



Planning Committee - Supplementary

Wednesday 15 March 2017 at 7.00 pm

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)
Agha (Vice-Chair)
Hylton
Long
Maurice
Moher
J Mitchell Murray
Pitruzzella

Substitute Members

Councillors:

A Choudry, Colacicco, Daly, Ezeajughi, Hoda-Benn, Kabir, Khan and Naheerathan

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Governance Officer
020 8937 1354; joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:
democracy.brent.gov.uk

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 6.00pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
4. 500 High Road, Wembley HA9 7BH (Ref. 16/1537/PRE)	Wembley Central	1 - 2
5. Raglan Court, Empire Way, Wembley (Ref. 16/3408)	Tokyngham	3 - 4
7. Garages, Atherton Heights, Wembley (Ref.16/5103)	Alperton	5 - 6
8. Land at junction of Engineers Way and First Way, Wembley (Quintain plot E03) Ref.17/0016)	Tokyngham	7 - 8

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 15 March, 2017 Case No.

16/1537/PRE

Location	500 High Road, Wembley, HA9 7BH
Description	Proposed demolition of existing building and proposed erection of a part 9 and part 11 storey mixed use building containing 360sqm of commercial floorspace (use class A2) on the ground floor and comprising 74 residential units (9x studio, 20x 1 bed, 27x 2 bed and 18x 3 bed) on the upper floors

Agenda Page Number: 19 - 28

Councillors Site Visit

A site visit was carried out by Councillors on 11/03/2017. The following queries were raised and are now addressed in this supplementary section:

Building Line – *Can the position of the proposed building line around the development be illustrated/ explained clearly to allow a comparison of the existing and proposed?*

The building lines along St Johns Road and Elm Road are not proposed to change, with the existing lines being adhered to by the proposed development.

Parking Spaces – *How will the surrounding parking spaces be altered and would there be a provision for on road disabled parking space?*

Brent's highways team are satisfied that a car free development can be supported given the very close access to lots of public transport services. Nonetheless, 5 disabled car parking spaces and a car club space are proposed within the service road part of Elm Road. The spaces are currently used for servicing and Brent's highways team would therefore require that an off street loading area is provided for the proposed commercial unit either along Elm or St Johns Roads. This could acceptably be shared with Boots if necessary.

Commercial Space – *Can the location of the proposed commercial space be explained and would the unit above Boots be retained as existing? How would the appearance of the site work at street level?*

Whilst Boots is part of the same land parcel, the development is not proposed to alter the Boots shop on the high road or the units above Boots. The proposal will specifically relate to the existing extent of the red brick building that contains the Job Centre. The Job Centre is currently accessed from entrance doors along St Johns Road immediately before the corner with Elm Road. The new proposal would see the new retail unit (which is proposed to retain the Job Centre as the tenant) being accessed from a similar access slightly further south along St Johns Road, closer to the junction with Wembley High Road.

The commercial unit would be reduced in size, although would still occupy 360sqm of the ground floor (down from approx. 800sqm), with the rest of the space being occupied by the two residential cores (market and affordable) and associate bike/bin stores etc.

There would be a number of doors within the frontages, for example, within the Elm Road frontage the following entrance doors will be provided: Boots goods access, Market bin stores access, market value flats entrance, market value bike stores entrance. Within the St Johns Road frontage, the following entrance doors will be provided: Commercial unit access, affordable flats entrance, affordable bin stores access, Boots fire escape.

Street furniture and trees – *What is proposed for surrounding street furniture including the public toilet and*

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 16/1537/PRE Page 1 of 2

phone box? Would these items and the surrounding trees be retained and/or improved?

There has been little proposed in terms of the surrounding street furniture, however Brent's highways team would require a publicly accessible bicycle stand to be provided on the public footway fronting the commercial unit, paid for by the applicant. The Council's tree and landscaping officers will be consulted as part of a full application to consider the implications on nearby trees, and whether there is a need for tree protection/planting. The public toilet has not been raised as a concern by Brent's highways team and it is possible that this will be easy to retain following development since it is on the other side of the road. The re-provision of the toilet would not be required to mitigate an impact of the development unless it is lost as a result of the development.

Daylight/ Sunlight and Orientation – *Has the potential impact on the much lower rise nearby residential properties been checked?*

A study has not been submitted yet, but this would need to be considered when assessing the proposed development and a subsequent planning application would need to be accompanied by a study.

Height and perspective illustrations – *The view from corner of Elm Road/St Johns Road appears to give the impression that the existing buildings on the right are fairly tall. Can the justification of the proposals height be explained and possibly have some further details showing the developments relationship with neighbouring building more clearly/accurately.*

Proposals must be considered having regard to their context. This may include the current context together with the likely future context in locations where significant development is envisaged. The Wembley Area Action Plan identifies this site together with the site opposite it on St Johns Road as being sensitive to tall buildings (30 m or more in height), but no inappropriate for them. The buildings opposite this site fronting Elm Road are identified as being inappropriate for buildings more than 30 m in height.

Significant change in the scale and massing of buildings in the vicinity of this site is expected in the future and regard is given to this when considering development proposals.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 15 March, 2017 Case No.

16/3408

Location	1-129 INC, RAGLAN COURT, Empire Way, Wembley, HA9 0RE
Description	Erection of roof extension comprising 2 additional floors over Block A and Block B to provide a total of 72 additional self-contained flats (36 x 1bed on each Block) with associated landscaping, ancillary servicing and plant, cycle parking and associated works

Agenda Page Number: 33 - 52

A letter of objection was received from a resident/owner of a Raglan Court flat who is unable to attend the committee meeting. The points raised in the letter, made in response to the committee report, are discussed below.

Para 9 Scale. The scale of development is totally inappropriate when considering what is currently on the footprint. The proposed increase will have a significant impact on existing residents.

The proposed scheme results in a development that is below the London Plan range in terms of density of development. The resultant building will be of a scale between the 2 storey houses on Manor Drive and the 9-18 storey development opposite on Empire Way. The proposal would make a more efficient use of a site, in a location which is appropriate for residential use and for which there is significant demand.

Para 14 Design. The design is not sympathetic to the existing building and will completely change the look of the building, the extension looks like a bolt on.

The scheme has been designed to create a contrast with the existing building and brickwork so as to ensure that the original building remains a prominent feature and part of the character of the development site. The built form is recessed and uses a pallet of materials that officers consider to compliment the existing building. It is considered that the proposed size, siting, design and use of materials will deliver an acceptable quality of design

Para 19 Layout and quality of build. The London Plan is there for a reason and the proposed development fails to meet the standard in respect of the Floor to ceiling height of 2.5m.

All of the proposed units exceed the minimum floor space standards set out in the London Plan; have a private balcony of 6.7sqm; and have a good level of outlook. Whilst the floor to ceiling height is 0.1m below the London Plan standard, it exceeds the nationally prescribed 2.3m height. Additionally, the floor to ceiling windows will ensure good levels of light are received by all new units. Whilst the proposal falls slightly short of the London Plan floor to ceiling height standard, the large floor sizes, private balconies and generally high standard of accommodation proposed would justify the short fall in this instance.

Para 25 Housing Mix and Affordable Housing. I would like to challenge the planning departments decision to include the existing properties in the calculation to see if the proposed development provides sufficient family accommodation. The applicants stated that the scheme cannot viably provide any affordable housing nor any payment in lieu of affordable housing, which alone should be sufficient grounds to reject the proposal.

The proportion of family units is discussed in detail within the main committee report.

The Council reviewed the schemes viability and sought an independent review of the viability appraisal by external consultants. It was acknowledged that the bespoke nature of the scheme, with a sizeable two storey vertical extension on top of the existing building, will result in complexities in terms of construction and management, and attract relatively higher build costs. It was concluded that the scheme could reasonably provide 11 affordable housing units, representing 15.3% affordable housing. In line with London Borough of Brent DMP 15, a post implementation financial review mechanism will be required in this case, to capture any improvement in scheme viability in the form of additional on-site DMR units or a commuted payment for offsite affordable housing.

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 16/3408 Page 1 of 2

Para 49 Parking. I would like to challenge the parking analysis as the development in its current state struggles with parking to the extent that the landlord has had to introduce an £80p.m. parking charge for residents. This has displaced the parking problem on to nearby streets especially Empire Way

In order to address any potential impacts of the development on parking, a parking management and allocation plan is recommended to be secured through condition, setting out how parking will be controlled and how parking spaces will be allocated to residents within the existing and proposed elements of the development, and between tenures within the development.

Additionally, a "parking permit restriction" for the new flats is sought in the event that a year-round CPZ is introduced in the future. It would in the meantime apply on Wembley Stadium event days. A condition is recommended to this effect, requiring the owner to notify all residents that they will not be entitled to on-street parking permits.

Para 53 Transport assessment. The measures introduced by the landlord have already displaced traffic onto neighbouring roads and has heavily contributed to the reports findings that the existing parking is fully utilised.

As set out above, additional measures are proposed via condition in order to mitigate potential impacts of the development in terms of parking both on the site and the surrounding streets.

Recommendation: Remains to grant planning permission

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 15 March, 2017 Case No.

16/5103

Location	Garages, Atherton Heights, Wembley
Description	Demolition of existing 15 garages and erection of 18 pre-fabricated garages (for parking/storage purposes) and retention of 2 existing garages (for parking/storage purposes)

Agenda Page Number: 71 - 82

Further objection received

The planning department received a further objection to the development, raising objections of a similar nature to previous objections.

Following this submission, the Local Planning Authority has received six representations that object to the proposal. No other representations have been received.

The ground of objections are as follows:

Ground of objection	Officer's response
The Leaseholders were not notified of the current proposal or planning application.	Letters were sent to all addresses within Atherton Heights, addressed to the owners/occupiers. This letter requests that the letter is passed on to the owner where applicable (e.g. if a home is rented). This is in line with legal requirements.
The land was sold off to another developer without any notice given to the Leaseholders by the Managing Agents or the Freeholders of Atherton Heights, with the sale having a detrimental effect on the Leaseholders	Whether the leaseholders were made aware of the sale of the land cannot be considered within this application as it is not a material planning consideration.
The developer instructed a Private Parking Enforcement company to issue tickets for parking both on the land and unlawfully on the adopted highway.	This is discussed in the consultation section of the main report.
Residents are forced to park on the main Bridgewater Road and often have to find parking a long distance away from the property and restricted at times to find a space.	The parking capacity of Atherton Heights has been taken into account by your officers. The applicant has set out that residents do not have a legal right to park on this land and as such, it is the ownership of the land that displaces parking rather than this proposal in itself.
If the Planning is granted the garages will be to be offered for rent to non residents of Atherton Heights which could lead to security issues at Atherton Heights and allowing non-residents would be unethical.	The existing garages could be let to third parties and as such, the proposal in itself will not lead to security issues.
This will also add extra costs and the Freeholder will increase the Service Charges to recover the costs	Service charges cannot be considered within a planning application as they are governed by separate legislation.
The resident will have no privacy as the external grounds will be easily accessible to	Access to the garages would be from the adopted highway. Granting consent for the

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 16/5103 Page 1 of 2*

the public to access the garages.	replacement of garages does not convey rights for those who occupy those garages to use other land that they are not legally entitled to access or use.
Potential commercial use by small private traders who may attract customers to the block and create further problem	The applicant proposes that the new garages are to be used for the same purposes as the existing garages - for the parking of cars or for storage purposes.
Disruption of residents during construction	Construction causes some level of disturbance due to the nature of the activity. However, a Construction Method Statement is recommended to be secured through condition to minimise potential disruption.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to conditions within the decision notice

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 08

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 15 March, 2017 Case No.

17/0016

Location	Land at the Junction of Engineers Way and, First Way, Wembley
Description	Reserved matters application relating to condition 1 (layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping) pursuant to outline planning permission 15/5550. This application relates to Plot E03 (known as Canada Court) for the construction of a building ranging from 12 to 26 storeys in height, providing 743 residential units within private and intermediate rented tenures (intermediate rented tenure to be London Housing Bank dwellings), with private communal residential landscaped gardens and clubhouse; energy centre (to serve the wider masterplan and the SW Lands development); a podium level bridge link (connecting to Plot E05 mezzanine), 91 coach parking spaces, and 569 sqm (GEA) of commercial space for either B1 (Business) and/or D1 (Community) use, ancillary space, and associated plant, cycle storage, refuse provision and associated infrastructure.

The application seeks to discharge the following conditions for Plot E03:

19(h): Wind; 19 (k): Internal layout of buildings; 19(l): Access; 19(m): Daylight; 19(n): Private external space; 27: Construction Logistics Plan; 31: Counter Terrorism Measures; 34: Noise; 36: Noise; 37: Construction Method Statement; 38: Air Quality; 39: CHP Emissions; 49: Indicative Phasing

Agenda Page Number: 83 - 104

Removal of details pursuant to condition 46 (Piling) from this application

As stated within the 'Consultation' section of the Committee Report, Thames Water requested a layout plan clearly indicating the method and locations of all piles to be installed on the development site before they were able to agree the proposals. In response to the comments from Thames Water the applicant provided a Piling Layout Plan showing the proposed piling layout in relation to the location of Thames Water assets. The plan shows the location of the piles in relation to existing Thames Water assets which are to be retained/diverted as well as the location of the piles in relation to the diverted assets.

At this moment in time no further response has been received from Thames Water to confirm the discharge of condition 46 (Piling) as part of application 17/0016 for the approval of reserved matters for Plot E03. Therefore the applicant has withdrawn this condition and will seek to discharge this condition separately.

The description of the proposal will be updated accordingly removing condition 46 (Piling).

Recommendation: That the Reserved Matters (condition 1) and details pursuant to conditions 19(h), 19(k), 19(l), 19(m), 19 (n), 27, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 49 are approved.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank