

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2026

Case No.

26/0225

---

Location	Brent NHS Primary Care Trust, Wembley Centre For Health & Care, 116 Chaplin Road, Wembley, HA0 4UZ
Description	Demolition of existing buildings to provide within buildings of between 3 and 6 storeys, 108 residential units (Use Class C3) and car parking spaces together with associated public realm, landscaping and highway improvements, cycle parking and stores, and all other associated and ancillary works.

#### Agenda Page Number: 23-90

#### Further representations received:

Cllr Lorber has made representations raising objection the proposal, which are summarised below:

- Imposing a car-free restriction on this development will have an impact on parking on nearby roads that are outside of any Controlled Parking Zone, as future residents will park in these areas instead which will cause nuisance to existing residents.

*Officer comment: The proposed development accords with relevant transport policies, which promote non-car development in highly accessible locations to reduce car dependency and encourage sustainable travel. It is noted that there is some limited parking proposed including disabled parking as required by policy. As the site is within an all year round CPZ ("SA") and adjacent to the Wembley Stadium Event Day CPZ a parking permit restriction is to be applied to all residential units proposed (save for disabled badge holders), and this shall be secured through the s106 agreement.*

*Controlled Parking Zones have been proved to be an effective means of restricting on-street parking to ensure that it remains available for the use of existing residents when new residential developments come forward. The site is located in a sustainable location and the use of the CPZ together with restricted on site parking is in line with the Council's wider policies on promoting non-car access to reduce congestion and pollution.*

*Additionally, the proposal would be supported by sustainable transport measures, including a Travel Plan that would be secured as part of the s106 agreement. This Plan would be expected to set out a range of measures to encourage future residents to move towards non-car modes of travel and set targets to measure the effectiveness of the Plan against over time, which would include targets to increase the % of trips being undertaken by non-car modes of travel. Set targets will be monitored at the end of years 1, 3 and 5 and can be revised, as required.*

- Is there any space on site for motorcycles and delivery vehicles to park

*Officer comment: There are no minimum numerical requirements for motorcycle parking in the London Plan. It is not a requirement for any development, so should be determined on a case-by-case basis. No such parking is proposed, nor has any been sought by Transport officers. No dedicated loading area is proposed, though with the number of delivery vehicles per day estimated to be around 16 vans (and one lorry) this does not give rise to highway concerns. Delivery vehicles would be expected to load / unload from within the site, or from Chaplin Road.*

- For the purposes of the Financial Viability Assessment, what base value is being used for land bearing in mind it was originally donated

*Officer comment: In line with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and for the purposes of the FVA submitted the benchmark land value has been established based on the existing use value of the site plus a premium for the landowner. The PPG is clear that applicant specific circumstances including their acquisition of the site should be excluded from an FVA. This would also be the case where land was historically donated for development. The benchmark land value established based on the existing use value of a site plus a premium for the landowner and applied in the FVA is £2.61m.*

Document Imaged

*It is also noted that, prior to the site being acquired by the applicant, the land was owned by the NHS and was subsequently disposed of through an NHS-led best value disposal process. The Local Planning Authority was not a party to that transaction and is not in a position to comment on, or attach weight to, the historical circumstances in which the land came into NHS ownership. The planning assessment must therefore be undertaken having regard to the relevant planning policy and guidance, including the approach to benchmark land value set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, rather than the site's historic ownership or provenance.*

- There is a complete disregard of the site's history and heritage, including the contributions The Barham's made to the establishment of the Old Wembley Hospital

*Officer comment: Heritage effects have been considered in detail within the main report (paragraphs 83-106), which recognises the contribution Titus Barham made in donating the land as the site for a new hospital. In the overall planning balance section (paragraphs 358-373) the harm that demolition would result in, to a non-designated heritage asset is weighed against (and is outweighed) by the range of identified public benefits (including housing delivery). Recommended condition 31 would ensure that the site's history and its heritage is suitably recorded and displayed on site, which is considered proportionate.*

- Why is there no provision of a community facility on site as part of the development

*Officer comment: This has been considered in detail within the 'Principle of development' and 'Loss of social infrastructure' sections within the report.*

An additional neighbour representation of objection has been received following publication of the report, this is from an individual who has previously submitted objections to the development, as summarised in the 'Consultations' section of the report.

The additional comments received maintain objection to the scale and siting of the semi-detached townhouses and their relationship with the shared site boundary. Other key neighbour concerns that are re-iterated include, daylight and sunlight impacts, disagreement with the application of the mirrored baseline assessment (for assessing daylight impacts), harm to amenity of neighbouring kitchen, overlooking and loss of privacy and construction and environmental impacts (with conditions requested). All these considerations have been discussed within the main report.

Reference is also made to application (23/0644), which was dismissed on appeal (October 2024). Whilst the site context was materially different, the Inspector concluded that the failure to achieve the minimum 18m separation distance between facing habitable room windows, as recommended by SPD1, combined with the four-storey scale of the adjoining development, would result in unacceptable overlooking and a loss of privacy for future occupiers of the appeal scheme. The Inspector also concluded that the proposed 2m high privacy screen would not adequately mitigate those impacts.

The Inspector's findings have been carefully considered. However, each application must be determined on its own individual merits, having regard to its specific design, layout and surrounding context. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed relationship between the development and No.15 Fairview Avenue does not fully accord with the 18m separation guideline in SPD1, the circumstances of the current proposal differ from those considered under referenced application (23/0644). These differences include the fact that the townhouses proposed are over three floors, rather than four, and this proposal is not a case of backland garden development but is rather a comprehensive redevelopment of a previously developed site.

Whilst the relationship between the proposed townhouses and No.15 Fairview Avenue results in a reduced separation distance to the existing flank kitchen window when compared with the 18m separation guideline in SPD1, the impact is not considered to be unacceptable.

The kitchen window is an unusual relationship, being located within a side elevation close to the shared boundary and looking across the neighbouring site, rather than being a rear-facing window to which the SPD1 guidance is principally directed. The proposed townhouses are set over 10m from the neighbouring property, comply with the 9m garden-to-habitable room separation recommended by SPD1, and satisfy the 45-degree guideline, ensuring there would be no undue sense of enclosure. Whilst a minor reduction in privacy would occur, this would be limited in practice, particularly given that a 2m boundary treatment could lawfully be erected along the boundary under permitted development rights, materially restricting intervisibility.

Taking these site-specific circumstances together, the relationship is considered to provide an acceptable level of outlook, daylight and privacy for the occupiers of No. 15, notwithstanding the limited departure from the 18m separation guideline.

Accordingly, the Inspector's conclusions in relation to the earlier appeal do not alter the overall assessment or recommendation on the current application.

**Recommendation: Remains that the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report together with the prior completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement.**

**That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement.**

**That the Head of Planning and Development Services or other duly authorised person is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions (including to delete, vary, or add conditions, Informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision).**

DocSuppF