

Decisions of the Planning Committee

7 November 2016

Members Present:-

Councillor Melvin Cohen (Chairman)
Councillor Wendy Prentice (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Maureen Braun	Councillor Stephen Sowerby
Councillor Eva Greenspan	Councillor Laurie Williams
Councillor Tim Roberts	Councillor Jim Tierney
Councillor Agnes Slocombe	Councillor Anne Hutton (substitute for Councillor Claire Farrier)

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Claire Farrier Councillor Mark Shooter

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2016, be agreed as a correct record.

CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the running order.

It was also noted that the meeting was being audio recorded.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS

Councillor Claire Farrier sent her apology, with Councillor Anne Hutton attending as substitute.

3. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS

None.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. ALLIANZ PARK, GREENLANDS LANE, LONDON, NW4 1RL

Officers explained that the proposal was for an extension and development of the existing Community Stadium at Allianz Park and the rationalisation of certain elements of existing consent for the site.

It was proposed to demolish the existing West Stand and replace with a new permanent spectator stand comparable in scale and appearance to the exiting West Stand. The new stand would increase capacity of the Stadium from 10,000 to no more than 10,500.

The Chairman welcomed Heath Harvey, Chief Executive Officer and Gordon Banks, Community Director from Saracens who highlighted the following points:

- This was an exciting opportunity which would also benefit the local community and Middlesex University, whilst enhancing sports participation, recreation and health and well- being;
- Saracens were in the process of engaging with other stakeholders;
- The vision was to create a community hub site with a vibrant venue for sport and community engagement;
- The site would continue to host celebration events, such as the fireworks event held yesterday which attracted 3000 people;
- The current site had embraced athletics, with usage more than doubling in recent years and the new proposals would continue to support this increase;
- The proposals aims were to enhance facilities, such as the club rooms, meeting rooms, training facilities disabled access, and the café area;
- The Community gardens would be improved and enhanced visually and could help provide a useful environment for adults with mental illnesses and young people with learning difficulties;
- There would be a small increase in seating capacity (from 10,000 to 10,500) to improve the elite sports experience;
- There would be the option to temporarily increase the seating capacity to 15,000 to cater for one off cup games;
- The current Middlesex University sports academy would expand and occupy a considerable amount of space in the West Stand;
- There would be a tree lined avenue to the centre of the new building;
- There would be a stadium management plan to ensure that detailed operation plans were in place;
- Travel plans would need to be amended for non-match days and it was pointed out that there would be no student parking on site;
- The stadium would be open throughout construction and noise and lighting would be reviewed;
- Middlesex University school of Health and Sports would share the training rooms in the new stand.

Members asked the following questions:

1. How many regular seats were there currently and how would this reconcile with the proposal to only increase regular capacity by 500 seats?

Members were informed that:

East Stand Seating – 3,000 premium seats increasing to 4,500 during the rugby season;

West Stand – there were 3,200 seats proposed, no temporary seating and this stand also had to accommodate two gantries and 40 wheelchair and carer spaces;

There were also 1,200 seats both in the North and South Stands.

2. Would disabled access be expanded?

Members were informed that there would be two different positions at two different levels, to enhance facilities which would reflect different pricing levels.

3. Would schools be able to hire facilities?

Members were informed that all schools in the Borough would have free access to the facilities.

4. How many disabled wheelchair places would there be in total?

100 – at different levels.

5. Were the entrances in the most suitable location?

Yes, they conformed with terrorist legislation.

6. What were the very special circumstances with regard to green belt?

The aim was to provide the best sports facility in North London.

7. Would there be any conflicts in terms of the University using the facilities?

There would not be a significant overlap between the University, Rugby Club and community needs.

8. Had there been consultation with residents?

Yes, there had been regular consultation with Residents Associations and other groups. Three formal public consultation meetings were due to be held on Thursday, Friday and Saturday and 10,000 residents had been emailed about the consultation meetings.

9. Was CCTV in place as part of the security measures?

Yes, it was.

10. What transport measures were in place?

There was a comprehensive transport system in place. 12 – 15 buses were provided on match days and this worked very well.

11. Was the proposed surface for the second car park suitable?

Yes, this area had experienced serious drainage problems since it was originally resurfaced and it was proposed that this area be resurfaced to match the existing south car park, in order to improve usability and appearance.

The Chairman thanked the representatives from Saracens for attending the meeting.

6. EUROPEAN DESIGN CENTRE, EDGWARE ROAD, COLINDALE, NW9 5AE

Officers drew Members attention to the proposal to demolish the existing two storey building and replace it with residential development ranging in height from 2 to 12 storeys.

It was noted that the proposal was for 75 residential units and not 500 as detailed in the Committee papers.

Julia Riddle, Planning Consultant for the scheme gave a presentation, supported by the schemes architect:

- The progress in meetings with the Council prior to this pre-application meeting;
- The purpose of this presentation concentrated on the principle of the development and issues around bulk and massing;
- Details of the existing site and use;
- It was proposed that the ground floor of the new development would accommodate commercial use, with residential use above;
- Highlighted the current site plan;
- Spoke about the Colindale Area Action Plan and explained that it supported delivery of new homes in the vicinity;
- Detailed comparisons between the existing site and the proposed scheme;
- Explained that there were up to 71 units proposed and talked about impact on Neighbours;
- The proposal was for up to 12 storeys in height, scaling down to 2 storeys;
- This was a high scale amenity for new and existing residents with a view to enhancing amenity spaces;
- TFL were comfortable with Edgware Road frontage;
- Massing images were detailed;
- It was explained that the outlook from existing residential units was 24.5 metres;
- Proposals for access were detailed and it was noted that there would be 'one to one' parking provision;
- The next steps would be to look at feedback from this meeting and engage in public consultation.

The Chairman thanked the scheme's representatives for the presentation and invited Members questions:

1. What was the nearest point of impact for existing properties?

10.5 metres currently, 16 metres under the new proposals.

2. What would be the implications for 'shadowing' under the new proposals?

There would not be much difference between the existing site and proposed scheme. There would be benefits to neighbouring properties for most of the year but a 20% reduction at certain times of the year.

3. There seems to be a significant amount of enclosure (not just in relation to light) – has this been assessed?

Yes – against the building that has received planning permission. It has been designed to have minimal impact.

4. Is the nearest point of impact for existing properties 16 metres as stated in 1) above or still 10.5 metres?

It was confirmed that whilst the existing 10.5 metre separation distance would be retained, the height of the development adjacent to the boundary would reduce from 2 storeys to 1 storey.

5. Would the windows of existing residents face the new site?

No, they would not.

6. Would the aim be to secure 40% affordable housing?

Yes – this would be the starting point in the viability test.

7. Would residents on site have rear access into Greenway?

No – access would be from the front.

8. What was the height of Imperial House?

14 storeys. It was clarified that the scheme would have 12 storey height adjacent to Imperial House.

9. Would there be a steeper view for properties looking up to Portland House?

Yes – but it is marginal.

The Chairman thanked the representatives for attending the meeting.

7. ANY ITEM(S) THAT THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

None.

The meeting finished at 8.14pm