



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 11 May 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Agha (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Mahmood and Maurice

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors McLennan and Stopp

Apologies for absence were received from Marquis and M Patel

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None.

Members however declared that they had received emails from Julie Harrington and James McDougall of the Football Association (FA) about application references 15/55550 and 15/6515.

2. **Red House building, South Way, Land and Pedestrian walkway between South Way and Royal Route, Wembley Park Boulevard, Wembley (Ref. 15/3599)**

PROPOSAL:

A hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of the site including:-

- a) Full planning permission for the demolition of existing building and erection of a 13-storey building comprising a 312-bed hotel (Use Class C1) with ancillary and/or ground uses including a restaurant, bar, offices and gym (Use Classes A1-A4/B1 and/or D2) (referred to as Plot W11), on-site cycle parking and
- b) Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing building (The Red House, South Way) and erection of a 4-storey building comprising 1610sqm of and/or A1-A4/B1/D1 and D2 uses, with all matters reserved (referred to as Plot W12) and new pedestrian boulevard (outline). with associated service yard, landscaping and infrastructure works (as amended).

RECOMMENDATION: To delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duty authorised person to grant planning permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London, and subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice..

David Glover (Area Team Manager) introduced the application, set out the historical background including the reasons for the previous refusal and clarified the key changes since made by the applicant. Members heard that the mix of metal cladding and brick proposed by the applicant offered good visual appearance and that within the context of the Masterplan, the relationship between buildings was considered acceptable. He continued that the applicant had

submitted further assessment of pedestrian crowd flow to demonstrate that the width of the interim boulevard would be adequate for those going to Wembley Stadium. In reference to the supplementary report, David Glover reported on the findings that arose from the discussion by officers with the Event Safety Team and the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) for Wembley National Stadium and advised that if planning permission was to be granted, the interim width of the boulevard during construction could be subject to the submission of details to be approved in writing by the Council prior to the commencement of any works to prevent any narrowing.

Ann Clements and Julian Tollis (applicant's agents) addressed the Committee. Ann Clements drew members' attention to the presentation by the applicant to members on the boulevard and other elements of the application. She confirmed that space for a GP practice was intended to be provided within Plot W12, part of the outline element to this application. She continued that the applicant had provided updated views from the boulevard, and plans to show the proposal in its wider context, including the proposed development on the MG House site and wider development proposed and envisaged in the Wembley Regeneration Area. Julian Tollis clarified the design aspects of the proposal including its relationship with MG House and measures to preserve the Royal Route Dome.

In the ensuing debate, members asked questions as to whether any provision had been made for the South Way enclosure, the adequacy of the width of the boulevard and whether the applicant had engaged with Wembley National Stadium (WNS) about the impact of the proposal on the operation of the stadium.

In response to members' questions, Ann Clements stated that no changes were proposed to the operation of the stadium activities as any such changes was the responsibility of the Local Authority. She added that whilst the width of the boulevard was adequate, the applicant could widen it to 10metres if required and that the applicant had been engaging with WNS and the Safety Advisory Team and implemented changes recommended.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) and Tony Kennedy (Head of Transportation) responded to questions about parking and advised members that no parking facilities were proposed for the hotel due to its proximity to a multi storey car park, although drop off and pick up for disabled persons would be available. In bringing the discussion to a close, members agreed an additional condition for the width of the boulevard to be widened to 10metres during construction.

DECISION: Agreed as recommended and a further condition that the width of boulevard to be 10 metres during construction.
(Voting: For 6 Against 0, Abstention 0).

3. **Olympic Way and land between Fulton Road and South Way including Green Car Park, Wembley Retail Park, 1-11 Rutherford Way, 20-28 Fulton Road, Land south of Fulton Road opposite Stadium Retail Park, land opposite Wembley Hilton, land opposite London Design Outlet (Ref. 15/5550)**

The Committee agreed to receive officer introduction and representations by objectors, ward members, applicants and their agents for this application and application references 15/5615 and 16/1024 together but decide each application individually.

PROPOSAL:

Hybrid planning application, accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment, for the redevelopment of the site including;-

Full planning permission for erection of a 10-storey car park to the east of the Stadium comprising 1,816 car parking spaces of which 1,642 are for non-residential purposes, up to 82 coach parking spaces and associated infrastructure, landscaping and vehicular access.

And

Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings on site and the provision of up to 420,000 sqm (gross external area) of new floorspace within a series of buildings comprising:

Retail/financial and professional services/food and drink (Use Class A1 to A4) up to 21,000 sqm;

Commercial (Use Class B1) up to 82,000 sqm;

Hotel (Use Class C1): up to 25,000 sqm;

Residential (Use Class C3): up to 350,000 sqm (up to 4,000 homes) plus up to 20,000 sqm of floorspace for internal plant, refuse, cycle stores, residential lobbies, circulation and other residential ancillary space;

Education, healthcare and community facilities (Use Class D1): up to 15,000 sqm;

Assembly and leisure (Use Class D2): 23,000 sqm;

Student accommodation (Sui Generis): Up to 90,000 sqm.

And associated open space (including a new public park) and landscaping; car and coach parking (including up to 55,000 sqm of residential parking and 80,000 sqm non-residential parking) and cycle storage; pedestrian, cycle and vehicular accesses; associated highway works; and associated infrastructure including water attenuation tanks, an energy centre and the diversion of any utilities and services to accommodate the development

RECOMMENDATION:

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to grant permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London and subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and to delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Chief Legal Officer, and subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice, an additional condition regarding design standards and amendments to conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 19, 22, 26, 29 and 36 as discussed above.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the application and with reference to the supplementary report informed members that Section 106 contributions were requested by Network Rail and Chiltern Railways for station improvements to address the resulting significant increase in demand at the station. He continued that Officers considered that the Section 106 contributions

sought by Chiltern Railways and Network Rail were not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore would fail the tests set out within paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010, as amended. He also drew members' attention to the fact that a condition was attached to the extant consent relating to the South West Lands site which secured the provision of station facilities and advised that that condition had been recommended to be attached to the South West Land consent, if approved (reference 14/4931).

In respect of the application for Careys and VDC site, David Glover informed members that Careys, landowners and occupiers of the site directly to the east of the application site were willing to withdraw their previous objection providing the applicant was prevented from installing ventilation (passive or mechanical) within the eastern elevation where it would abut Careys land. He advised that the applicant proposed a solid wall facing the Careys site which would result in any emissions from vehicles on the lower deck being directed to the north or south rather than the east. Vehicles on the upper deck would be in the open air and any emissions would be dispersed by the wind. He then referred to additional letters received Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) on behalf of WNSL / The FA but added that the submission of the rebuttal letters was not considered to trigger the requirement for additional consultation.

The Area Planning Manager then drew members' attention to additional conditions requiring further details of façade treatment in the interest of the appearance of the building; the approval of details of any extract systems or fans prior to the installation of such equipment to ensure that noise levels and the direction of those fans can be controlled, in the interest of amenities of any sensitive uses, but having regard to the nature of the site, which was within a designated Strategic Industrial Location and a number of amendments as set out in the supplementary report.

In respect of the application for The Junction Retail Park, David Glover informed members that the proposed hardsurfacing, erection of lighting columns, planting and associated works were not considered to have a material or detrimental impact on the heritage asset of Wembley National Stadium. The proposal which would maintain views to the Wembley Arena and without adversely affect its setting, accorded with the relevant paragraphs within the NPPF and NPPG with regard to the effect on heritage assets. He added that having evaluated the material planning considerations in relation to the proposed development, officers considered that the submission demonstrated compliance with the Brent and Mayoral policy and guidance together with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance subject to the conditions set out in the committee report and supplementary report.

Julie Harrington (representative of the FA) informed the Committee that the proposals were in the interest of the Wembley National Stadium (WNS) and the wider public who use it. She was mainly concerned about the safety of football supporters particularly when they were exiting the stadium as South Way was not designed to accommodate large numbers of people after a match. Furthermore,

she expressed concerns about the detrimental impact on the outlook of the iconic stadium, issues that had led the Secretary of State and Sport England to express their objections to the proposals. Julie Harrington continued that the conditions recommended by officers would be inadequate to remedy the detriment from the proposals particularly the “kettling effect” of football supporters. She felt that a little more time would be required to enable WNS to reach a consensus with Quintain on outstanding aspects of concern and urged members to be minded to refuse the applications in the interim.

Rory McGowan (Momentum Transport) provided an analysis of the traffic modelling, access to the multi storey car park and the holding area proposed for supporters. He submitted that traffic egress would take between 1.5 hours to 3 hours and that there would be about 40 minute queue period to the car park, making access to the lift almost impossible. He continued that keeping upwards of 10,000 people in a narrow holding area for 40 minutes would be an unsafe operation and would conflict with policy and guide to safety in sports grounds.

In response to members’ questions, Rory McGowan stated that additional traffic flow from the new Costco site would worsen the traffic situation especially on an event day. He continued that the trip generation calculation had not been updated since the permission was granted some 12 years ago, hence Transport for London’s (TfL) concerns on the scheme.

Tony Kennedy (Head of Transportation) advised that he had requested mitigation measures and that closing off South Way would in his view, assist and address concerns expressed about people stacking. He added that concerns raised presented no new information relevant to the determination of the proposals. John Fletcher (Development Control) although expressed reservations about the closure of South Way, added that it would not be a significant issue that could not be managed.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Stopp ward member for Wembley Central stated that he had been approached by the local residents in Wembley and beyond. Councillor Stopp objected to the proposals on the grounds that the developments offered less than 20% affordable housing and furthermore, would obscure the iconic Wembley Stadium arch which signified hope.

Ann Clements and Max James (applicant’s agents) addressed the Committee. Ann Clements informed members that the proposals accorded with the new Masterplan and would continue to enhance Quintains’ focus on transforming the Wembley area. She added that the focus was on the western site (boulevard) which would release additional homes to the growth area. She outlined the mix and tenure of the residential properties and added that 34% would be released for affordable housing. Ann Clements continued that the proposals would not give rise to significant transport issues due to its excellent public transport facilities and the applicant’s intention to progress additional improvements through travel plans, car clubs and junction improvements in addition to over 3,400 public car parking spaces. Members also heard that a site had been identified for primary school provision in York House, to be developed by the Department of Education.

Simon Web and Simon Ankler (Transportation consultants for the applicant) presented further updates on the transportation data for the applications. They advised members that the frequency of coaches would be managed and added that as the coach park site was naturally ventilated there would be no noise and environmental pollution. They added that officers considered acceptable the closure of South Way for a short period of time and that details of parking management would to be submitted for approval to ensure the delivery of the best outcome. They also confirmed that the applicant would revisit the measures for the reduction of carbon emission in the VDC car park.

DECISION: Agreed as recommended subject to revised S106 heads of terms requiring the submission of a revised Travel Plan which included increased targets for cycling and revisions to condition 40 (air quality) so that it refers to the consideration of particulate matter.

(Voting: For 4, Against 1, Abstention1).

4. Former VDC and Careys site, South Way, Wembley, HA9 OHX (Ref. 15/5615)

PROPOSAL: Erection of building, associated hard and soft landscaping and other associated works and access to provide a dual level coach and car parking facility with a capacity of up to 290 coaches.

RECOMMENDATION: Delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duty authorised person to grant planning permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London and subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and to delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duty authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Chief Legal Officer, and subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice, with an additional condition regarding extract systems or fans, and amendments to conditions 3, 5, 9 and 13 as set out within this supplementary report.

See application reference 15/5550 for preamble.

DECISION: Agreed as recommended, subject to a condition requiring the approval of details relating to the air quality impacts of the coach parking.

(Voting: For 4, Against 1, Abstention1).

5. The Junction Wembley Retail Park, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0EG (Ref. 16/1024)

PROPOSAL: Use of the land for the provision of car and/or coach/mini bus parking for up to 1,312 cars; or 472 cars and 220 coaches and/or minibuses, or combination thereof, and associated hard and soft landscaping and infrastructure including lamp posts

RECOMMENDATION: To delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duty authorised person to grant planning permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London, and subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision

Notice, with amendments to conditions 5 and 7 as set out within the supplementary report.

See application reference 15/5550 for preamble.

DECISION: Agreed as recommended.
(Voting; For 4, Against 1 and Abstention 1).

6. Land Surrounding Wembley Stadium Station, South Way, Wembley (Ref. 14/4931)

PROPOSAL:

A hybrid planning application, for the redevelopment of the site to provide seven mixed use buildings up to 19 storeys in height accommodating:

- outline planning permission for up to a total of 75,000sqm to 85,000sqm mixed floor space including up to 67,000sqm of C3 residential accommodation (approximately 725 units); 8,000sqm to 14,000sqm for additional C3 residential accommodation, C1 hotel and/or sui generis student accommodation (an additional approximate 125 residential units; or 200-250 bed hotel; or approximate 500 student units; or approximate 35 residential units and 200 bed hotel); 1,500sqm to 3,000sqm for Classes B1/A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/D2; together with associated open space and landscaping; car parking, cycle storage, pedestrian, cycle and vehicle access; associated highway works; improvements to rear access to Neeld Parade; and associated infrastructure
- full planning permission for a basement beneath Plots SW03 - SW05 to accommodate 158 car parking spaces and 9 motor cycle spaces; Building 3A within Plot SW03 to accommodate 188 residential units and 150 cycle spaces; and associated infrastructure, landscaping, open space, vehicular access and servicing

RECOMMENDATION: To delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to grant permission, subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London and subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and to delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Chief Legal Officer, and subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice, and amendments to conditions 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16 and 30 as set out in the supplementary report.

See application reference 15/5550 for preamble.

DECISION: Agreed as recommended.
(Voting: For 4; Against 1, Abstention 0).

7. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

Note:

At 9:55pm the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes.

At 10:00pm, Members voted to disapply the guillotine procedure to enable all applications to be considered on the night.

At 10:05pm Councillor Colacicco left the meeting room and did not return.

The meeting closed at 10.20 pm

A AGHA

Vice Chair in the Chair