

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 19 June, 2019

Case No.

18/4675

Location	110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS
Description	Replacement of existing building (containing public house and former members club) with a mixed use development within a part 4 and 5 storey building comprising public house and function room on ground floor (Use Class A4), 48 self-contained flats (14 x 1 bed, 22 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed & 1 x 4 bed), green roof and photovoltaics panels, bicycle and refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping (SCHEME A)(Amended Plans - Key changes to public house facade and internal layout)

Agenda Page Number:81-116

Please note that this supplementary report is identical to that for application 18/4701 with the exception of the agenda page number and recommendation.

Following the publication of the Report a further two letters of objection have been received, raising some or all of the following points:

- Loss of the public house will be severely detrimental – it is a community facility
- Policy CP23 protects community facilities
- The PH hosts Busy Rascals and National Childbirth Trust courses
- Loss of a beautiful building
- Policy BE27 confirms that buildings within a conservation area cannot be demolished unless they positively detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The replacement building clashes with the surrounding aesthetics, doesn't fit into the conservation area
- Proposed block too tall and wide
- No space for a kitchen in the public house
- Residential tower block will have a negative impact on other listed buildings
- Willesden Green Station is listed and will be overshadowed by this structure. It is out of character.
- The playgroup is essential for my child
- Willesden Green is not here to be gentrified
- We are here to support each other, to support local businesses, and to make sure that the area is kept affordable so no one is left wanting
- No one wants this landmark to be demolished

Policy BE27 was one of the heritage policies within the now superseded Unitary Development Plan. The application has been assessed against current policy and guidance.

The remainder of the above points have been previously raised and addressed within the relevant sections of the Report.

Members are also asked to note the following:

The CIL Indexation figure for Scheme B (ref: 18/4701) noted on p11 of the Report should be 224 **not** 323. That is, it should read the same as that reported for Scheme A (ref: 18/4675). The level of CIL received would therefore be similar to that for Scheme A.

An objector commented that the committee report incorrectly sets out that the pub owns the space currently and would own the space in the proposed development (paragraph 28 of the report). However, it is set out within this paragraph that the owner of the building or public house will own the space to be used for community purposes, not that the current pub operator owns the existing space or will own the new space. It is also set out within the report that this is a legal matter rather than a planning matter, but that the community use of the space would be secured through the legal agreement.

Whilst not all objections are repeated verbatim they are paraphrased in the interest of brevity particularly as many of the objectors raise similar points. However, all are given consideration in the determination of the application.

Document Imaged

Within the response to the points of objections listed on p3 of both Reports, reference is made to the Carlton Tavern as being listed. The building was in fact not listed but was about to be listed by Historic England.

It has also been suggested by an objector that more of the Inspectors' Decision Letter should have been included within the Report, in particular paras.32-34. These paragraphs consider: the existing space around the building and how the height and design respond to the shops and station opposite (para.32); the upper parts of the existing building can be seen from the station platform and on existing the station one is reminded of the origins of the development of Outer London (para.33); and the existing building makes a positive contribution to the setting of the station, which it would be desirable to preserve (para.34). The Report does not attempt to repeat verbatim, the Inspector's comments but does paraphrase some of his views at para.12. With regard to being able to view the site from the station platform, that is his observation. The proposal has been assessed against the significance of this heritage asset as set out in paras.19 and 20 of the Report.

An additional comment has also been made that the scheme is contrary to DMP21 and that insufficient assurances are provided to secure space for Busy Rascals, not to start demolition until that is agreed and to stop future changes of use, and the lack of oversight if future changes are delegated to officers. Scheme B has been recommended for approval on the basis of the Recommendations at the end of the Report, which are considered sufficiently appropriate to secure these matters. This includes specific obligations regarding community use. The objector also refers to the "Statement of Community Involvement" submitted by the applicant and references a lack of support by local residents for "Scheme B" (application reference 18/4701). Members should note that the comments received in relation to this planning application have been summarised, and that objections to the design and appearance of the proposed building has been discussed for both schemes. Officers have considered the revised proposals and consider the design to be acceptable for the reasons set out in the main committee report.

The objector also cites other developments where a replacement public house has been proposed and approved but that the pub has not opened, namely to Good Ship (Kilburn), Falcon Public House (Queens Park / South Kilburn) and Brent Tavern (Cricklewood). The objector also refers to the Corrib Rest (Queens Park). Replacement public houses were secured within the Good Ship, Falcon and Brent Tavern schemes, but those developments have not been built yet. The Council, as Local Planning Authority, can grant planning permission for the development of a site. However, it cannot specify the precise timeframes for the delivery of that development (other than setting dates for the commencement of works). As set out in the main report, the submission demonstrates that the proposed public house is laid out in a way that would be viable, including a potential location for a kitchen (should the pub operator choose to include one). Controls are recommended over the use of the pub (if consented and delivered) through condition. Should a planning application be submitted for a change of use of use of the pub (either within the existing building, or in the future, the pub within the proposed development if consented and delivered), such an application would need to be considered on its merits. That is not proposed within this application.

Recommendation:

Remains refusal for the reasons set out in the committee report.