

## 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.*

**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