

Marie Hancock  
NorthWestTWO Residents' AssociationApplication Number 18/0210  
Contact: Barry Henn  
19 November, 2018

Dear Marie Hancock

APPEAL ON APPLICATION - THIS MAY AFFECT YOU

**Location:** 110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS

PPEAL ON APPLICATION - THIS MAY AFFECT YOU

The appeal relates to a application at **110 Walm Lane, London, NW2 4RS**

The application proposes, Demolition of public house and erection of a 4 and part 5 storey building comprising 48 self-contained flats (14 x 1 bed, 22 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed & 1 x 4 bed) on upper floors with green roof and photovoltaics panels, a public house and function room on ground floor, provision of bicycle storage with associated amenity space, landscaping and refuse stores

Redbourne (Queensbury) Ltd has recently made an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate. The appeal is against the Council's decision to refuse the application. The Council's reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its massing, poorly designed front elevation and lack of articulation, would appear unduly prominent and out of character in the street scene and in the wider locality. The development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Mapesbury Conservation Area in which the site is located. As a result, the proposal fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Policies 3.4, 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016); Core Strategy (2010) policy CP17, Development Management Policies (2016) DMP1 and DMP7; Supplementary Planning Guidance 17 "Design Guide for New Development", October 2001; and the Mapesbury Conservation Area Design Guide.
- 2 The proposed development would not provide an adequate overall standard of accommodation for future occupiers, by virtue of the lack of amenity space for all units, the undersized nature of units AF3, AF5, AF8, AF11 and AF15, the poor outlook of units 2.06, 3.06 and 4.05 and the poor layouts, narrow widths and usability of the units which would be contrary to Development Management Policy (2016) DMP1 and DMP19, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015).



- 3 The proposal would fail to provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing which would be contrary to Core Strategy (2010) policy CP2 and Development Management Policy (2016) DMP15, policy 3.12 of the London Plan consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016) and policies H5 and H6 of the draft London Plan.
- 4 In the absence of a legal agreement to control the matter the proposal would result in additional carbon dioxide emissions within the borough in an Air Quality Management Area, without any contribution to carbon reduction measures in the area. The proposal would also fail to demonstrate that a BREEAM rating of at least 'Very Good' could be achieved. As a result the proposal would be contrary to London Plan consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016) policy 5.2, 5.3 and 7.14, Core Strategy (2010) policy CP19, Development Management Policy (2016) DMP1 and the Mayors Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014).
- 5 In the absence of a legal agreement to control the matter, the development would result in additional pressure on servicing, parking demand and transport infrastructure to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic and pedestrians which would be contrary to Development Management Policies (2016) DMP1 and DMP12.

The Planning Inspector will decide this appeal on the basis of a **public inquiry**. This method is used in cases where both parties to the appeal (Council and Appellant) would prefer to state their cases orally and call witnesses. You will be notified of details of the public inquiry as soon as they are available.

You may attend the meeting or ask someone to attend on your behalf in order to say what you think, at the discretion of the Planning Inspector. If you are disabled or anyone you know who wants to attend the meeting is disabled, please let me know in order that the necessary arrangements can be made. In addition, the Planning Inspector will visit the application site to consider the likely affects of the proposal on the surrounding area. During the site visit, the Planning Inspector will not discuss the appeal with, or listen to arguments from anyone.

**Please make sure that any comments you have, are sent in writing to the Planning Inspectorate no later than 3 January, 2019. These must be sent to by either emailing or by writing to:the following address, quoting the reference number APP/T5150/W/18/3214420 to Case Officer, The Planning Inspectorate, Room 3N, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN**

Please note that the Planning Inspectorate will forward any representations that you make to the Planning Inspector to be taken into account before her or she reaches a final decision. The Inspectorate's guide and other useful advice on appeals are available on their website: **[www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk)** Once the Planning Inspector has made a decision, the Planning Inspectorate will send copies of the decision to the Council and the Appellant. If you would like a copy of the Inspector's decision letter, please state this in your letter to the Planning Inspectorate.

Yours sincerely

**Barry Henn**

Barry Henn - Planning Officer  
REGENERATION & GROWTH

Further information about how we use your personal information throughout the planning application process, can be found on our privacy notice <https://www.brent.gov.uk/media/16410724/privacy-notice-planning.pdf>

LetAplUniq