

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 9 December, 2020

Case No.

20/1424

Location	100 Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1QJ
Description	Demolition of existing commercial building and erection of two buildings (6 storeys and part 7 storeys in height) comprising 100 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and commercial floorspace (Use Class B1c) on ground floors with associated servicing, parking and refuse stores, amenity space, a commercial yard and soft landscaping

Agenda Page Number: 127-170

Amendments to plan numbers (condition 2)

The following changes were made to condition 2 to confirm the plan and supporting document numbers.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

001 REVB – Site location Plan
002 REVA – Existing Site Block Plan
010 REVA – Existing Ground Floor Plan
011 REVA - Existing First Floor Plan
012 REVA - Existing Second Floor Plan
030 - Existing Elevations
050 REVA – Proposed Demolition Plan
110 REVM – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
111 REVK – Proposed First Floor Plan
112 REVJ - Proposed Second Floor Plan
113 REVK - Proposed Third Floor Plan
114 REVI - Proposed Fourth Floor Plan
115 REVI - Proposed Fifth Floor Plan
116 REVJ - Proposed Sixth Floor Plan
117 REVI - Proposed Roof Plan
130 REVB – Proposed Ground Floor Outline Fire Strategy
131 REVB – Proposed First Floor Outline Fire Strategy
140 REVC – Proposed Hard Landscape Outline Plan
141 REVB – Proposed Hard Landscape Plan 1 of 4
142 REVB – Proposed Hard Landscape Plan 2 of 4
143 REVB – Proposed Hard Landscape Plan 3 of 4
144 REVB – Proposed Hard Landscape Plan 4 of 4
150 REVE – Proposed Landscape Plan Outline
151 REVC - Proposed Landscape Plan 1 of 4
152 REVC - Proposed Landscape Plan 2 of 4
153 REVC - Proposed Landscape Plan 3 of 4
154 REVC - Proposed Landscape Plan 4 of 4
200 REVF – Proposed Sections
300 REVG – Proposed North and East Elevations
301 REVH – Proposed South and West Elevations
302 REVH – Proposed Internal Elevations
310 REVE – Proposed North Elevation Block A
311 REVF – Proposed East Elevation Block A
312 REVE – Proposed South Elevation Block A
313 REVF – Proposed West Elevation Block A
314 REVE – Proposed North Elevation Block B
315 REVF – Proposed East Elevation Block B
316 REVE – Proposed South Elevation Block B
317 REVF – Proposed West Elevation Block B

Document Imaged

Air Quality Assessment Reference AQ108902R3 dated October 2020

Phase 1 Desk Study Reference 20/11793/GO REV 2 dated March 2020

Phase 2 Report on a Site Investigation Reference 20/11793/A/GO dated May 2020

Arboricultural Survey and Impact Assessment (BS5837:2012) Reference AIA/MF/046/20 dated 19 May 2020

Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) Reference WOOL22871 REV B dated 12 May 2020

Noise Impact Assessment Reference AC108906-1R2 dated 14 May 2020

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Loss of existing industrial floorspace

To provide clarification on paragraph 9, the Secretary of State's Directions alterations to draft Policy E4, includes removal of the requirement to ensure no net loss of industrial floorspace capacity and Brent's status as a "provide capacity" Borough. These Directions are currently being considered by the Mayor, and only limited weight could be given to this policy requirement at this time. However, the Secretary of State has not changed the requirement to meet their industrial needs, which in Brent's case will be to provide additional capacity. The consideration of the loss of the existing industrial floorspace and the replacement industrial floorspace has been discussed within the main body of the committee report.

It should be clarified that the commercial floorspace will be used for purposes within use class B1c (now use class E(g)(iii)). There is reference in the report to use class E(g)(ii), however this is incorrect and should read as B1c (now use class E(g)(iii)).

Heather Park Financial Contribution

Paragraph 78 states that in order to compensate for the level of amenity space provision which is below Brent target levels and to provide recreational facilities for older children, the applicant has agreed to a financial contribution towards improvements in the nearby Heather Park. Further discussions are taking place with the Council's Park Service to identify the projects that the contribution could go towards. The Section 106 Head of Terms includes a Financial contribution to off-site play provision for older children, towards improvements in Heather Park.

The Council's Parks Service Department have confirmed that a financial contribution of £46,510 would be required to supply and install various items of equipment in Heather Park, plus safety surfacing, new or altered fencing, and other improvements to the park. The applicant has agreed the specified amount which will be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

Heating

Committee members requested further information on the type of heating source proposed for the scheme.

Page 21 of the submitted Energy Statement Report states that heating and hot water would be provided by communal gas boilers with 89.5% efficiency, and the active cooling is provided by electrically powered equipment. The Energy Report has advised that there is insufficient capacity within the electricity network to use Air Source Heat Pumps.

Paragraph 127 highlights that the Council's Sustainability Officer has advised that there is a heat network further along Beresford Avenue at the Grand Union Development and the applicant should seek to negotiate to connect the proposed development to this network. The applicants view is that the initial investigation work suggested the site is not located near the existing and proposed district heat network. Additionally, the communal gas boiler is proposed as the main heating system for the residential units, so it can be connected with any potential heat network. It is therefore recommended that a condition is secured to look at the feasibility of connecting to a future heating district network.

Transport Considerations

PTAL

Committee members requested further information on the PTAL rating of the application site. The site has a PTAL rating of 2.

Service and Delivery Management Plan

Paragraph 161 highlights that the submitted Service and Delivery Management Plan predicts that the during

the peak hour of 10am–11am, five delivery vehicles would be servicing the site, including 2 HGVs. A loading bay is indicated in a lay-by fronting the site and whilst this could accommodate more than one LGV, only one HGV could be accommodated within the loading bay at any one time. Transport would require the Delivery and Servicing Plan to contain targets aimed at reducing the number of service vehicles throughout the day.

It is noted that a revised DSP was submitted during the course of the application. However, the Council's Transport Department have advised that this only states that the ultimate goal is for the commercial units to have a maximum of 2 deliveries per day whilst Transport requested a target to ensure that the timings of the deliveries are co-ordinated so that the numbers of delivery vehicles doesn't exceed the capacity of the layby. A revised DSP is still therefore required which will be secured via condition.

Healthy Streets Assessment

Paragraph 163 highlights that for walking and cycling trips, the submitted Transport Statement is generally insufficient for the requirements of a major development. It would need to include a Healthy Streets Assessment of the local pedestrian and cycling routes to key local trip generators such as shops, stations, schools and health centres and this needs to be added to the submission. A revised Transport Assessment has been submitted which does now include a sufficient Healthy Streets Assessment.

Recommendation: Remains to grant permission subject to s106 agreement and conditions as recommended in main report, with revisions to conditions as set out in the Supplementary Report.