

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 3 June, 2026

Case No. **25/2875**

---

Location	Land next to 125 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9
Description	Proposed construction of a dwellinghouse with landscaping works to the front and rear gardens, installation of boundary wall and bike and bin storage

#### **Agenda Page Number: 39-62**

Members are advised that, following publication of the committee report, two further objections have been received (one new objection and one additional objection from an individual who previously commented). The issues raised have largely been addressed within the main Officer's report; however, Members are asked to note the summary of issues and the Officer's response set out below.

#### **Amended Design not Considered to Overcome Appeal Decision**

Members are advised that an additional objection has been received which places significant weight on the previous appeal decision relating to application ref. 25/1246 (APP/T5150/W/25/3375873). Officers acknowledge that the appeal decision is a material consideration in the determination of the current application and confirm that it has been carefully considered as part of the assessment of this revised proposal.

Officers also acknowledge that the objector raises a number of valid points regarding the Inspector's findings, particularly in relation to the contribution that the verge makes to the character of the junction and the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road. However, officers remain of the view that, on balance, the revised proposal is acceptable in planning terms.

The Inspector did not conclude that residential development on the site would be unacceptable in principle, including the provision of an additional dwelling in this location. Nor did the Inspector conclude that the loss of the verge itself was unacceptable in principle. Indeed, the Inspector expressly acknowledged that a contemporary or varied architectural approach would not necessarily be inappropriate within the wider context of the area, noting the varied character of surrounding development.

The Inspector's concern related specifically to the relationship between the previous design approach and the adjoining semi-detached pair. In particular, the dismissed scheme proposed a substantially different mono-pitch roof form, contrasting detailing and materially different massing, which the Inspector concluded created a visually uncomfortable relationship with the attached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road.

The current application seeks to directly address those concerns through a significantly revised design approach. The proposal now incorporates a more traditional pitched roof form, revised fenestration resulting in a more tempered visual prominence, and a materially different palette of materials, including red clay roof tiles and brickwork that directly reflect the adjoining pair and surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the ridge height of the proposed dwelling now sits below that of No.125 Preston Road, and the introduction of a shadow gap assists the proposed dwelling in reading as a subordinate and distinct dwelling, rather than appearing as an awkward or overly dominant extension to the existing pair.

Officers do not consider these changes to be merely cosmetic amendments. Rather, they are considered to directly address the design concerns identified by the Inspector in relation to the previous scheme.

Officers also do not agree with the objector's interpretation that the Inspector found development on the verge itself to be unacceptable in principle. Whilst the Inspector identified that the verge contributes positively to a sense of openness at the junction, paragraph 9 of the appeal decision makes clear that the identified harm arose from the cumulative impact of the previous design approach, the attachment to No.125 Preston Road, and the positioning on the verge. Officers are of the view that the revised scheme has materially altered a number of those key elements, particularly the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining pair, such that the overall impact is now considered acceptable on balance.

It is acknowledged that some degree of change to the openness of the junction would inevitably arise through the development of the site. However, officers consider that the revised design approach significantly reduces the visual harm previously identified by the Inspector and that the proposal would now integrate into the streetscene in a substantially more sympathetic manner than the previously dismissed appeal scheme.

Members are also advised that the wider townscape context along this part of Preston Road is evolving, with a varied architectural character already evident within the surrounding area, including more contemporary forms of development nearby. This forms part of the changing character context against which the current proposal has been assessed.

The proposal has also been carefully assessed in relation to neighbouring residential amenity impacts. Officers remain satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of outlook, enclosure, light, or privacy, for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

The Inspector did not conclude that residential development on the site would be unacceptable in principle, including the provision of an additional dwelling in this location. Nor did the Inspector conclude that the loss of the verge itself was unacceptable in principle. Indeed, the Inspector expressly acknowledged that a contemporary or varied architectural approach would not necessarily be inappropriate within the wider context of the area, noting the varied character of surrounding development.

The Inspector's concern related specifically to the relationship between the previous design approach and the adjoining semi-detached pair. In particular, the dismissed scheme proposed a substantially different mono-pitch roof form, contrasting detailing and materially different massing, which the Inspector concluded created a visually uncomfortable relationship with the attached pair at Nos.123 and 125 Preston Road.

The current application seeks to directly address those concerns through a significantly revised design approach. The proposal now incorporates a more traditional pitched roof form, revised fenestration resulting in a more tempered visual prominence, and a materially different palette of materials, including red clay roof tiles and brickwork that directly reflect the adjoining pair and surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the ridge height of the proposed dwelling now sits below that of No.125 Preston Road, and the introduction of a shadow gap assists the proposed dwelling in reading as a subordinate and distinct dwelling, rather than appearing as an awkward or overly dominant extension to the existing pair.

Officers do not consider these changes to be merely cosmetic amendments. Rather, they are considered to directly address the design concerns identified by the Inspector in relation to the previous scheme.

Officers also do not agree with the objector's interpretation that the Inspector found development on the verge itself to be unacceptable in principle. Whilst the Inspector identified that the verge contributes positively to a sense of openness at the junction, paragraph 9 of the appeal decision makes clear that the identified harm arose from the cumulative impact of the previous design approach, the attachment to No.125 Preston Road, and the positioning on the verge. Officers are of the view that the revised scheme has materially altered a number of those key elements, particularly the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining pair, such that the overall impact is now considered acceptable on balance.

It is acknowledged that some degree of change to the openness of the junction would inevitably arise through the development of the site. However, officers consider that the revised design approach significantly reduces the visual harm previously identified by the Inspector and that the proposal would now integrate into the streetscene in a substantially more sympathetic manner than the previously dismissed appeal scheme.

Members are also advised that the wider townscape context along this part of Preston Road is evolving, with a varied architectural character already evident within the surrounding area, including more contemporary forms of development nearby. This forms part of the changing character context against which the current proposal has been assessed.

The proposal has also been carefully assessed in relation to neighbouring residential amenity impacts. Officers remain satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts in terms of outlook, enclosure, light, or privacy, for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

### **Accessibility**

Concerns have been raised over the suitability of the proposed development for wheelchair access. In particular, concerns relate to doors opening outwards into the corridor, insufficient space to accommodate door swings, the absence of shower facilities within the ground floor toilet, and a furniture layout that may not

provide sufficient space for wheelchair movement.

Policy D7 of the London Plan requires new dwellings to meet M4(2) of the Building Regulations to ensure they are accessible and adaptable and a condition will be imposed to secure this requirement. Compliance with technical details against Approved Document M (Category M4(2)) including internal layout, circulation space, doorway width and swings will typically be addressed by the Building Control process.

In addition, paragraph 2.27 of the M4(2) Building Regulations guidance states that, whilst step-free access to a WC is required on the entrance storey (ie. the ground floor in this case), the provision of a shower at this level is only required where it is reasonable to do so. The absence of a ground floor shower therefore does not, in itself, indicate that the dwelling would fail to meet the requirements of the M4(2) standards.

### **Fire Safety**

The objection raises concerns regarding fire safety, including whether first floor windows function adequately as fire escapes, the absence of a kitchen fire door despite being referenced in the fire strategy, and inconsistencies in the proposed fire safety measures. It also questions whether the development is intended as an HMO, given references to fire extinguishers and an assembly point, which are not typically required in a standard single dwelling.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy D12A of the London Plan (discussed in paragraph 71-74 of the Committee Report) which requires development to achieve high standards of fire safety.

Accordingly, references to fire extinguishers and an assembly point are not considered indicative of HMO use and do not raise concern in this regard. The planning application relates to a C3 dwellinghouse. The use of the property as an HMO would need planning permission.

Technical requirements regarding fire safety would be controlled under Building Regulations.

### **Car Parking**

Concerns have been raised that the proposal provides no off-street parking, potentially increasing pressure on-street parking, particularly on Wembley Stadium event days. Concerns are also raised regarding cumulative parking and traffic impacts in combination with the approved development at Land Opposite GEC Pavilion (ref: 24/2139). This is discussed in detail in paragraph 43-45 of the committee report.

### **Party Wall**

Concerns have been raised regarding whether a Party Wall Agreement has been secured. It is also queried that appropriate measures will be implemented to seal the vertical gap between the existing and proposed walls to prevent the accumulation of vermin and debris.

Party Wall matters is a civil matter, the provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 provides a legal framework for neighbours to address matters, such as work near a boundary.

### **Flood Risk**

Concerns are raised over ground levels and flood risks. However, as discussed in paragraph 68-69 of the committee report, the site is not located in a flood zone and when considered in combination with the landscaping measures that would be provided in the rear garden and the installation of permeable paving site wide, they are considered sufficient to manage surface water.

**Recommendation: Remains to grant consent subject to conditions as set out within the draft decision notice.**