

Agenda Item 03

**Supplementary Information
 Planning Committee on 18 February,
 2020**

Case No. 18/4919

Location	1-26A, coachworks & storage areas, Abbey Manufacturing Estate, all units Edwards Yard, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HA0
Description	Demolition and erection of a mixed use development of buildings ranging between 3 and 14 storeys in height comprising 581 residential units, flexible commercial floorspace falling within use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1(a), B1(c), D1 or D2, associated car parking, landscaping and ancillary facilities (Phased Development)

Agenda Page Number: 13 - 68

Change in recommendation: Application deferral

The recommendation to grant consent was subject to a number of conditions, including condition 3 that would prevent the commencement of development within a specific phase unless the land within that phase is bound by a Section 106 agreement.

It is recommended that the determination of this application is deferred to a later planning committee meeting so that further information can be included within the committee report regarding the basis and justification for the condition, and the structure of the associated legal agreement(s).

Additional response to the application

On February 13th 2020 an additional representation was received from a representative of the adjoining site referred to as 'the triangular site' within the committee report, which also forms part of the site allocation. The representation included the following comments:

Comment	Officer response
<p>Vehicular access to the triangular site is shown in the Development Plan as coming from the adjoining site. However, proposals for the adjoining site do not include an access to this site. Despite formally objecting to this omission, a vehicular access is not included and this point is not addressed in the Committee report. It could render the adjoining site undevelopable unless the Council consider access from Woodside Avenue in a flexible way.</p> <p>The Council's discussion of the impact on adjoining sites does not refer to the point raised in the objection about vehicular access</p>	<p>The committee report, at paragraph 13, confirms that the neighbouring site is not considered to be compromised from a development perspective. In reaching this view, officers were aware of the existing site constraints, including the existing access between Woodside Avenue and the site.</p> <p>The Development Plan did not show an access through the application site to the adjoining Woodside Avenue site. This was shown within the Alperton Masterplan SPD. However, this provides guidance and the layouts shown within this are purely indicative.</p>
<p>The adopted Site Allocations DPD (2011) identifies a major allocation including the adjoining land and the application site. The DPD states that the 'Council will expect a comprehensive development...'. This approach is reiterated in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Sites that come forward on a piecemeal basis must take account of the Masterplan aspirations and should definitely not stymie development on adjoining allocated sites.</p>	<p>The DPD document does specify: The Council will expect a comprehensive development following an agreed masterplan that sets out land uses and proposed development in more detail.</p> <p>The majority of the site allocation is proposed to come forward in a comprehensive fashion, with the application site including all of the allocation with the exception of the land situated to the North West of the application site. This is considered sufficient to address the potential "bad neighbour" relationship between the industrial uses whereby the</p>

Document Imaged

industrial uses could affect the amenities of future residents and the presence of residential dwellings could have affected the operation of the industrial uses.

As discussed above, the proposal is not considered to materially affect the deliverability of the adjoining Woodside Avenue site

Amendments/clarifications within the committee report

- It is to be clarified that, at head of term (a) on page 14, the head of term should read "payment of Council's **reasonable** legal and professional costs".
- The monitoring residential table on page 20 of the committee report refers to a slightly incorrect unit mix, for clarity, the correct mix is 254 x 1 bed, 213 x 2 bed, 110 x 3 bed and 4 x houses.
- Condition 31 (page 64) is to be re-worded following advice from Thames Water. Thames Water requires the full site wastewater management plan to be agreed prior to first occupation of the entire site, rather than allowing flexibility for this to be addressed on a phase by phase basis. This is due to the complexities of the site which will require a site wide drainage strategy and because of issues relating to the need to relocate the Thames Water pumping station. The condition would be amended accordingly.

Recommendation: That the application is deferred to a later Planning Committee meeting for the reasons set out above.

DocSuppF