because a) Traffic impact studies need to be sufficiently tested b) More family houses should be built instead of flats c) Reopening of North End Road is a waste of money and it would compromise the safety and peaceful environment.	a) See responses to RWM063(c) b) See responses to RWM062(j) c) The reconnection will prevent the existing and future residents and businesses of the Masterplan being trapped in the North West District on stadium event days. More importantly, it is also required to maintain a fair spread of traffic on the junctions into and out of the Masterplan area, ensuring that new development does not worsen traffic conditions. The improvements will be funded through Section 106 contributions from developers which Brent Council will negotiate through the planning processes. The stretch of North End Road at Empire Court (245 residential properties) will remain as cul-de-sac. Vehicular access from Empire Court to Stadium Business Centre will continue to be	a), b), c), & d) No change necessary
RWM143	Mrs A.Zelouf			

Ref No.	Representation	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	How Masterplan has been altered
		w) Reopening of North End Road should be a material consideration for the Academy application.	blocked. The Council will, at more detailed planning stages, need to undertake a safety audit of such works. d) A non existing structure cannot be a material consideration.	
RWM144	Ali	The current Masterplan process should be halted because a) Traffic impact studies need to be sufficiently tested b) No rush for the plans as there are sufficient planning policies and guidelines in place.	a) See responses to RWM063(c) b) See responses to RWM062(v)	a) & b) No change necessary
RWM145	Mrs Khan	a) Bad consultation b) Unrealistic plans c) No evidence showing traffic problems will be solved d) More homes are needed than "rabbit hutch apartments". e) Concerned that the council tax payers will end up having to pay for Wembley Live and swimming pools if developers do not pay for them.	a) Disagree. See responses to RWM030 (r) b) Disagree. See responses to RWM132 c) See responses to RWM063(c) d) See responses to RWM140(b) e) See responses to RWM062(r)	a) , b), c),d)& e) No change necessary
RWM146	Puran	The current Masterplan process should be halted because a) More work is required to demonstrate how the main elements of the plan will be delivered. b) Traffic impact studies need to be sufficiently tested.	a) See responses to RWM062(c), (d) & (e) b) See responses to RWM063(c)	a)& b) No change necessary
RWM147	A.S. Dalwai	a) Traffic impact studies need to be sufficiently tested b) Reopening of North End Road will bring no benefits to the area and will make congestion worse. c) Bad consultation d) Suggests a more realistic plan e) Concerned that the council tax payers will end up having to pay for these facilities.	a) See responses to RWM063(c) b) Disagree. See responses to RWM037(g) and RWM062(f) c) Disagree. See responses to RWM030(r) d) See responses to RWM062(c) e) See responses to RWM062(s)	a)-e) No change necessary
RWM148	Mr and Mrs Lim	a) Poor consultation - done deal presented b) Should stop current process. c) North End Road reconnection will have detrimental effect on local residents d) Unrealistic wish list of expensive buildings that puts off developers.	a) & b) Disagree. See responses to RWM030(r) c) Disagree. See responses to RWM037(g) and RWM062(f) d) See responses to RWM062(c)	