

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 20 October 2021

Time: 19:00

Venue: Victoria Hall, Ealing Town Hall, New Broadway, Ealing, London, W5 2BY

Attendees:

Councillor Praveen Anand, Councillor Julian Bell, Councillor Louise Brett, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Paul Conlan, Councillor Fabio Conti, Councillor Karanvir Dhadwal, Councillor Tariq Mahmood, Councillor Dee Martin, Councillor Kamaldeep Sahota, Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Anthony Young

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from:

Councillor Jon Ball with Councillor Busuttil as his substitute.

Councillor Chris Summers with Councillor Praveen Anand as his substitute.

Councillor Nigel Sumner with Councillor Anthony Young as his substitute.

Cllr Shahbaz Ahmed with no substitute.

2 Urgent Matters

There were none.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Young declared that he had had a briefing with the Ward Councillor for the International House application.

Councillor Bell declared an interest with respect to agenda item 10, 1 Pitshanger Lane, by virtue of the fact that the company in which he worked for, BCG, had advised the applicants. Councillor Bell confirmed that he had not assisted in any way but would nonetheless remove himself from the meeting and not take part whilst that item was considered by the Committee.

Councillor Martin declared that in her capacity as a Ward Councillor, she had engaged in discussion with the developers for the White Hart application. Councillor Martin also declared that she was aware of the Northolt Grange Community Centre application.

4 Matters to be Considered in Private

There were none.

5 Minutes

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 14 September 2021.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

6 Site Visit Attendance

The following Councillors had attended site visits:

Councillor Ray Wall (Chair), Councillor Tariq Mahmood (Vice-Chair), Councillor Praveen Anand, Councillor Julian Bell, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Paul Conlan, Councillor Fabio Conti, Councillor Dee Martin, Councillor Kamaldeep Sahota and Councillor Anthony Young.

7 The Green, Southall, UB2

Gregory Gray, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that, in 2017 Cabinet had considered a Report concerning the future of The Green car park and had resolved to invite and evaluate competitive tenders for a joint venture partner for its redevelopment and the delivery of new homes in the Borough. Pursuant to this, in 2018 Cabinet had resolved to select Peabody Developments as the preferred development partner. The 'applicant' was the London Borough of Ealing and Peabody Developments Ltd ('Peabody'). Peabody had taken responsibility for the preparation and submission of the application documentation.

It was further explained that the application was for the demolition and mixed-use phased redevelopment to provide 3 urban blocks comprising 564 residential units (Use Class C3), 2922.8 sqm of flexible commercial, non-residential institutional/local community and employment floorspace (Use Classes E, F1 and F2), private and public car parking, servicing bays, public realm and associated landscaping, play and amenity space, plant and refuse areas and access arrangements.

The Committee was informed that the majority of the site was located within the King Street Neighbourhood Centre. The application site was approximately 2ha, primarily comprising the Featherstone Terrace Car Park owned by the Council, and privately owned industrial and banqueting facilities

in Dilloway Yard and behind The Green. A small part, a coach park, was designated LSIS but contained no employment floorspace.

It was explained that, in accordance with development plan objectives, the application offered significant potential for regeneration development uplift and the proposed uses fitted well with local and strategic policies and were strongly supported by the Development Plan. The proposals provided a successful mix of integrated, managed town centre uses including a net uplift in the employment capacity of the site and 564 units of housing at a policy compliant tenure mix.

The Development Plan had emphasised the importance of any new building responding to the setting of adjacent Conservation Areas and other statutory heritage assets, in this case Southall Manor as the closest heritage asset as well as the locally listed St Anselm's Church and sub-station. The proposed development took those as its points of reference and responded appropriately in respect of massing and layout.

The opportunity to secure high design quality, materiality and outstanding quality for the towers, were vital to achieving a successful outcome. Careful account had been taken of the impacts of the development in terms of bulk, mass, scale, design quality and external appearance of the new buildings, in particular the incorporation of tall buildings and the ability of the scheme to satisfy those criteria whilst securing the qualities identified by the Design Review Panel, that was appropriate to its setting. The applicant had produced a reasoned analysis to show why less tall buildings would not provide the same or similar benefits, without harming those or other assets, including whether transferring the height to other blocks may have been likely to have a more harmful impact on other assets. Regard was also had to whether the scale gave rise to significant harmful or adverse impact on the character of the area, and residential amenity.

Having given careful consideration to all the material planning considerations, the proposed development was considered to be a sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance, National Design Guide, Greater London Authority and the London Borough of Ealing's development plans. It was therefore recommended by Officers that planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement, a referral to the Secretary of State and a Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on amendments to the recommendation, External Consultees, Internal Consultees, further written representations and amendments to the Conditions.

Nick Sutton, on behalf of three landowners of part of the site who objected to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- The Peabody Group had offered to provide 50% affordable housing but had done so without knowing how much they would have to pay for part of the land on the site.

- If The Peabody Group needed to pay more than they were currently offering for the land, their ability to deliver 50% affordable housing would be severely compromised.
- The 50% offer was simply a headline figure in order to secure permission and it would be inevitably reduced as negotiations took place in respect of land values. Members should place little or no weight on the amount of affordable housing being offered.

Simon Barry, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The representation made the following key points:

- The Peabody Group were responsible for over 67,000 homes and 155,000 residents, including 16,000 care and support customers. It was recognised that their role as a social landlord went beyond the bricks and mortar of their developments. The Peabody Group created homes and new communities for its residents that intertwined and complemented the existing community.
- The Peabody Group had consulted extensively with the local community and looked forward to continuing to work with the local people and businesses to actively contribute to a wide range of areas including, public realm design, public art and community and commercial uses.
- The proposal would deliver various benefits to Southall including 564 new homes, 50% of which would be affordable and approximately 90 new jobs across a variety of class uses.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to some of the questions and points raised, Officers confirmed that:

- The Committee could request for a condition for the requirement of the provision of electric car parking charging points to be 20% for both private and public parking. There were no obvious design restrictions with regard to the layout of the site that wouldn't provide for charging points to be included.
- There would be 60 car parking spaces provided for the residents and there would be 90 public car parking spaces as part of the scheme. Those figures were based on the capacity of the site and its relative proximity to crossrail and bus transport facilities and were not mathematically based but were reasonable, plausible and acceptable in the context of the site.
- With regard to car parking space allocation, it would be on a first come first served basis. Disabled car parking spaces would all be reserved and set aside for those persons who were disabled, and they would also be allocated on a first come first served basis within each of the phases.
- The car parking spaces would be leased because that was the requirement of the London Plan. If a person were to sell their property or move out then their space would then become available for somebody else. There would be no maintenance charge for the parking spaces and therefore no additional cost to any tenant whether they be rental, shared ownership or market units.
- There had not been a response to the Council's consultation request from the NHS with respect to the Section 106 NHS contribution. As indicated in the briefing note, the decision to allocate £90,000 was proportionate in the Council's opinion.
- The Council's Leisure Department had requested a Section 106 contribution towards the improvement of play space and amenity space

elsewhere in the area which were listed in the recommendation. This was due to the shortfall of play space and amenity space within the scheme.

- Residents would be able to access waste bins within the development which would be located within core areas within the blocks.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **215058FULR3** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
2. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
3. Referral to the Secretary of State
4. Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.
5. A condition be included to ensure that 20% electric vehicle car parking charging points be provided for both the private and public parking within the scheme.
6. Delegation be given to the relevant Officer to explore and discuss with the NHS the proposed Section 106 contribution and whether it was felt to be proportionate. Negotiation and agreement would need to be in consultation with the Chair.

10 1 Pitshanger Lane, Ealing, W5 1RH

Harini Boteju, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the existing site contained a two-storey care home known as Kent Lodge. It was located in a corner plot of approximately 0.25 hectares on the junction of Pitshanger Lane and Kent Gardens. The building had no architectural merit, was no longer fit for purpose as a care home nor economically viable to upgrade and had been decanted. The site was not within a conservation area nor did it contain a listed building.

It was explained that the proposal was for the demolition of the existing care home, a new building which would provide sixty new residential units within a landscaped setting. The proposed new building would comprise a range of heights from two storey up to eight storeys with an external finish of light colour brick and projecting balconies. The height would graduate towards the junction of Kent Gardens and Pitshanger Lane with an articulated façade comprising a stepped footprint and set-back to upper storeys. The tallest elements of the building would be concentrated towards the junction. Existing street trees to the corner of the site would be retained and further soft landscaping would be planted.

It was further explained that the proposed sixty new homes would include six wheelchair accessible homes, which would be created with their own private amenity space and access to a landscaped communal central courtyard with a children's play area. A range of units would be provided, 39 of which would have two or more bedrooms which would accommodate families. In line with the London Housing SPG, 35% affordable housing would be provided by habitable room. This equated to 19 units, with a London Affordable

Rent/shared ownership split of 62/38, with strong support for the mix of larger family homes to be provided.

The building had been designed to be mindful of impacts to light, outlook, privacy and overlooking, particularly to nos. 3 Pitshanger Lane and no. 22 Kent Gardens. Whilst it was accepted that the tall building would alter the views from the nearest neighbouring properties, these impacts would not be significant. A sunlight/daylight study had indicated where there would be impacts to neighbouring properties, but that the scale of impact would be minimal and daylight to habitable rooms would remain good in relation to BRE standards. It was considered unlikely that the proposal would have a significant impact to the character and appearance of the locality.

Weighing up all the material considerations, the proposed development was considered to comply with policies D3, D5, D6, D7, D9, H1, H2, H4 H12 and the good growth objectives GG2 and GG4 in terms of change of use, housing provision and design of the building. In relation to sustainability, the proposal would comply with policies T5, T6, T7, G1, G5, G7, G8, SI1, SI3, SI4 and SI13 secured by conditions. It was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on further written representations that had been received, amendments to conditions and corrections to the report.

Deborah Edwards, on behalf of Pitshanger Community Association (PCA), an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- The overbearing nature of the development on 22 Kent Gardens and 3 Pitshanger Lane would affect the light, privacy and way of life for the residents, an important planning issue. Some 550 objectors, the majority of whom live in the immediate area, consider that the development would be out of character with the area.
- The London Plan stated that buildings like that proposed should be near transport hubs, this area isn't. There was considerable strain on public transport already and the addition of 60 extra residences would exacerbate this.
- The London Plan stated that tall buildings were those not less than 6 storeys or 18 metres measured from ground to the floor level of the uppermost storey. It also stated that those buildings should only be developed in locations identified as suitable by local Councils. The proposed building was tall and Pitshanger Lane was not one of Ealing's designated areas. The PCA request the Committee to reject this application.

Kieran Rushe, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The representation made the following key points:

- The existing building on the site was at the end of its economic life and did not meet modern day requirements. The proposal had sought to

deliver a sustainable building and would deliver towards a zero carbon target.

- 60 new homes would be provided as part of the proposal, 35% would be affordable and 62% would be for affordable rent. The affordable units were based on the family sized rented accommodation that Ealing desperately needed, which would include seven 3 or 4 bedroom family homes at London Affordable Rent. This was strongly supported by Council Housing Officers.
- The proposed building would be u-shaped and would step up from two stories to eight stories at its highest point.

James Murray MP, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- The proposed development would be wrong for the location and would be contrary to planning policy. There were three key policy tests in the new London Plan, adopted in March 2021, which the proposal had failed to meet. Policy H1, Policy D3 (D)(1) and Policy D9.
- The location had not been identified as appropriate for tall buildings, and it seemed very unlikely that it would be the case in future. Its context was defined by the two/three-storey shopping parade on Pitshanger Lane and homes or blocks typically up to a maximum of three/four storeys nearby.
- The applicants were made aware of my concerns when we had met in December 2020, particularly about the building's height and design. Although the applicants had since removed the top frame in the corner of the building, the height and design of the proposal was essentially unchanged. The planning committee should reject this application. Alternative plans could be made to work on the site if the applicant were to listen more closely to local residents and follow more closely the relevant planning policy.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to some of the questions and points raised, Officers confirmed that:

- A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) went south of Pitshanger Lane, down Castlebar Hill, Kent Gardens, south of Scotch Common and down Kent Avenue.
- There would be a Section 106 contribution for reassessment of the CPZ
- There was a terrace to the side of 3 Pitshanger Lane onto which there was an external staircase. There was also a fire escape.
- The site was not designated for tall buildings however it presented an open vista which could support a tall building.
- The Council were only just embarking on their Local Plan review. Policies set out in the London Plan which was newly adopted plan had specified that when considering tall buildings, the Borough needed to allocate and designate areas specifically for them.
- The majority of the proposal was on lower levels, smaller elements of the proposal were classified as taller. The height would graduate towards the junction of Kent Gardens and Pitshanger Lane. The layout for the site was considered logical.
- Considerable pre-application discussions which the local community were part of had resulted in amendments to the scheme.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **212893FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

**Councillor Julian Bell removed himself from the meeting whilst this application was considered and voted on by the committee.*

11 Orion Park, Northfield Avenue, West Ealing, W13 9SJ

Sean Moulton, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that this application proposed minor material amendments (MMA) to planning permission 171721FUL which was granted permission in February 2018 for the phased construction of buildings comprising residential units, flexible retail space, office space, landscaping, access and servicing, car parking and associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

It was explained that development had commenced on site, as noted in the previous approval, 204703CPE dated 17 November 2020 for demolition works pertaining to the construction of four buildings ranging in height from two to six storeys comprising 76 residential units, flexible retail space, office space, landscaping, access and servicing, car parking and associated works as the development of the proposal permitted under planning permission 171721FUL.

The changes as part of the proposed variation were:

- An increase of 19 units from 76 to 95 across blocks A, B, C and D;
- 100% affordable housing provision for the entire development an increase from 31.6%;
- An increase in the number of 3-bed units from 18 to 24;
- Alterations to unit mix. Primarily through an increase of one, two and three bed units, and a reduction of studio units;
- An amendment to building footprints to accord with 2.50m-3.00m London Underground Limited easement;
- An increase to the height of Block A by 5.88m, Block B by 0.90m and Block D by 7.03m;
- A reduction in the height of Block C by 1.60m;
- Relocation of rooftop plant rooms to the ground floor;
- Incorporation of roof terraces on lower infill elements set further back from properties to the north and set back further from the building line;
- Creation of an entrance square within the development;
- An increase in floorspace of retail at ground floor from 273sqm to 496.2sqm;
- A reduction in floorspace of office at lower ground and ground floor from 944sqm to 519.6sqm;
- Removal of the pedestrian colonnade into the site;
- An increase in the cycle parking provision from 140 to 196 spaces;

- An increase to the car parking provision from 25 to 26 spaces, Incorporation of a loading bay for commercial floorspace; and
- Inclusion of air source heat pumps.

It was considered that the proposed amendments did not erode the quality of the previously approved scheme or result in additional impacts to neighbours. The amended scheme would achieve a number of significant planning benefits which weighed strongly in its favour, including:

- The delivery of a further 19 additional homes in Northfield, which made an important contribution towards the pressing housing need in the Borough where demand was far exceeding supply.
- The delivery of a 100% affordable housing scheme, which represented a 68.4% increase. A total of 95 affordable homes were to be provided making an important contribution towards Ealing's 'Strategic Priority 1' in their Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2014-19 and the Council's desire for the provision of 2,500 'Genuinely affordable homes' over the four years from 2018/19 onwards;
- The delivery of six additional three-bedroom, family-sized units, which would make an important contribution towards meeting the needs of the borough, as specified within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2018);
- A variety of accommodation types and sizes which met or exceed London Plan standards, and met the needs of future residents of Ealing;
- The creation of a sustainable community in this important and highly accessible location;
- A regeneration scheme which complemented the surrounding built environment, through its positive visual impact within the site and in relation to the surrounding area, given the proposed layout and scale of the buildings and the high quality of the proposed architecture and materials.

It was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on some amendments to the Conditions and some additional notes.

Carol Atkinson, on behalf of Ealing Fields Residents Association, an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- Ealing Fields Residents Association accepted the need for more housing in the area but had major concerns about the impact on residents and strongly objected to the proposed amendments. There were concerns that the development would not be gated which gave rise to security concerns, there were known issues with street drinkers and drug dealing in the location and an open development would provide an opportunity for people to gain access and operate unseen.
- Block A fronting Northfield Avenue was out of keeping with the surrounding area. It would have been preferable to see a design that respected the Art Deco character of Northfield tube station, and the

Derwent Yard flats. The increased size of block A would have a major effect on Derwent Yard with loss of light to several of the flats.

- Blocks B and C had moved slightly further away from the houses on Belsize Avenue. The outcome of that had resulted in increased height which would impact residents in terms of over shadowing and overlooking. Block D at the rear of Mayo Court would be considerably taller, which would have a detrimental impact on the elderly residents.

Justin Kenworthy, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The representation made the following key points:

- The proposed amendments had offered to deliver more benefits to the borough which included 100% affordable housing, more genuinely affordable homes which included an increase in London Affordable Rent homes from 19% to 30%. Ealing Council's Housing Team would be given nomination rights for them.
- The development would be more sustainable and would use less energy and produce less co2 and consume less water and future occupiers would benefit from better quality homes. The development would also deliver more benefits to neighbouring properties including no balconies or accessible roof terraces facing towards Belsize Avenue and moving the rooftop amenity space further away from Belsize Avenue and Derwent Yard and adding privacy screening in place. It would deliver more daylight and a better outlook for the rear gardens of Jefferson Close and Mayo Court.
- The development would also deliver additional Section 106 contributions. £148,000 would be added to the £457,000 already secured and would help improve local education, health care, transport, infrastructure and air quality monitoring as well as carbon offsetting.

Councillor Millican, a local Ward Councillor, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- On behalf of local residents, I strongly object to this application. Cramming in 19 more flats and adding two stories in height was certainly not a minor material amendment. The development would have a huge impact on those living nearby in Mayo Court and Belsize Avenue. Block D would be more than seven meters taller and would be considerably close to Mayo Court than the previously approved scheme.
- It was concerning and very disappointing that the appearance of the blockade from Northfield Avenue had no regard to the art deco of Northfield Station. The two extra storeys on Block A would also make the scheme far too dominant on Northfield Avenue.
- The report had acknowledged that the scheme would have an impact on local residents' lives. The report had stated that the outlook from the first-floor windows from 1 to 47, which was the entire length of the road, would unavoidably change and there would be a material impact on the residents, however the proposed gain and the separation distance were consistent with the surrounding urban grain therefore while the outlook from the first floor windows would now be part of the proposal this was not considered unreasonable and would be acceptable.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to some of the questions and points raised, Officers confirmed that:

- A gated community had not been considered for the site as it was felt that it could be quite inclusive and also exclusive of the community. The proposal could provide community benefits in terms of open space and access to the retail units and would also enable anyone to come in and out which encouraged more surveillance and provided much more community benefit in terms of mixing of local people and new development users.
- There would be privacy screens along the elevation that faced Belsize Avenue which would reduce overlooking into those properties as well as being set further back into the site.
- As part of standard conditions, noise monitoring would be reviewed by the Council's Pollution Technical team prior to occupation.
- With respect to wheelchair accessible units, there would be a minimum of 10% required as part of the conditions in place.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **213744VAR** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

8&9 The White Hart, Ruislip Road, Northolt, UB5 5AX

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that this application sought planning permission and listed building consent for redevelopment of part of the site to provide a part 4, part 5, part 7 and part 8 storey hotel building with flexible commercial use at ground level. At the same time, the existing Grade II listed public house building would be retained and restored. The current scheme was the result of pre-application discussion with Council and Greater London Authority planning officers as well as public consultation with local residents.

The Committee was informed that the key elements of the proposed development were:

- retention of the listed public house;
- a 103-bedroom hotel with a hotel restaurant open to the public;
- function space;
- a flexible retail/commercial unit at ground floor level;
- 5 long stay and 3 short stay cycle parking spaces;
- 22 car parking spaces.

It was explained that, at up to eight storeys, the proposed hotel would be significantly higher than its immediate surroundings and was not in an area designated for tall buildings. However, the greater height would provide greater legibility in an area without local landmarks and dominated by transport routes and the White Hart Roundabout. By providing a height increase towards the roundabout, the taller building would also provide a

bookend to the adjoining 3 storey commercial parade along Church Road. A reasonable case had been made for a tall building to be acceptable on this site in line with London Plan Policy D9.

It was further explained that the existing public house building was Grade II listed and the proposal would preserve the main historic elements of it. The proposals involved demolition of ancillary modern additions to the pub which did not have any historic or architectural significance, restoring the building, and reinstating missing features. The historic entrance fronting the roundabout would remain, but the pub would also face onto the proposed open courtyard / public square to the north. The general internal layout of the pub would remain largely unchanged, and a sensitive extension would provide a community function room. The proposals would bring the pub back into use, so continuing the historic use of the building as a pub, which was part of its historic significance. The proposed alterations to the pub were not considered to harm the building and would preserve and enhance its historic significance.

The Committee was informed that impacts on the setting of the listed public house also needed to be considered. The proposals would significantly improve what was currently an unattractive and isolated setting. While the proposed hotel buildings would produce a significant change to the setting, the taller hotel building would be largely set back from the pub, which would retain its prominence within the site.

The Committee was further informed that where a development proposal led to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm needed to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, securing its optimum viable use. On balance, the proposed development, along with the heritage, community and economic benefits associated with it, were considered to outweigh any harm to the pub's setting from the tall hotel buildings.

It was considered that the proposed development was consistent with the aims of the relevant policies of the adopted the Ealing Core Strategy (2012), The London Plan (2021), Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), and the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013). It was therefore recommended by officers that planning permission and listed building consent be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement, a Section 278 agreement and a Community Infrastructure Levy payment to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on some amendments to the Conditions.

Councillor Mahfouz, a local Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application and highlighted the following key points:

- Residents in Northolt wanted more local amenities in the area, a restaurant and pub within walking distance, more local job opportunities, something done about traffic issues in the area and a good development at the White Hart Pub site. The proposal offered all of those things.

- The applicant had engaged positively and regularly with local residents and Councillors to ensure that their views were taken into account whilst working on the proposal.
- This planning application was long overdue and long awaited. I urge the Committee to support this application so that local residents can finally have this center-piece building at the heart of Northolt West End.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the Application.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission and listed building consent for the application REF **201617FUL & 201618LBC** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. A Section 278 Agreement.
3. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
4. A Community Infrastructure Levy payment to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

12 International House, 7 High Street, Ealing, W5 5DB

Smruti Patel, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that this planning application was for the creation of a 5th floor to be used as office space, Use Class E(g)(i), internal courtyard extensions to the second, third and fourth floors and demolition and replacement of the reception and enhancements to the entrance.

It was explained that the internal courtyard extensions and replacement reception would not be visible from the highway. The proposed fifth-floor would involve demolition of the existing steep pitched roof in favour of a flat roof design and the enhancements to the entrance would involve alterations to the shopfront and the installation of arches and suspended planters.

It was further explained that the redevelopment for intensification of offices in the Town Centre was supported by both local and regional policy. The provision of additional office space would materially improve the provision of a critical mass of offices in the Town Centre. It was therefore considered that site's redevelopment was supportable. The site was considered acceptable for the proposed level of office redevelopment use given its Town Centre location and good transport links.

With respect to the impact upon heritage assets, the proposal was considered to have result in no harm to the listed buildings within the vicinity including Christ the Saviour Parish Church which was Grade II* Listed. However, it was considered to result in less than substantial harm upon the Ealing Town Centre Conservation Area.

The Committee was informed that the proposal would provide clear public benefits which included more office space within the town centre, the

creation of over 1,500 permanent jobs and 260 construction jobs, optimisation of an underutilised and dilapidated site, reduction in the carbon emissions of the existing floorspace by 75%, creation of high-quality office accommodation within the town centre, revitalisation of Ealing Town Centre and improvements to the highway network by Section 106 contributions.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on some amendments to the Conditions.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the Application.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **214524FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

13 Northolt Grange Community Centre, Rushdene Crescent, Northolt, UB5 6NF

The Committee considered a report that had been submitted by Wade Banks, Planning Officer.

The Committee was aware that the application site was located at the Northolt Grange Community Centre and St Raphael's Roman Catholic Primary School. The site was boarded by Rushdene Crescent to the east and Hartfield Avenue to the south. The school site was composed by primarily single-storey buildings that hosted a primary school, nursery and a community centre. The site was composed also by a series of facilities including several hardscaped play areas, a large playing field, an obstacle course with a trim trail and grass, an artificial turf play area and a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) called "The Cage" to the north-east of the site. Access to the site was both off Rushdene Crescent to the east and Hartfield Avenue to the south.

It was reported that the application sought to provide school facilities on a consolidated school site. It was also to facilitate the separation of the school from the eastern plot, which was to be the subject of a future planning application. The application had been submitted as a hybrid application, incorporating both a full planning application and an outline planning application, with all matters reserved.

It was further reported that the full planning permission was for the demolition of the existing community centre, school building, MUGA, and other associated structures, and development of a new hardstanding play area and path. The full planning permission would therefore cover the proposed demolition works, the installation of 1,100sqm of new hardstanding playground and the installation of a new pedestrian path. The outline planning permission was for the proposed temporary classrooms and an extended

parking area for the school staff, with all matters reserved for future consideration.

The report highlighted that it had been acknowledged that the proposal would result in the loss of social infrastructure. However, the existing community centre had been closed for four years and the site was not located in an area of defined need as identified in the borough's social infrastructure needs assessment, policy S1 of the London Plan. The site was vacated in 2017 and had been identified as a potential site for residential uses since 2018 which had suggested that the proposed development was in line with requirements of policy. The potential re-provision of community facilities would be included within the forthcoming residential development at the site and so it was considered that the principle of development was acceptable.

The proposal was consistent with the aims of the relevant adopted policies and documents of the Local Development Plan, relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. It was therefore recommended that both full planning permission and outline planning permission be granted with conditions.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided information on some amendments and an addition to the Conditions and some further notes with respect to a CUA.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the Application.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, Full and Outline planning permission for the application REF **213792HYBRID** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

14 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Wednesday 17 November 2021.

The meeting of the Committee concluded at 9:45pm.