

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)**  
**Thursday, 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2004 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Cribbin (Chair), Councillor Harrod (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Chavda, Freeson, Kansagra, McGovern, H M Patel, Sengupta, Singh and Steel.

Councillors Arnold, V Brown, Coughlin, Hughes, R S Patel, Sayers and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

1. **Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

None declared.

2. **Land Adjoining New National Stadium, Royal Route, Wembley, HA9 (Ref: 03/3200)**

The Committee had before them a report detailing an outline planning application for works for the re-orientation of Wembley Arena, Class A1 (retail) comprising up to 14,200 square metres designer retail outlet and 11,800 square metres sports retailing; 400 square metres of boutique retailing; Class A1/A2 shops/financial and professional services up to 8,000 square metres (including a supermarket of up to 2,500 square metres); Class A3 (food and drink) up to 12,700 square metres; up to 63,000 square metres of Class B1 (a, b and c) business floor space; up to 25,400 square metres of Class C1 (hotel) floor space; up to 26,700 square metres of Class C1/sui generis (hotel apartments); up to 5,000 square metres of Class C2 (residential institutions) floor space; Class C3 (dwellings) up to 277,000 square metres floor space comprising up to 3,727 residential units; student accommodation (sui generis) of up to 16,600 square metres (554 bed spaces); Class D1 (non residential institutions) up to 8,200 square metres of floor space; Class D2 (assembly and leisure) up to 13,700 square metres.

Together with associated open space, public market area (Class A1), hard and soft landscaped areas, highway and engineering works, electricity sub-station, other utility requirements, other parking and servicing, demolition and improvements to Olympic Way:

AND

Reserved matters relating to siting, design, external appearance and means of access for the erection of a three-storey structure to provide car and coach parking.

The **Director of Planning** gave a PowerPoint presentation to Members outlining the main points in the report of Quintain's Stage 1 planning application for the land surrounding Wembley Stadium. The Committee were advised that an outline application had been submitted on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2003, and revised on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2004, for mixed use development on 17 hectares (42 acres) of land to the north, east and west of the new stadium. Details of the proposed use of the site included:-

- 3,727 new homes for around 8,500 people, including 40 per cent affordable allocation. The majority of buildings would be between 8 to 14 storeys, although there would also be 21 and 27 storey 'landmark' towers.
- The creation of an estimated 6,120 long-term jobs and a further 1,600 construction jobs over 11 years.
- Up to 28,500 square metres of leisure usage.
- 34,400 square metres of retail usage.
- 12,700 square metres for restaurants, cafes and bars.
- 63,000 square metres of new office space.
- 8,200 square metres of community facilities.
- A new flagship hotel.
- New public squares and spaces
- Refurbished Arena

There were proposals for a stadium car park of up to 2,900 spaces with provision for coaches and cars to be located at First Way in the eastern part of the site. There were also plans in the initial phases for a stadium piazza, hotel, arena works and square. A Boulevard would connect Olympic Way to Station Square and would represent the cultural heart of the masterplan.

Members were advised that the application met the requirements of the Brent Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan. The application also helped achieve the aims of Destination Wembley, namely that "By 2020, Wembley be a national and international destination, a key contributor to the national economy and the vibrant heart of the London Borough of Brent."

The Director of Planning also addressed issues relating to the site's relationship with the stadium, the retail and leisure impact, transport, housing, the community and social infrastructure, regeneration and employment and sustainability.

Members were advised that the application was subject to a Section 106 agreement of £21.6 million, excluding on site affordable housing and essential on site infrastructure, and conditions that would mitigate any adverse impacts.

The Director of Planning referred Members to further consultations received, and the Planning Service's responses to them, in the supplementary report from the Wembley Hill Residents Association, the residents of 18 Dennis Avenue, Wembley and 53 Mostyn Avenue, Wembley, RE International (UK Ltd), Sport England, Brent Advocacy Concerns and Wembley National Stadium Limited. Members were advised that a letter from Herbert Smith, acting on behalf of the joint owners of Brent Cross shopping centre, the Standard Life Assurance

Company and Hammerson Property Limited, withdrawing their initial comments submitted on the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004.

Members were advised of additions and amendments to the Section 106 agreement in the supplementary report, including:-

- An additional statement in paragraph 11.5.1 to read “Details to be agreed through Community Facilities Plan for each phase of development.”
- An additional statement in paragraph 11.10.2 to read “Site management arrangements to be detailed within a comprehensive site management plan.”
- An amendment in paragraph 11.8.3, the word “viewed” to be replaced with “reviewed.”
- An amendment in paragraph 11.11.1 to read “Waste Management Strategy.”

The Director of Planning advised Members that with regards to the contribution sought towards bus improvements and following discussions with Transport for London, that £1,750,000 be used for Routes PR2, 92 and 224, as opposed to £1,000,000 for the PR2 Route and £750,000 for 92 and 224 Routes in the original report, in order to allow greater flexibility. He also added that the Section 106 would include the maintenance and management of existing and proposed public toilets on all major event days.

Members noted an additional condition in the supplementary report, proposed in order to ensure that the development was correctly phased in the interests of the proper planning of the area. The new condition stated that:

“No development shall commence (excluding the car and coach park) until a detailed phasing plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing plan. “

Members were also advised of amendments to conditions 11, 12, 19, 26, 35, 49, 50, 65 and 66.

Members noted amendments and clarification in the supplementary report to Quantum of Leisure Use on page 1 of the main report; paragraph 7.3.2 relating to management; paragraph 10.1.15 relating to the Electricity Sub-Station; paragraph 9.11 relating to car/coach parking arrangements; paragraph 11.7.3 relating to transport; paragraph 7.2.15 relating to residential use; and paragraph 7.2.23.

**Cllr Chavda** moved a motion that each speaker be given up to 5 minutes to present their case. This was put to the vote and declared LOST.

**Mr Stephen Games**, in objecting to the application, questioned the benefits it would offer local residents, expressing concerns regarding the density of buildings, overcrowding and the impact on local traffic. With regards to the Phase 2 plans, he felt that these would add to the concerns he had mentioned above and he enquired as to when these plans would be made available to the public.

**Mr Chris Rink**, in objecting to the application, expressed concern on the grounds of the lack of provision of schooling, residential, medical and health facilities and common open space. He stated that there should also be re-consultation on the re-location of open spaces. He also believed that there was not the required space for the amount of residential units proposed.

**Mr Robert Dunwell** voiced concern about issues relating to transport and parking, in particular the £500,000 mentioned in the report to provide for the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones schemes. He requested that any parking scheme be decided by public consultation. He also suggested that 2,500 additional parking spaces could be created using former building sites, until the public transport system was properly in place. In reply to a query from **Cllr Kansagra**, Mr Dunwell explained that the possibility of the continued use of the 2,500 parking spaces, once the public transport system had been in place for a year, should be decided by the views of the local residents.

**Mr Peter Corcoran**, in objecting to the scheme, felt that Event Days would represent dangers in terms of large volumes of people leaving the stadium and using the nearby stations. He understood that Chiltern Railways capacity for handling passengers was 1,500 people per hour, which in his view would not be adequate. He questioned the wisdom of building an extensive number of residential units near the national stadium and stated that further consideration was required regarding access routes. He also suggested that it would be beneficial to study the land use around stadiums of similar stature, such as those he had visited in Paris, Athens and Toronto.

**Mr Chris Rink**, speaking on behalf of **Mr Yorulmaz**, requested that blocks be limited to a maximum of 4 storeys and that measures be in place to reduce noise pollution, especially on Event Days and during pre-event preparation and construction. He reiterated his earlier points regarding concerns about the lack of medical and school facilities and requested that 20 acres of open space be made available.

**Mr Nick Shattock**, representing the applicant, outlined his reasons for why the application should be approved. He stated that the applicant had appreciated the importance of consultation and a total of approximately 6,400 people had been consulted, and over 2,000 individuals mailed. He felt that the plans had the support of most people and that the applicant's vision of Wembley was congruent to Brent Council. He believed that the site would be transformed into a modern, urban, world class destination

offering a wide range of jobs. He advised Members that the financial performance of the site would be subject to an independent assessor and that the applicant would continue to consult with Brent Council regarding the balance of land use. He referred Members to the Section 106 agreement which included the applicant providing £9 million towards educational facilities and the 40 per cent allocation of affordable housing, which he regarded as a high proportion. He added that the application met the future parking requirements of the area and that the proposed retail use on the site would complement that of Wembley Town Centre.

Members put forward a number of questions to Mr Shattock. **Cllr Kansagra** suggested that it would be appropriate to provide a primary school on site, in view of a possible 700 to 800 new children moving into the residential units proposed. In reply, Mr Shattock explained that discussions with Brent Council had indicated a preference to allocate the resources elsewhere. He added that there were no current plans to build a primary school on site, although the applicant was interested in buying other land near the site which could be used for educational facilities. He added that building a primary school on site had not been completely ruled out. **Cllr Steel** commented on the architecture of the proposals, stating that he felt there could be improvements in the design of the blocks. Mr Shattock replied that as it was an outline application, the details of issues such as the architectural design were yet to be finalised, but that there would be ongoing consultation with the architects. **Cllr Harrod** commented that the affordable housing allocation should be nearer 50 per cent, bearing in mind the Unitary Development Plan's (UDP) guidelines, and also remarked upon the disproportionately low number of rented affordable housing units and high number of intermediate affordable housing units. In answer to Cllr Harrod's comments, Mr Shattock stated that the applicants sought to address the needs to launch a new community in an area of urban regeneration and that the 40 per cent allocation of affordable housing represented the best balance. He added that the site needed to encourage economically active people in order to aid the future of the community, and that there would be training and education facilities to facilitate the community's success, including the North West London College. In answer to **Cllr Sengupta's** query, Mr Shattock confirmed that the housing allocation met with PCT requirements. **Cllr Kansagra** suggested that parking spaces could be maximised by including multi-storey parking structures in the plans. In answer to **Cllr Steel's** query concerning the selection of tenants for affordable housing, Mr Shattock advised Members that selection would result from consultation between Brent Council and the applicants, although Brent Council would ultimately issue the nominations.

**Cllr Van Colle** stated that he had been involved in working parties regarding recycling and higher density housing issues that had made some recommendations concerning heating and power facilities. He stressed the importance of the creating the right balance for housing use and felt that there was a need for further consultation with regards to this. He felt that a too higher an allocation of affordable housing could affect

the number of other dwellings filled. He also suggested that working groups be set up to re-consider the design of residential units prior to construction. He emphasised the need for appropriate parking provision for the residents. He felt that the conditions should include school and healthcare facilities, bearing in mind the extra people, including children, the residential plans would attract.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, **Cllr Hughes** stated that he had been approached by local residents. He stated that he was not opposed to the application in principle, but hoped that it would facilitate the sustainability of the site in terms of the environment, education and health provision. He felt that transport provision was currently inadequate, for example would the stations be able to cope with the numbers of people leaving the stadium after an event. He stressed the need for a school on site, in view of the number of children anticipated for the new residential units. He questioned whether private tenants could be attracted to the site bearing in mind the allocation of social housing. He felt that the application should be rejected on grounds of the need for further consultation and the lack of educational, health and transport facilities.

In reply to the comments made, the **Director of Planning** stressed that this was an outline application and that therefore the design of residential units remained undecided, although there would be plenty of consultation regarding this. Concerning queries on infrastructure, he was aware of potential educational needs and pressure points in the area, but felt that it was not appropriate to build a school on site at this stage. He added that educational issues were being addressed and options being discussed. The Primary Healthcare Trust had been approached regarding health issues and their requirements were currently being met by the applicant. The Director of Planning added that there would be some flexibility if the Primary Healthcare Trust required any changes to those facilities currently provided. Improvements were under way in improving transport infrastructure, including, for example, the works at Wembley Park station which would result in the doubling of passenger capacity limit. Wembley Stadium station would undergo platform lengthening and developments were also planned for Wembley Central station. Chiltern Railways would also need to increase capacity. Residents would be encouraged to use facilities when not in use during events.

With regards to Cllr Hughes concerns about consultation, the Director of Planning stated that extensive consultation had been undertaken since the mid 1990s, there had been significant local interest and the level of opposition to the plans were low. A specific Wembley Area Consultative Forum meeting had taken place with a specific aim to inform residents of plans for Wembley Stadium and the surrounding areas.

**Cllr Freeson** commented on a number of items in the report regarding procedures and housing and community facilities. He enquired about the net and gross housing density and expressed concern about the disproportionate number of small units, for example the number of studio

flats proposed as opposed to family housing units. With regards to open space provision, he asked that if this could not be provided within the site area, that a specific request be made to find land for such use in the immediate area adjoining the site. He felt that there was a need for a primary school to be located on site, or if this was not possible, that one be situated in very close proximity to the site, and that its location be determined at an early stage of the planning phases. He enquired as to why a healthy living centre was not proposed any earlier than Phase 3 of the development.

He also sought clarification regarding the Travel Demand Assessment review indicating that there would be scenarios whereby the predicted level of traffic to the Network would be higher than included in the TRANSYT models which had assumed a worst case scenario.

He felt that communal space, education and health facilities should be progressed concurrently with the development plan of the residential units.

**Cllr Chavda** expressed his concerns regarding educational, medical and parking provision and also about the proposed height of some of the blocks. He felt that more needed to be done in consulting the views of children regarding facilities. He requested that:-

- (a) Residents and resident associations be invited to monthly meetings;
- (b) 1 free parking space and 1 parking space priced at normal parking rates be provided for each residential unit;
- (c) Health facilities and an appropriate number of doctors be in place prior to residents moving in;
- (d) Education facilities such as playschools, nurseries and primary schools be built on site prior to residents moving in;
- (e) Blocks be limited to a maximum of 5 storeys.

**Cllr Kansagra** stated that he welcomed the scheme in principal but not the application as it currently stood. He identified concerns in the following areas:

- (a) Lack of communal space as per Brent Council's SPG17 Amenity Space Standards;
- (b) The lack of green spaces;
- (c) That a school on the site had not been included as part of the Section 106 agreement, especially as the nearby Preston Manor High School was already oversubscribed and also required extensions;
- (d) The possible adverse impact the site might have on Wembley High Street traders;
- (e) He enquired about who would run the community facilities;
- (f) He suggested that it would be appropriate to provide a helipad for VIP guests to the site;
- (g) The application's proposed building density was too high.

He felt it could be beneficial to defer the application for task groups to make reports on the various issues.

**Cllr Steel** commented on the design of the blocks and suggested that the buildings could be designed to be more aesthetically pleasing. He also suggested that the wording in the report relating to parking measures allocating £500,000 offered by the applicant to introduce Controlled Parking Scheme should be changed to support any parking/traffic scheme supported by the residents.

**Cllr Harrod** stated that the proposed retail use of the site would have the desirable effect of bringing customers and businesses to the area. The educational and training facilities proposed would provide for the needs of people of various ages and the inclusion of North West London College to the site was beneficial. Primary schools in the area would benefit from funds made available from the Section 106 agreement for redevelopment and he suggested that the Palace of Industry Site could be suitable for locating a new primary school. He added that Wembley High School was already benefiting from investment and that Preston Manor High School may also similarly benefit in the future.

He reiterated his views regarding what he considered the relatively low allocation of affordable housing and rented affordable housing and the high number of intermediate affordable housing units proposed. **Cllr Freeson** backed these views.

To conclude, **Cllr Harrod** felt that the meeting had given the opportunity for a variety of views to be known to the applicant, but that he supported the outline application.

In answer to comments raised by Cllr Chavda concerning parking provision for residents, the **Director of Transportation** advised Members that residents would be allocated the maximum number of parking spaces under current guidelines. Residents with parking permits for the site area would not be eligible for permits elsewhere. Roads within the estate would be privately managed and therefore not subject to local authority parking restrictions. Regarding Cllr Freeson's query concerning the Traffic Impact Assessment, he confirmed that the Assessment represented the worst case scenario and that in the case of the TRANSYT models and the linked signal configuration, UTC/SCOOT, these accounted for the capacity of the traffic signals and how they would work. With regards to Cllr Steel's comments that the report be re-worded to £500,000 being allocated to support any parking/traffic scheme supported by the residents, he mentioned that the report also stated that the funds would be used towards other Green Travel measures in the vicinity of the site if local opposition prevented implementation of Controlled Parking Zone schemes.

The **Director of Planning** responded to the various comments made by Members regarding the residential uses of the application. He reminded

Members that the proposals were for other land uses as well as residential uses, and because of the location of the site and its proximity to the national stadium that there would be plenty of dual use public squares. Over 80,000 square feet of community facilities had been proposed and the Section 106 agreement had secured subsidies for many of the facilities to be provided. The proposed 3,727 residential units would provide 500 habitable rooms per hectare. There had been much negotiation with the applicants to secure a comparatively high 40 per cent allocation of affordable housing. He advised Members that significant expenditure had been provided by the applicant for upfront costs relating to essential on site infrastructure and on site affordable housing. Community facilities would be rolled out once the residential units became available as this was the most practical and realistic way of phasing in such amenities. Educational needs of the site and surrounding areas would be taken into account and he suggested that the construction of a new school in Phase 2 of the development would be considered if a need had been identified. He advised Members that although the Planning Committee could identify the amount funds provided for educational needs, that the allocation of the funds would be determined by the Local Education Authority. He noted Cllr Freeson's comments concerning progressing communal space and health and education facilities concurrently with the development plan of the residential units and also with Cllr Freeson and Cllr Harrod's comments regarding allocation of social housing. He summarised by stating that the size and nature of the application made it unique, and that through considerable thought, consultation, discussion and negotiation, he felt that a well balanced application had been submitted and therefore recommended Members to approve the application.

**Cllr Chavda** then moved the following motions:-

- (i) that in light of the likely effects on present and future residents of Wembley, that monthly consultation meetings take place with residents and residents' associations;
- (ii) that each residential unit be provided with 1 free parking space and 1 additional parking space chargeable at normal parking rates;
- (iii) that health facilities and the appropriate number of doctors be in place before the first residents move into the residential units;
- (iv) that educational facilities, including playschools, nurseries and primary schools, be in place before the first residents move into the residential units;
- (v) that blocks be limited to a maximum of 5 storeys.

These were put to the vote and declared LOST.

**The Chair** indicated that residents and residents' associations would be given plenty of opportunities to provide feedback and to be consulted regarding the site's development plans.

**Cllr Kansagra** then moved the following motions:-

- (i) that the scheme provides for a primary school on site at either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the development;
- (ii) that the Section 106 agreement provide funds for the extension of Preston Manor School;
- (iii) that blocks be limited to a maximum of 10 storeys;
- (iv) that parking spaces for Wembley Stadium be increased from 2,900 to 7,000 spaces;
- (v) that green space be allocated on site

These were put to the vote and declared LOST.

**NB The first motion was declared lost after the casting vote of the Chair.**

**Cllr Steel** moved that the second sentence of section 9.8.16 of the report be amended to read "To this end, the applicant has offered a sum of £500,000 to support any parking/traffic scheme chosen by residents in the forthcoming public consultation in the surrounding residential areas and this sum is considered sufficient to introduce such a scheme." This was put to the vote and declared LOST.

Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application, subject to a Section 106 agreement as amended and conditions as amended in conditions 11, 12, 19, 26, 35, 49, 50, 65 and 66, an additional condition relating to the submission of a detailed phasing plan by the applicant and Stage 2 referral to the Mayor and Government Office for London.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66 (d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:-

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta and Singh	<b>(6)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra, H M Patel and Steel	<b>(3)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Cllr Chavda	<b>(1)</b>

RESOLVED:-

that approval be given, subject to a Section 106 agreement as amended and conditions as amended in conditions 11, 12, 19, 26, 35, 49, 50, 65 and 66, an additional condition relating to the submission of a detailed phasing plan by the applicant and Stage 2 Referral to the London Mayor and Government Office for London.

3. **Wembley Arena, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0DX  
(Ref: 04/0426)**

The Committee had before them an application for Listed Building Consent for refurbishment and re-orientation of Wembley Arena and the construction of a new service yard area.

The **Director of Planning** referred Members to minor amendments in the supplementary report to the report and conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11.

RESOLVED:-

that listed Building Consent be granted, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11.

**NB: Cllr Steel was not available during consideration of this application and therefore did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

4. **Wembley Arena, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0DX  
(Ref: 04/0427)**

The Committee received a further report seeking to determine the planning application for the refurbishment and re-orientation of Wembley Arena, new service yard and the development of a new public open space (Arena Square) to the east of Wembley Arena.

The **Director of Planning** referred Members to minor amendments in the supplementary report to the report and to conditions 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43 and 44.

The applicant informed Members that as one of the largest venues in the United Kingdom of music and entertainment, Wembley Arena was in need of upgrading in order to compete with other venues. Plans included the restoring of the former architectural design whilst retaining the character of the building. The application had undergone considerable consultation with Planning Services and the intention was to use the venue for larger conferences and events. Community groups would have use of the venue at concessionary rates. Proposals also included the construction of Arena Square with illumination provision to facilitate the staging of festivals.

Members asked a number of queries concerning the application. **Cllr Harrod** stated that he appreciated the reasons for re-orientating the building, but stressed that it was important that the building was acoustically well-insulated in light of the unsocial hours of people leaving and entering the premises. In reply, the applicant stated that the Western Area of the building, designated as a service area, would be covered. The

overall design of the building would provide appropriate noise protection and access points for vehicles would be covered to keep noise to satisfactory levels. The applicant added that the size of the building would be large enough to accommodate the new technology. In response to **Cllr Freeson's** query about the use of the original swimming pool in the building, the applicant advised Members that the building now functioned as a music and entertainment venue and therefore it was not appropriate or viable to retain use of the swimming pool. In reply to Cllr Freeson's query concerning whether the potentially dangerous external fabric had been tested prior to being cleared or cleaned, the applicant informed Members that they had worked with English Heritage and Planning Services in order to provide a balance between conservation and commercial use. It had been decided that stripping the building to its original form would be too expensive so plans were being made to sensitively reinstate the former colours. In reply to **Cllr Kansagra's** query concerning the use of the arena roof, the applicant stated that there was potential for a part of it to be used for refreshment facilities.

The **Director of Planning** added that the application was in congruence with the Phase 1 development.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43 and 44.

RESOLVED:

that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43 and 44.

**NB: Cllr Steel was not available during consideration of this application and therefore did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

**NB: The meeting was adjourned at 10.20 pm for 10 minutes.**

**NB: Members agreed to disapply the guillotine procedure at 10.30 pm.**

The meeting ended at 10.50 pm.

M CRIBBIN  
Chair

*Mins2004'05/council/planning/pln3jej-special*