	<p>Council 29th October 2007</p> <p>Report from the Director of Environment and Culture</p>
<p>Wards Affected: ALL</p>	
<p>Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations, Submission to Secretary of State</p>	

1.0 Summary

1.1 This report presents the proposed submission versions of Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents for consideration as part of Brent's new Local Development Framework (LDF). They will ultimately replace much of Brent's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and have been amended after considering representations made during earlier public consultation. Accompanying the report is a schedule of all comments made on the draft DPDs including officers' recommended response to these and the proposed action in dealing with them. Government regulations require that full Council approve the 'Submission Versions' of LDF documents. The Council's Planning Committee considered this report on 4th October 2007 and made recommendations to Executive on 8th October 2007. Executive considered the report and recommend that the Council approve the submission versions of the Core Strategy and SSA's for submission to the Secretary of State.

<p>Council 29th October 2007</p>	<p>Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07</p>
---	---

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations be agreed for a six week consultation period and submission to the Secretary of State on or around 5th November 2007; and
- 2.2 That the Director of Environment & Culture is authorised to make minor, non-material changes to the DPDs as necessary.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 Members will be aware that the Council has agreed to replace the current Unitary Development Plan (UDP) with a series of new development plan documents, the first of which the Core Strategy Preferred Options was made available for public consultation in October 2006. Subsequently, a further two documents, one setting out Site Specific Allocations and the other setting out detailed Development Policies, were available for consultation in June 2007.
- 3.2 It was agreed in January 2007, as part of the Local Development Scheme, to take forward the Core Strategy and the Site Specific Allocations together by submitting these to the Secretary of State in October/November 2007. As part of this submission, which is now proposed for November 5th, there is another statutory 6 week deposit period where there is an opportunity for the public to support or object to the policies and proposals set out in the document.

Public Consultation

- 3.3 Wide publicity was given to the consultation upon both the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations including notices in local newspapers, a whole page advertisement in The Brent Magazine notices in libraries and One–Stop-Service offices as well as writing to all Borough organisations (such as residents’ associations), statutory consultees, outside agencies and other interested parties who have asked to be consulted. Community workshops were held at the Town Hall on both occasions to which the public were invited, and officers attended Local Area Consultative Forums to present on the issues and to answer any questions. There was also a stall highlighting the LDF consultation at this year’s Respect Festival.
- 3.4 The workshop on the Core Strategy, held on November 6th 2006, was attended by about 40 people, either representing borough organisations such as residents’ associations or as individuals. Another workshop, this time dealing primarily with Site Specific Allocations, was held on July 12th 2006. This was attended by over 100 people because of concerns about proposals for specific sites round the Borough, particularly the London

Transport Sports Ground. A summary of the report for each workshop is included as Appendix 1 (note that because of the length of the appendices to this report, that all appendices have been sent to the Members room, or are available via the website link set out in the background papers section to this report).

Summary of Main Issues Raised by Consultation

- 3.5 The following is a summary of the key issues that have been raised, together with the proposed response and action recommended for both the Core Strategy and the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPDs). All the objections raised and observations made, together with officers' proposed response to these, are included in the accompanying schedules. Both the draft Submission version Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations documents are also available from the members room and via the website, with changes from the Preferred Options versions shown by highlighting or strikethrough. The highlighting and struck through sections will be removed for submission to the Secretary of State.

Core Strategy

- 3.6 There were 44 respondents to the Core Strategy making just over 450 individual representations. A breakdown of representations by type and chapter is provided in Appendix 2 (all appendices have been sent to the members room and via the website link set out in the background papers to this report). Appendix 3-*Core Strategy, Objections Made and Proposed Council Response*- sets out detailed responses to the Core Strategy and your officers recommendation on actions to be taken on those representations. On the whole the Core Strategy has been well supported, although there are inevitably some changes that are being proposed in response to comments made. The fundamentals of the strategy remain intact and changes are generally of a detailed or minor nature. The key points are set out in the order the topic they relate to appears in the document.

Vision and Objectives

- 3.7 In general the Vision and Objectives have been supported, although some additions are proposed to the objectives to reflect specific points raised, such as promotion of sport and health.
- 3.8 A general point made by Government Office for London (GOL) concerns the relationship with other relevant strategies, so these have been made more explicit where relevant. GOL raised general concerns that there was insufficient coverage of monitoring and delivery / implementation so this has been addressed by the addition of a new section on this.

A Spatial Strategy for Brent

- 3.9 One comment is that the spatial extent (i.e. boundaries) of the growth areas should be shown. However, it is not appropriate to delineate these as the intention is to show general locations where growth is to be focussed rather than identifying specific sites. The Site Allocations document promotes individual sites within these areas for mixed-use development to help meet growth targets.
- 3.10 Another suggestion (relating to policy CP SS1) is that dispersal of growth is a better alternative to focussing it in growth areas, particularly Wembley on which there is too much emphasis. It was clear at consultation on Issues and Options stage that concentrating growth was the approach that commanded most support, and it is also a strategy supported by the Sustainability Appraisal. Wembley is particularly appropriate as a location to support growth because of its high level of access by public transport and the availability of large, available sites in need of regeneration.
- 3.11 Concern was expressed that focussing growth would preclude any high density development outside growth areas. The proposed Council response is that it does not rule it out but, that development elsewhere will have to be assessed against criteria for determining planning applications set out in the Development Policies DPD including having regard to local character, etc.
- 3.12 TfL are seeking inclusion of detail about proposed and committed transport schemes and proposals. Consequently, Fastbus, currently being promoted by Park Royal Partnership and Brent Council, will be referred to and shown on the Key Diagram.
- 3.13 Sport England are concerned that insufficient emphasis has been put on sports provision and have highlighted the particularly low participation rates in Brent when compared to other local authorities. It is therefore proposed that a greater emphasis will be put on sports provision in policy CP CT1 on Promoting Leisure and Tourism.
- 3.14 Representations have pointed out that Park Royal has “significant residential interfaces” with potential for residential development. The proposed response is that, within the Brent part of Park Royal at least, the opportunity for residential development is very limited.
- 3.15 An objection to policy CPSS4 is seeking greater flexibility in the use of land in strategic industrial / business locations. The proposed response from the Council makes reference to the Brent Employment Land Demand study 2006 identifying a need for a quantum of employment land to be safeguarded for employment use.

A Better Townscape – By Design

- 3.16 Respondents expressed general support for the objectives of the Spatial Design Strategy, and of raising design standards in Brent through the proposed Design Quality Protocol mechanism.
- 3.17 The mains issues raised in representations about these (and our responses) were as follows.

<p>Council 29th October 2007</p>	<p>Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07</p>
---	---

- 3.18 The reasons for targeting specific areas for particular design attention needed to be fully explained, and there was a need to clarify a high standard was sought in all parts of the Borough. These are now being addressed in modifications to the Policy and additions to the supporting text (by moving the reasons, and definitions of targeted areas from the Development Policies DPD (Preferred Options) into the Core Strategy);
- 3.19 Arguments for the highest possible densities to be allowed in these Growth and Low Townscape Quality Areas – that the requirement for exceptional design to facilitate higher densities was too high. This argument has not been accepted;
- 3.20 Questions about Brent’s approach to the location of tall buildings. These had been addressed within the Development Policies DPD (Preferred Options) –and the spatial element of this Policy has thus, been moved into the Core Strategy;
- 3.21 Some scepticism was expressed about enforceability of the proposed Design Quality Protocol – and the need for further definition/clarification, of aspects of its operation (such as timescale, flexibility, and its relationship to Design Statements). Some clarification, and information about where further details will be set out, is now included within the supporting text and some amendments made to the Policy.

Towards a Sustainable Brent

- 3.22 Respondents were generally supportive of the proposed Climate Adaptation Infrastructure programme, and of the need for developments to contribute towards sustainability.
- 3.23 The main issues raised in representations about these (and our responses) are as follows.
- 3.24 The need for further definition of the Climate Adaptation Infrastructure Programme (as this is an innovatory initiative) and clarification of its elements and timescale to ensure delivery. This is being addressed for clarity, by moving this adaptation initiative with a timescale, into the Environmental Protection Policy (providing a wider context for that policy’s requirements for individual developments). The sustainability policy would then focus on a comparable Climate Mitigation Programme instead;
- 3.25 The need for flexibility in applying the sustainable design and construction policy in order to avoid stifling regeneration, and the need to include further details of approaches to development in flood risk areas. In addressing these, the flood adaptation issue has been moved into the Environmental Protection Policy, the Sustainability Policy has also been replaced with the comparable one –moved from the Development Policies DPD (Preferred Options) as it is more up-to-date and spatial. The issues raised about lowering the standard required, were not accepted.

Protecting the Environment

- 3.26 There were relatively few objections to the Environmental Protection

Council 29 th October 2007	Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07
--	-----------------------------------

policies. The main alteration to this section is reference to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which has now been carried out by the Council as both the Government Office for London and the Environment Agency raised concerns about the soundness of the Strategy without this assessment. The SFRA has informed the revision of the Strategy and parts of the justification text in this section have been altered to highlight it as an important resource for developers. Also policy CP ENV1 has been strengthened and includes reference to the different forms of flooding that have been mapped in the SFRA, and requirements for flood risk assessments and flood resilient construction.

- 3.27 Also in light of comments on the climate change policy (CP SD1) reference to climate adaptation formerly contained in this policy are now included in CP ENV1 as this already addressed some climate adaptation measures and to ensure the policies work well together. Text added states that the Council will take a borough-wide view of climate adaptation infrastructure to ensure security of supplies of water and energy and also states that this will facilitate assessing any cumulative impacts of development upon these supplies and upon Brent's environment. This also reflects Environment Agency comments that water efficiency and water resources should be included in this section, and is further reinforced by additional text requiring energy and water efficient development at CP ENV2.
- 3.28 Also, as a result of observations the wording to policy CP ENV2 (ii) was altered to strengthen the wording to "require developers to remediate contaminated land" and also wording was strengthened in general. All other amendments are clarifications, references to strategic documents which have informed the production of the policies and relating the issues in a more spatial way, mostly in response to general GoL and GLA comments on the Core Strategy.

Enhancing Open Space and Biodiversity

- 3.29 Only 9 representations were received, all in general support (some with conditions) or observations. The Environment Agency have requested that a reference to networks of open spaces, including river and wildlife corridors, be included.
- 3.30 A minor change has been made to policy OS2 in response to Environment Agency representations. Inclusion of reference to sport within OS1 has been made in response to Sport England comments and acknowledgement of the importance of sport.

Dealing with Waste

- 3.31 The GLA are concerned that the figures included in the London Plan (and proposed Alterations) on apportionment of London's waste to Brent and the targets for recycling contained in the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy be included in the Core Strategy.

Meeting Housing Needs

- 3.32 The GLA requested that a stronger wheel chair accessible housing

requirement be included. This is accepted therefore policy CP H3 has been amended.

- 3.33 There was objection to the principle of the affordable housing target and threshold of 10 units which are not accepted. There was general support for the affordable housing strategy although a number of representations requested more emphasis on the 'viability test' therefore amendments have been made to the supporting text.
- 3.34 Regarding the housing targets, several residents objected or expressed concern that these were too high and not environmentally sustainable.

Connecting Places

- 3.35 The main objections relate to; balancing required infrastructure with development, local distinctiveness of policies, evaluation of transport impacts, promoting locations for development, location of planned transport improvements and the negative & positive views on cycling facilities.
- 3.36 An additional paragraph 8.0.3 has been inserted to reinforce that development proposals will not be progressed in advance of necessary transport infrastructure. This paragraph also highlights the Burnt Oak/Colindale area due to its proximity to the Strategic Road Network. A joint TfL, Barnet & Brent study of the A5 corridor should encompass the principles of an Evaluation of Transport Impact that the Highways Agency requested, which will help inform future planning applications and a pooling of contributions towards measures which mitigate impacts.
- 3.37 Whilst locations for transport improvement are illustrated within opening chapters in the Core Strategy, we recognise that these are not clear within the Connecting Places section. An additional paragraph 8.1.1 has been included to identify sites where improvements are planned, and paragraph 8.0.4 highlights transport interchanges which are in urgent need of improvement.
- 3.38 Development is encouraged in areas with high public transport accessibility, especially high trip generating uses. Therefore development is not confined to Town Centres but promoted in accessible areas which are either high density or cause high trip generation.
- 3.39 There has been both a positive and negative response to cycling and using contributions for cycling facilities. Brent is trying to reduce the need to travel by car, and sustainable means of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport, when improved, should help reduce short journeys made by car and thus improve traffic and aim in contributing to building healthy communities.

Business, Industry and Warehousing

- 3.40 The preferred option version of the Business Industry and Warehousing section of the Core Strategy attempted to reconcile similar policy issues that were faced by the hierarchy of industrial land designations and office buildings within the borough. In addition, the Local Development

Framework is meant to be a spatial document that is more concise than the Unitary Development Plan that was more of a list of policies covering every possible eventuality – therefore the section attempted to combine issues that would previously have been dealt with by a series of detailed policies.

- 3.41 The main policy areas that the section approached were:
- Protection of land and premises
 - Pressure for mixed use development of previously developed land and the need to plan for significant numbers of new homes in the borough
 - The redevelopment of employment land and premises
 - Improving the operational standards of business and the principles of development for such uses.
- 3.42 To this end, the section attempted to recognise that Strategic Employment Areas and Borough Employment Areas were effectively the same in terms of policy protection, except that Strategic Employment Areas such as Park Royal were also recognised by the Mayor of London as being of strategic importance to London’s economy.
- 3.43 This approach was objected to by the Greater London Authority and Government Office for London because they believed that this failed to recognise the importance of Strategic Employment Locations (named as Strategic Employment Areas in Brent).
- 3.44 For the sake of clarity, the submission version proposes to return to explicitly separating Strategic Employment Areas and Borough Employment Areas in separate policies. In addition, the submission version proposes to approach the policy issues surrounding office development within a separate policy.
- 3.45 Unsurprisingly, the preferred options version received a number of representations from house builders suggesting that industrial land designations should be relaxed to allow them to be released and used for the development of new homes. In response, the submission version proposes to maintain the level of protection afforded to Strategic and Borough Employment Areas, but also introduces a policy promoting the commercial regeneration of industrial estates using the principle of minimal enabling development.

Town Centres and Shopping

- 3.46 There was substantial support for policy applying the sequential approach to development and to the promotion of Wembley town centre.
- 3.47 A number of objections sought changes on the town centre boundaries and frontage designations to bring in individual off- street frontages. Officers are recommending that no changes be made in relation to the request to include ASDA at Wembley Park and Sainsbury at Kenton within the designated town centre. This is because of the lack of satisfactory physical integration with the relevant centres and shopping frontages. It was, however, agreed

that further reference be added to the Core Strategy emphasising the already adopted strategy of expanding of Wembley town centre eastwards to facilitate development on sites close to the Stadium. It is to be pointed out that the town centre boundary will be re-defined within the Development Policies DPD to reflect the realities of existing policies and outstanding consents.

- 3.48 Development Policy TC1, on retail floorspace need allocations to centres in Brent, has been moved into the Core Strategy because of its spatial significance, particularly on Brent's retail distribution. Objections have been made indicating it is not appropriate to include a policy setting out retail floorspace allocations. However, this policy is in line with national policy and is necessary because it quantifies retail needs across the Borough . It also provides clarification that these needs are not concentrated solely in Wembley. Officers therefore consider that no change is necessary in light of these objections.
- 3.49 Another representation raised the need for policies to ensure development in Wembley respects the image of Wembley Stadium. Officers accepted the suggestion so it is recommended that a reference to the relevant Urban Design policies in the Development Policies DPD, which protect the view of Wembley Stadium, be added to the Core Strategy.

Culture, Sport and Tourism

- 3.50 Concerns mainly from Sport England regarding Brent's Core Strategy not addressing the need for community sport, and importance Brent being a host borough for Olympics 2012. These concerns have been addressed by increasing the emphasis for sports provision generally.

Enabling Community Facilities

- 3.51 Few representations made (9), which generally supported the strategy. Minor changes were requested to refer to places of worship more explicitly.
- 3.52 Places of worship added into policy in response to comments and differences in types of community facilities made clearer within supporting text.

Site Specific Allocations

- 3.53 Unsurprisingly, the Site Specific Allocations generally received a far higher level of objection than the Core Strategy and generally very little support. Appendix 4, Site Specific Allocations, Objections Made and Proposed Council Response sets out each representation and your officers recommendation in response to it. For location of all appendices to this report see the Background Papers at the end of this report. In particular, the London Transport Sports Ground preferred allocation for a new school has aroused a far higher level of objection than any other site. There are 61 objections to this site whereas, the next highest, the proposed mixed-use development for the car park at Church End (site 27d) had 45 individual

Council 29 th October 2007	Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07
--	-----------------------------------

objections. Both sites have been the subject of campaigns, and the LT Sports Ground proposals have also been the subject of a petition with over 1,100 signatures opposing the proposals.

3.54 The main points raised and a summary of the proposed Council response for those sites with 5 or more objections are set out below. The full schedule of objections and proposed Council response for all sites is contained in the schedule accompanying the report. The number of objections and supports for each site are set out in Appendix 2 (see note on Appendices in the Background Papers section).

London Transport Sports Ground (site 11)

3.55 61 Objections. These relate to a number of concerns:

- development of open land
- traffic congestion adjacent to the site
- the loss of sports facilities
- demand is in the south of the borough, not the north
- too close to existing schools (particularly Preston Manor) with the risk of clashes between the two sets of pupils
- encourages greater vehicle use
- loss of biodiversity
- school buildings would have to be too high

3.56 The Council's response is based upon the need to provide additional school places in the Borough to meet an urgent need; a need that will become more acute as in excess of 5,000 homes planned for the Wembley regeneration area are built out. In assessing the best option for delivering additional school places an appraisal of potential sites was undertaken which looked at various options around the borough, including in the south. The conclusion was that the London Transport sports ground site was by some way the best option in that a school could be developed on the Bridge Road frontage without any significant loss of playing fields and that the site would be more sustainable than any other site allowing for easy access by public transport.

3.57 The potential loss of playing pitches is to be avoided on development as the draft new Proposals Map, which was consulted upon alongside the site allocations, designates the playing pitch areas as open space which should not be developed. An additional benefit of a school on the site is that the playing field can be available as public open space outside school hours. Currently the site is a private sports ground and recently part has been used as a quad bike track.

3.58 An early assessment of the transport impact of a school on the site,

provided by officers from the Transportation unit of the Council is that a school would be acceptable. This, of course, is subject to a detailed transport impact assessment which would be required should a planning application be brought forward for the site.

- 3.59 Suggestions have been made as to alternative sites in the Borough for a new secondary school, all of which have already been considered in the site option appraisal. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations, undertaken by independent consultants, found a secondary school to be appropriate.
- 3.60 The Wembley Park Action Group (WPAG) have submitted a detailed objection on the choice of Wembley Park as a school site. Their submission and your officers response sum up both sides' cases in respect of this site. The WPAG put forward Gladstone Park, Stonebridge (school and open space site) and the Gwenneth Rickus site (Brentfield) as possible alternatives to Wembley Park. The WPAG consider firstly that these sites are inherently more suitable and, secondly, they better meet the needs of schoolchildren in the south of the borough that have less choice of Brent schools than children in the north. This means, in their view, that the most disadvantaged and those of Afro-Caribbean backgrounds will be more disadvantaged by school location in Wembley.
- 3.61 Your officers are of the view which has been expressed consistently that Wembley Park is the 'best' site for a new school, responding to new housing growth in a site that has very good public transport accessibility, provides playing pitches attached to the school and does not suffer from planning constraints and other deficiencies that characterise the other sites that have been considered, three of which WPAG continue to promote (see officers response to WPAG in schedules-SSA11). Moreover it is available for development now to meet the rising and urgent needs for new school provision.
- 3.62 In terms of particular communities, the Afro-Caribbean population is not so concentrated and the options in terms of access by public transport so limited that this group would be effectively excluded from the Wembley Park school (the council's response sets out the numbers of people from Afro-Caribbean groups in wards adjoining the Wembley park site. A new school would be a little over 2 miles by road from the centre of Stonebridge, not insurmountable travelling distances in an urban area.
- 3.63 This is not the only site that will be developed or expanded for school provision and schools it is proposed to expanded other sites in the south of the borough. Your officers are examining ideas to bring forward a new secondary school in the Stonebridge/Brentfield area in the future but the demand for school places is such (16 Forms of Entry) that this should be seen as an addition to and not instead of the Wembley Park site. The Wembley Park site should be considered as sequentially preferable because it is the best site.

Church Road Car Park (site 27d)

- 3.64 We received approximately 45 objections to the SSA for Church Road Car Park, however these were related to the belief that the existing market would be included in any new development as an indoor market. It is not the Council's aspiration to create an indoor market at this site, the preferred option text for this SSA required space for a market, but did not specify clearly that it should be an outdoor market, therefore additional text is proposed to clarify this point. In addition, as a result of other objections, and for clarification, text has been added to the adjacent SSA, White Hart Public House (27c), to state that contributions to an open air market within Church End local centre will be considered in lieu of provision of an indoor market on the White Hart site, which was a requirement in the existing planning permission on the site as this was the original site of Willesden market. The Vicarage part of SSA 27b (Ebony Court, Church End) will be removed from the allocation as this part of the site is not available for development.

Abbey Manufacturing Estate (site 43)

- 3.65 5 Objections have been received, 2 from occupiers of property within the site concerned about the loss of a home and loss of a business respectively. The residential property is included within the site as it is likely to be required to provide new access for development. There is an objection from a car repair business on the site although it is unavoidable, if redevelopment is to result in better environmental conditions for local residents and improved access to a new industrial site, that some existing occupiers would be displaced. The Council can provide assistance in helping displaced businesses to relocate. In addition, it will require a private developer to bring forward a scheme to undertake a redevelopment of the site, and in order to do this they will have to put the site together, including negotiating with owners to purchase the land. The Council will only use CPO powers if a wider public benefit will be delivered by a scheme and as a last resort. Note the new proposal to extend site 43 below.

- 3.66 It was the intention of the original allocation to preserve an area of industrial land to the south of it. Objectors have pointed out that it would be better to include this land so that the whole area can be planned comprehensively and a flexible arrangement of uses can lead to the best regenerative outcome. Your officers concur with this approach subject to caveats that ensure a suitable amount of land is retained for employment use. The new enlarged site is therefore supported.

Brook Avenue (site 105)

- 3.67 Objections are based on the site being unnecessary to achieve the Council's objectives and the loss of good quality family housing. It is proposed to delete this particular site allocation as it is considered unlikely that a comprehensive development site can be brought forward, and because of

the difficulties of drawing up an appropriate scheme owing to the majority of the site being in areas of low and medium flood risk.

Kingsbury Library and Community Centre (site 42)

3.68 The Council received 5 objections to the proposed allocation. These included an individual resident, a residents' association, two elected members and the occupants of the neighbouring community facility. Objections to the inclusion of this allocation were based on the following matters:

- loss of library facility
- location of new library in Kingsbury town centre and associated implications for car parking
- loss of community centre
- potential loss of Stag Lane clinic

3.69 The response referred to the decision of the Council's Executive to new facilities in Kingsbury One Stop Shop. Visitor numbers to the existing library have been declining in recent years and it was felt that new facilities in a far more accessible location would provide a worthwhile service for years to come. It was also clarified that the existing library would remain open until the new facility is available for transfer; that the Council would seek the retention or re-provision of the community led facility, and that the allocation does not involve any such objective to close the Stag Lane Clinic.

The Lancer Public House, Kenton (site 56)

3.70 The Council received 13 objections to this allocation, although two respondents made more than one objection each. The respondents appeared to be local residents. Objections to the inclusion of this allocation were based on the following matters:

- perceived over development in the locality
- flatted development and the perceived changes in the neighbourhood
- impact on road congestion
- potential loss of daylight.

3.71 It is proposed that this allocation be removed from the document on the basis that development along the lines proposed in the allocation has received planning permission, and that further consultation was therefore unnecessary and could be considered as counter-productive.

Extra Site Allocations added or substantially amended.

3.72 There were also objections that some sites were omitted from the Preferred Options document that should have been included. On some sites officers

recommend the inclusion of a new SSA and on others that they remain omitted. On the following sites your officers recommend **inclusion** of the site as a new SSA:

Site 112-Clock Cottage, Kenton

This lists the uses that have been considered appropriate as potential uses as set out in the informal planning guidance. It does not however allocate parts of the developable land to different uses or different uses.

Site 113 Wembley Point, North Circular Road

Proposals to improve the offices, provide some residential development and improve Stonebridge Station and routes to it are supported subject to any development satisfying flood-risk issues through an 'Exceptions Test' (i.e. show why the site needs to come forward & demonstrate that there are measures to overcome flood problems).

Site 114 Homebase, Church End

The land is in use as a DIY store for many years but the site is allocated as a Borough Employment Area, so that any future use would have to be industrial or warehousing. Officers recommend that a more flexible approach could be taken to allow for mixed use development (residential and workspace uses) should the retail use cease. Such a designation makes it clear that the council does not support out-of town retail uses.

Site 21 Alperton House, Ealing Road

The owners of Alperton House would like to redevelop the 70's office block for a mix of uses, including retail (along Ealing Rd/Bridgwater Rd frontage), office use, cafes/pub and residential uses. They argue that the Public House that sits next to the canal should also be included to achieve a comprehensive development. Officers support these ambitions to bring forward new improved development on a somewhat ill-planned and neglected site. Originally officers recommended that the site was well occupied and should not be included as an SSA but demand for office space is patchy and re-provision would provide a regenerative boost to the area and retain similar employment levels than exist on the site at present. A new SSA is therefore recommended.

Site 115 Dudden Hill Playground, Willesden

It is proposed that the playground that is poorly located and very insecure is re-developed and that proceeds from its sale be used to improve the very poor quality Villiers Road open space, but which is more secure and better overlooked.

Site 121 - 721 Harrow Road/Rountree Road, Sudbury

This former garage site formed part of the proposals for the re-development of the Barham estate behind it. Your officers support the development of the frontage site for a mix of retail, residential and community uses as long as it adds to and does not detract from the future estate redevelopment

proposals.

- 3.73 There were some SSA's where your officers recommend amending existing site allocations. These are:

Site 43 Abbey Manufacturing Estate

See para. 3.66

Site 14 Albert Road/Marshall House

The original preferred options document excluded the British Legion and Albert Road Day centre as they were included in Supplementary Planning Guidance. This Guidance was re-written –as the Queens Park Car Park Supplementary Planning Document-recently to exclude these sites. In order therefore to provide clarity, it is proposed that all the Albert Road sites (on the north side of the road) that will come forward as an early phase of the redevelopment of South Kilburn be included in a single SSA.

- 3.74 There were also a further set of SSA's that land owners and developers suggested adding to the Preferred Options list that officers do not recommend should be added. These are set out in more detail in Appendix 5-see Background Papers section for location of appendices.

Site 117 Multi-use Games Area at Roe Green Park, Kingsbury

The proposal is to add this site of the former Kingsbury Swimming Pool site back in as a site for a new indoor swimming pool. A new multi-use games area has been built on the site when plans to redevelop the site for a new sports club and swimming pool proved to be unviable. Since there are no new clear proposals for a pool, officers do not consider a new SSA is warranted.

Site 118 Greenhouse Garden Centre, Welsh Harp

The owners of the Garden Centre would like a SSA that gives them much more latitude to develop the site for other uses. The site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) in the current UDP a status intended to preserve the open nature of the whole Welsh Harp area. Any SSA would be contrary to this designation. There are no compelling reasons why the MOL designation should change and officers therefore recommend not adding this SSA to the submission version.

Site 119 Artesian Close Industrial Estate

This site is designated as a Borough Employment Site but an SSA is proposed that allows a wider range of uses. Officers consider that there are no good reasons for a change in the status of the land and the site should be protected for industrial uses and thus no SSA included in the next version of the LDF.

Site 120 Palace of Arts and Industry

Qunitain Estates are seeking flexibility within a new SSA that allows for a wide range of commercial and other uses. Your officers view that the UDP

allocation already allows for a wide range of uses subject to the sequential approach. The UDP allocation conforms with current government guidance and therefore an SSA is not recommended.

Site 122 Remploy House, 415 Edgware Road

This is an office site in the Staples corner strategic Employment area. An SSA is sought by the owners that gives more flexibility in use: i.e. not just industrial/warehousing use. Your officers recommend that the site in the middle of a protected industrial area should retain its current status and no SSA be extended to this site.

Sites 123/124 Chiltern Cutting North and South, Wembley

A new SSA is suggested that supports residential development on the north part of the cutting and mixed use to the south. Your officers point to a current UDP designation that allows a mix of town centre related uses. This designation is preferable as development on the site which has some nature conservation value should only be that which supports the regeneration and functioning of the town centre. Moreover the UDP designation is part of the plan that is 'saved' for the foreseeable future, until a new Action Area Plan is completed for Wembley.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.75 It is a statutory requirement that a sustainability appraisal be undertaken as an integral part of drawing up the new or revised policies and proposals of the Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal, which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment as required by European legislation, was carried out by consultants Collingwood Environmental Planning as the Preferred Options were drawn up. The regulations require that further sustainability appraisal is necessary if new policy is introduced or significant changes have been made. It is not considered that any of the changes to the Core Strategy require further appraisal. There are new site allocations proposed which have been appraised, and the results of this appraisal are included in Appendix 6 (see background papers section for location of appendices).

Planning Committee

- 3.76 The Planning Committee considered all the documentation concerning the Core Strategy and SSA's on the 4th October. The role of Planning Committee is to consider the detail of the reports and make recommendations onto the Executive. Planning Committee supported officers recommendations re responses to the Core Strategy and SSA's and the changes proposed to the two documents save for two issues: some minor wording changes to the Lonsdale Road SSA and the inclusion of the Kingsbury Pool as an SSA.
- 3.77 Your officers agreed with the changes to Lonsdale Road SSA but did not support the inclusion of Kingsbury pool as an SSA. Officers completed an additional report to Executive on these matters and also a clarification on

Twyford Tip. These are included as Appendix 9 and Appendix 10 respectively to this report and these appendices are attached to this report.

- 3.78 In summary, the objection to the lack of Kingsbury Pool is that it should remain a clear statement that the council intend to proceed with development of a pool on this site, in an area where there is an acknowledged need for a new sports centre/pool. In summary, officers maintain the site of the former Kingsbury Pool at Roe Green Park should not be considered until work on a new sports strategy has been completed by consultants. Moreover if a different site emerges from this or other work, those objecting to any new site would hold up the Roe Green Pool site as 'the' place the council has chosen through its planning process. Any 'new' site could be given a measure of certainty by the preparation of a planning brief- a new SSA is not the only way to give a degree of planning certainty.
- 3.79 In conclusion, in the light of uncertainties over exact type of facility needed and its space requirements, its location and its viability as a project and council commitment to it, your officers would recommend that a SSA is not allocated on the former Kingsbury Pool site at this time.

Executive 8th October 2007

- 3.80 The council's Executive considered the report largely as it is set out above and also the further report from Planning Committee. Their recommendation to full Council is not to include Kingsbury Pool as an SSA, agree the wording changes proposed for Lonsdale Road and Twyford Tip and to accept all other officer recommendations.

Next Steps

- 3.81 Appendix 7 (Brent LDF- Core Strategy Submission Version) sets out the net changes after consultation on the Core Strategy at Preferred Options stage. It shows additional text in red and text that will be removed as struck-through. Similarly Appendix 8 (Site Specific Allocations- Submission Version) shows all the proposed changes after this round of consultation. Note that both appendices can be found on the council's website (link can be found on Background Papers section below), and have been supplied to members room.
- 3.82 At the submission stage, the Core Strategy and SSA documents will be put on formal public consultation for 6 weeks in November and December 2007. The two DPDs will also be submitted to the Secretary of State. There will be a need to organise independent Examination of the documents by the Planning Inspectorate, who will assess whether or not the documents are considered to be 'sound'. The Examination of the Core Strategy will commence approximately 6 months after submission to the Secretary of State and its length will depend upon the number and complexity of representations made. Examination of the Core Strategy will be followed soon after by examination of the Site Specific Allocations. It is likely that this

will be a longer Examination than into the Core Strategy. The Examinations are likely to take the form of local hearings where those who have commented on the documents, and are considered by the Inspector make a contribution to his/her deliberations of particular issues, will be invited to participate in a round-table discussion. This differs substantially from the old style public inquiry that was held into the UDP which was more adversarial in nature usually involving legal representatives by both the Council and objectors. Unless specifically requested by objectors and accepted by the Inspector, there should be no need for legal representation on either side.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 An allowance was made in the 2007/8 budget for the costs of preparing the LDF including that for consulting upon and publishing it. Part of the funding required has been met from the Planning Delivery Grant. Government officials made it clear that the Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) should be used to meet additional resource requirements of the new development plan system. The costs of submission and consulting upon the documents proposed in this report will be met from the Planning Service budget for 2007/8. For future years only a rough approximation of costs can be provided (see table below). There is a requirement for funding for Examination across two financial years because there will be a need now to hold separate 'Examinations in Public' because of the different timetables for the Development Policies document and the two DPDs to be submitted in November. With a likely continuing reduction in PDG, there will be a continued need to find funding from other sources for 2008/9 and 2009/10 and this will be considered during the 2008/9 budget process.

	£		
	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Estimated annual costs			
Public Inquiry costs		80,000	80,000
Other Costs	80,000	85,000	50,000
Total Costs	80,000	165,000	130,000
Sources of funding			
Planning Delivery Grant	60,000	?	?
Potential growth required		165,000	130,000

4.2 The Council has set out, in its Local Development Scheme, the proposed timetable for progressing the LDF. Any significant slippage from the

timetable will result in financial penalty through the loss of Planning Delivery Grant. Although it is not known what the grant will be next financial year, local planning authorities have been informed that it will reward local planning authorities for the delivery of their local development frameworks. In other words the emphasis is shifting from Development Control performance to Plan-making performance. For the current financial year Brent was awarded over £70,000 for plan-making, the second highest of any local authority in the country, out of an overall grant of £476,000. Next financial year the potential award, providing the timetable for preparation is maintained, is likely to be substantially higher.

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 changed the statutory basis for drawing up development plans in England and Wales. The Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance will be replaced by a Local Development Framework. The Council was required to carry out pre-submission consultation by regulation 26 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
- 5.2 The Development Plan Documents became material considerations in the determination of planning applications once they were made available for public consultation. However, little weight could be attached to the policies and proposals within the documents by a Planning Inspector in the determination of an application on appeal. With the submission of the DPDs, the policies and proposals within them will acquire greater weight in decision-making.

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 Full statutory public consultation has been, and will continue to be, carried out in the preparation of the development plan documents, which will include seeking the views of different groups across the Borough. An Equalities Impact Assessment of the LDF process has been produced.

Background Papers

Please Note that because of the bulk of the documentation, the following Appendices are not attached- they have been circulated to members of the council's Executive, and further copies are available in the Members Room and on the Council's Website –link below

<http://www.brent.gov.uk/planning.nsf/e35824689957a84280256623005fc7af/2>

Council 29 th October 2007	Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07
--	-----------------------------------

APPENDIX 1 Summary of Views Expressed at Workshops

APPENDIX 2 Number of Representations Made

APPENDIX 3 Core Strategy, Objections Made and Proposed Council Response

APPENDIX 4 Site Specific Allocations, Objections Made and Proposed Council Response

APPENDIX 5 Site Specific Allocations-Considered at Preferred Options stage but not included in Submission DPD

APPENDIX 6 Sustainability Appraisal of New Proposed Site Allocations

APPENDIX 7 Brent LDF- Core Strategy Submission Version

APPENDIX 8 Site Specific Allocations - Submission Version

Appendix 9, Additional Report to Executive on Planning Committee Recommendations and Appendix 10, Clarification on Twyford Tip Wording are attached to this report.

- Brent Local Development Scheme, June 2007
- Brent LDF Issues and Options Papers, September 2005
- Representations on Issues and Options Papers
- Brent Magazine LDF Questionnaire Results
- LDF Stakeholder Workshops Report, Oct 2005
- Brent Core Strategy Preferred Options
- The London Plan and draft Alterations to the London Plan, May 2006
- PPS12 and Companion Guide
- Brent Retail Need & Capacity Study, Feb. 2006
- Brent LDF Annual Monitoring Report, 2006
- Brent Employment Land Demand Study, 2006
- Draft Supplement to PPS1, Planning & Climate Change
- Community Workshop Report, Brent LDF – Core Strategy Preferred Options, Nov 2006
- Community Workshop Report, Brent LDF - Site Specific Allocations Preferred Options, July 2007
-


Contact Officers

Ken Hullock, Planning Service, X5309, ken.hullock@brent.gov.uk

Richard Saunders

Director of Environment & Culture

Appendix 9 - Additional Report to Executive on Planning Committee Recommendations

	<p style="text-align: center;">Executive 8th March 2007</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Environment and Culture</p>
<p>For Action Wards Affected: ALL</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations, Submission to Secretary of State</p>	

Forward Plan Ref: **E&C-07/08-16**

1.0 Summary

1.1 The Responses to the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations was considered by Planning Committee on the 4th October 2007. The Committee made two recommendations to Executive in respect of wording change on an existing Site Specific Allocation on Lonsdale Road and a request to include a new Allocation on Kingsbury Pool.

2.0 Detail

2.1 The council's Planning Committee at its meeting on the 4th October gave its support to Executive on the responses to individual representations, and to the Submission versions of the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations, except for two items;

- Kingsbury Pool
- Lonsdale Road

<p>Council 29th October 2007</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07</p>
---	--

Kingsbury Pool, Roe Green Park

- 2.2 The Planning Committee recommend to Executive that the former Kingsbury Pool site should be included as an SSA. The pool was included as a Site Specific Proposal in Brent's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). When the initiative to fund a pool through a private sports development fell through, the council decided to build a multi-use games area on part of the site. The Planning Committee consider that an SSA on this site gives an indication of the council's commitment to a third pool/sports centre in the north of the borough.
- 2.3 An objection was received on the lack of an SSA on this site and officers considered it and rejected it (set out in Appendix 8 of the main report). Your officers view is that there has long since been a broad acceptance of the need for a swimming pool & associated indoor sports use in the north of the borough but any new site should come out of an up-to-date assessment of sports needs. Consultants have been engaged by the council to advise on the need for such sports facilities, looking at the latest population trends and the up-to-date position on provision. A report will come before Executive early in the new year. Although this may not get to the level of individual sites, it will present a clear way forward based on needs and using a model developed by Sport England to predict future deficiencies in sports provision. Officers would not therefore recommend adding in the site of the former Kingsbury Pool at Roe Green Park until this work is concluded. Moreover if a different site emerges from this or other work, those objecting to any new site would hold up the Roe Green Pool site as 'the' place the council has chosen through its planning process. Any 'new' site could be given a measure of certainty by the preparation of a planning brief- a new SSA is not the only way to give a degree of planning certainty.
- 2.4 There is no current council commitment to either seeking a pool/indoor sports facilities by direct capital funding or through some partnership with private sector providers. In conclusion, in the light of uncertainties over exact type of facility needed and its space requirements, its location and its viability as a project and council commitment to it, your officers would recommend that a SSA is not allocated on the former Kingsbury Pool site at this time.

Lonsdale Road

- 2.5 Planning Committee are seeking a wording change to site 84, Lonsdale Road, Queen's Park. Currently the SSA allows retail and food and drink uses at the western end of Lonsdale Road, a mews formerly dominated by car repairers and small industrial workshops and now much more mixed in use. This is to allow a limited expansion of the very successful shopping facilities on Salusbury Road. Members of the Planning Committee, support a mix of employment uses and cafes etc, but are concerned that too many cafes and shops would create congestion and have a negative impact on traditional businesses. They would like to limit the

expansion of shops and cafes so that there was a reasonable balance of traditional employment and café/shop uses, and suggest that no more than 25% of the units would be allowed a change of use. Your officers support this objective and have indicated a wording change below-underlined text.

2.6 'Allocation-Mixed use including retail/food and drink uses (to a maximum of 25% of units) at western end.....'

'Justification-Increasing the supply of small and medium employment premises, while limiting the negative impact that an over concentration of shop/cafe uses may have on existing businesses in terms of highway congestion, re-provision.....'

Conclusions

3.1 Of the two Planning Committee further recommendations, your officers:

3.1.1 Do not support the inclusion of the site of the former Kingsbury Pool, Roe Green Park as an SSA;

And

3.1.2 Support the wording changes to Lonsdale Road SSA as set out above.

Appendix 10 Clarification on Twyford Tip Wording

Executive

8th March 2007

Report Title:

Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations, Submission to Secretary of State

Forward Plan Ref: E&C-07/08-005.

1.0 Summary-Letter from RHPC re Twyford Tip

- 1.1 RHPC made objections to the inclusion of Twyford Tip as a Site Specific Allocation for waste uses. Following representations from RHPC to site SSA3, and a subsequent meeting your officers agreed to amend the description of the site. Unfortunately this amendment did not appear in the Site Allocations document appended to the main report, although your officers made it clear that the amendment would be recommended.
- 1.2 The attached letter from RHPC asks the Planning Service to make the Council's Executive aware of this mistake. The Planning Service have therefore set out in the attachment the proposed change to the description. Instead of reading 'Civic amenity site now mostly vacant....' It now is proposed to read, 'Civic amenity site and mostly vacant land....' It is RHPC's contention that the current wording may convey an impression that the amenity site occupies most of the site and therefore members and the general public are likely to view waste use more favourably than if the site had been vacant for many years. Your officers are content to recommend the new description that reflects the position that the civic amenity site ceased on the main ex-tip site many years ago and today only a small part of the site is currently used as a civic amenity site.
- 1.3 RHPC also would like the wording of the planning history changed. They argue that the planning permission for the Asia Sky scheme has not expired and that their client has commenced operations on site that constitute a material start on site. This is a matter contested by the council.
- 1.4 RHPC make the case that their client intends to implement the Asia Sky mixed use proposals and therefore the new SSA3 allocation for waste uses should be

Council 29 th October 2007	Version No. 1.0-final 19/10/07
--	-----------------------------------

withdrawn. RHPC contend that the wording in the description and the fact that the Planning History gives only the council view, effectively prejudices the objectors case.

- 1.5 The Council's case is that Twyford Tip is suitable for waste uses for which there is a growing need. This site has been identified by the council and by consultants working for the GLA as one of the most eligible sites for waste processing uses. Your officers view is that the asia Sky development has not commenced on site and any new application that would be contrary to government advice, on a site that could be better used for waste processing uses.

Conclusion:

Your officers recommend the wording changes as set out in the attached document but recommend that SSA3 on Twyford Tip for waste uses is supported by Executive.