

Agenda Item 03

**Supplementary Information
 Planning Committee on 22 January,
 2020**

Case No. 19/0395

Location 1 Olympic Way, Wembley, HA9 0NP
 Description Erection of upto 7 storey roof top extension to the existing building to create 90 flats; erection of a rear extension to existing building to create a new 15 storey block (including a 2 storey under-croft for vehicular and pedestrian access) to create 26 flats, conversion of existing 8th floor office space to create 3 flats, creating a total of 119 self-contained flats; infilling of ground floor undercroft of existing building to form new ground floor uses comprising retail floorspace (A1, A3, A4) and office floorspace (B1), creation of first floor podium above existing car parking space to provide a landscaped amenity space for residents with associated cycle and refuse storage, creation of public access alongside Wealdstone Brook and refurbishment of existing building facades to No. 1 Olympic Way (including replacement of windows) (Revised description)

Agenda Page Number: 11 - 52 (January 2020 Committee)

Additional objection

On the 17th January 2020, a further comment of objection was received from a representative of the neighbouring site at 3 Olympic Way. The grounds of objection are as follows:

Ground of objection	Officer response
The plans do not show the relationship with 3 Olympic Way, the separation distances cannot be determined given the lack of detail.	The plans clearly show the separation between the proposal and the red line boundary between 1 Olympic Way and 3 Olympic Way. As such, the plans achieve sufficient detail.
The positioning of the new building on the boundary with 3 Olympic Way means that 3 Olympic Way may be compromised in terms of the compliance expected within SPD1 guidance (9m and 18m separations between sites). The relationship between the new building on the boundary with 3 Olympic Way therefore reduces the viability of re-development on the 3 Olympic Way site.	This is addressed in paragraph 37 of the committee report. Officers consider that the development is sensitive to SPD1's 9m and 18m criteria in all respects. Since no windows are proposed in the side elevation of the new part of the building facing towards 3 Olympic Way, the neighbouring site (if redeveloped with north facing habitable room windows) would need to position its northern façade at least 9m from this wall to achieve reasonable outlook in line with guidance expectations. This 9m separation is a general guidance expectation between all sites where facing windows would look across other sites. As such, officers do not consider that 3 Olympic Way is compromised in terms of deliverability since these standards are being upheld in this scenario as they would be across the borough.
The report fails to consider the impact of the development on pre-application proposals, instead only discussing impact specifically in the context of the prior approval scheme. It therefore fails to deliver comprehensive	Given that the prior approval scheme at 3 Olympic Way is an extant consent it reasonably warrants consideration in terms of impact, and the potential impacts have accordingly been considered. However, the adjoining site may be

Document Imaged

development.

developed, which could take a number of forms such as extension and alteration of existing buildings or the comprehensive redevelopment of the adjoining site. Consideration has accordingly be given to the potential impact on the adjoining site, treating that site as a development site. The pre-application submission has not been submitted within a formal planning application and does not benefit from planning consent. It is therefore not considered appropriate to test the impacts on that scheme to the same extent as an existing or consented development. Nevertheless, the potential impacts on the adjoining site have been considered and the relationship between the proposed building and the adjoining site (as discussed in the main committee report) is considered to be acceptable.

It is not considered that the proposed development unduly prejudices the development potential of the adjoining site. It is also not considered reasonable or necessary to require both 1 and 3 Olympic Way to be delivered as one comprehensive development. Instead it is considered to be reasonable and appropriate to consider whether this scheme has an appropriate relationship with the adjoining site, as discussed previously.

The daylight and sunlight report indicates a detrimental impact on the consented prior approval scheme at 3 Olympic Way in terms of VSC testing.

Officers acknowledge the instances where BRE guidance is not achieved in respect of daylight and sunlight, although consider that the wider benefits of the scheme outweigh this harm. Daylight and sunlight has been discussed in detail in the main report.

The proposed development at 1 Olympic Way creates a loss to VSC which is a greater loss than the refused scheme at Willesden Green Garage (ref: 17/5291), indicating that this level of harm would not normally be accepted.

The referenced planning application was allowed at appeal and is now a consented development. The inspector concluded that the benefits of developing the brownfield site outweighed the harm, including the daylight and sunlight harm. Nevertheless, each scheme must be considered on its merits having regard to the context of the site.

It is requested that if planning permission were to be granted, a condition be attached to the decision notice to require the pedestrian access-way be completed and adopted by the Council and Highway Authority prior to occupation of the development at 1 Olympic Way to ensure the benefits can be shared by the local community at the earliest convenience.

Officers consider ensuring completion and public accessibility of this route prior to occupation to be a reasonable requirement, especially given that one of the main residential accesses is entered from the pedestrian access way. Conditions will be amended to ensure this. However, requiring the route to be formally adopted is not considered reasonable; this has not been requested by Brent's highways officers.

--	--

Further to the above discussion, in the interests of ensuring that the public benefit of the pedestrian route is delivered alongside the development, condition 3 is to be varied to include the following wording (changes in **bold**):

“From the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the pedestrian route between the building on the site and the southern boundary of the site shall remain unobstructed and publically accessible for pedestrians at all times for at least 364 (three hundred and sixty-four) days per calendar year, except during discrete temporary periods of footway maintenance.

Reason: To ensure the development improves local pedestrian permeability for the benefit of local residents and visitors.”

Also, for the same purpose, Condition 21 is to be varied to include the following wording (changes in **bold**):

“Within six months of the commencement of the development, details of landscaping improvements, external lighting, surfacing materials and details of retractable bollards at the western end to be used along the east-west route between the building on site and the southern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall indicate a safe and high quality environment along the route, including within the undercroft area. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full prior to first occupation of the development and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a safe and inviting environment is established along the new pedestrian route forming part of the proposal.”

Clarification on the approach to cladding

The applicant has submitted information setting out that they consider that the cladding on the existing building can be re-painted to precisely match the new cladding panels. Officers would require further information to ensure that the panels would appear identical in every respect as cladding panels that do not could result in a building that is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the following additional condition is recommended:

The existing building shall be re-clad with cladding panels identical in appearance to those used for the extensions to the building hereby approved unless details are submitted to and approved by the writing by the Local Planning Authority which demonstrate that the existing cladding panels will be repainted in a way that results in an appearance that is identical in every respect to the new cladding panels and the development is thereafter carried out in full accordance with the approved details. This shall include samples of the painted cladding panels together with the cladding panels for the extensions to the building.

Reason: To ensure the visual appearance of the building is appropriate.

Recommendation: Following the above discussion, Officers continue to recommend approval of the development subject to a suitable Section 106 obligation, stage 2 referral to the GLA and to the imposition of the conditions in the decision notice, the changes to those conditions set out in the supplementary report and the additional changes to those conditions as discussed above.