

## **Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Date:** **Wednesday, 16 February 2022**

**Time:** **19:00**

**Venue:** **Council Chamber, Town Hall, New Broadway, Ealing, W5 2BY**

**Attendees:**

**Councillor Shahbaz Ahmed, Councillor Louise Brett, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Fabio Conti, Councillor Joanna Dabrowska, Councillor Tariq Mahmood, Councillor Dee Martin, Councillor Kamaldeep Sahota, Councillor Chris Summers, Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Simon Woodroofe**

### **1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies were received from Councillor Swaran Padda with no substitute, Councillor Karanvir Dhadwal with no substitute and Councillor Praveen Anand with Councillor Tariq Mahmood as his substitute.

### **2 Urgent Matters**

There were none.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

### **4 Matters to be Considered in Private**

There were none.

### **5 Minutes**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 15 December 2021.

**RESOLVED:**

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

## **6 Site Visit Attendance**

Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Shahbaz Ahmed, Councillor Louise Brett, Councillor Fabio Conti, Councillor Joanna Dabrowska, Councillor Kamaldeep Sahota and Councillor Simon Woodroffe attended the site visit.

## **7 Park View Place, Greenford Road, Greenford, UB6 0JA - Map**

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the proposal sought permission for mixed use, residential led redevelopment of the former office site which was within Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and adjoined to Grove Farm Park. The current scheme was the result of pre-application discussion with officers of Ealing Council and the Greater London Authority (GLA), as well as public consultation with local residents too.

It was explained that the application followed approval in January 2020 for four buildings of 5-9 storeys on the adjoining northern part of the former Kellogg's office site to provide 346 flats along with ancillary crèche or offices, cafe or shop or financial and professional services, restaurant or office and management suite, and a new pedestrian/cycle link to Grove Farm Park and play space. It was highlighted that Building 1 was part of that approved scheme but was now included in this application with a different number of flats.

It was further explained that the current application proposed demolition of a vacant 3 storey office building on the site and redevelopment to provide 288 residential units, commercial floorspace and community space within five buildings of between 6 and 11 storeys. The development would provide 90 car parking spaces and 547 cycle parking spaces. Communal gardens and public realm space, including a pocket park, a central park and a woodland park, would be provided as well as landscaping, play and amenity space areas.

The Committee was informed that the revised scheme would make a substantial contribution to meeting local housing demand. Just under 36% of all residential units by habitable rooms, comprising 95 flats, would be affordable, with a tenure split by unit of 28% London Affordable Rent, 32% London Living Rent, 26% Discounted Market Rent and 14% Shared Ownership.

It was explained that the proposal was considered to meet the relevant tests for allowing built development on MOL because it would take place on previously developed land, was not considered to cause substantial harm to the openness of the MOL and would deliver a significant amount of affordable housing within the London Borough of Ealing. It would also provide important public benefits to enhance the adjoining Grove Fam Park and MOL land.

The Committee was informed that it was considered that the proposed development was consistent with the aims of the relevant policies of the adopted 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 the application be approved subject to conditions, the completion of a Section 106, Section 38 and Section 278 Legal Agreements, a Stage II referral to the Mayor of London 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 a representation of queries that had been received and details of a correction to the report.

A video presentation that was submitted on behalf of local residents' associations in objection to the development, was shown to the Committee and highlighted the following key points:

- The whole site had an MOL designation and as such was protected as green belt by way of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The GLA stage one report stated that all tests required to build on greenbelt land needed special circumstances and would need to be satisfied to approve this application. The NPPF stated the fundamental aim of greenbelt policy was to prevent urban sprawl and the essential characteristics of greenbelt were their openness and their permanence.
- The GLA report stated that the application failed the new London Plan Policy D9 for tall buildings and had also identified problems with many single aspect flats and lacked in pepper potting within the blocks.
- The rear of the site was part of the Grade one SINC site of Grove Farm. 82 mature trees would be chopped down as part of the development and they would be replaced with a pitiful increase of 15 new trees.

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

- The Developer had worked tirelessly for 18 months on the scheme with huge assistance from the officers at Ealing Council and the GLA. Park View Place was a landscape-led development that would provide much needed affordable housing and community benefits which included a highly attractive usable open space for residents and the local community, a community hall with flexible use, a new café and a gym.
- The SINC area was less than 5% of the overall site. Currently on that part of the site was a redundant office auditorium.
- The Developer would not only make significant S106 contributions or sale payment of 4 million but would also make a real positive contribution towards the regeneration of the local community and improvement of nearby parks.

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

- The Government's definition of previously developed land was a site that contained a building or structure and the curtilage of that building whether

or not including land that's been developed or whether it's open land already. In this instance the whole site was considered as previously developed land even though parts of it may well be green space or covered in trees.

- With respect to building on MOL land, Government guidance had stated that there was an exception in that you can build on MOL land where it's previously developed land, there's no substantial harm to the openness of the land and it provided a significant amount of affordable housing to meet local needs. The proposal had demonstrated to meet that criteria, and therefore very special circumstances were not required.
- There would be two entrances to the site, one would be for pedestrians, and one would be for vehicles.
- S106 contributions for traffic calming measures would be planned for and used in the future, there was not currently a plan in place at this time however there would be a series of requirement from the Council's Transport Officer which would include things like junction improvements and improvements to cycle infrastructure.
- As part of the scheme, 107 trees would be removed, 56 of those would be relocated and 66 new trees would be planted too. In total there would be a gain of 15 trees which equated to 5%.
- The Affordable Housing units would be in blocks 1 and 5 this would enable the management of the units to be easier.
- The Developer had met all the measures required by Surrey Wildlife Trust. Conditions for various enhancements and ecological plans would be put in place. Surrey Wildlife Trust had accepted that there would be a biodiversity gain on the site and they accepted that there would be no impact on badgers.
- A Construction Ecology Management Plan would be put in place.
- 27 of the parking spaces would have active electric charging in place and the rest of the spaces would have passive charging, therefore could be converted to active as demand arose.
- An extensive Daylight and Sunlight Assessment had been carried out as part of the proposal.

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 **213378FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
2. Satisfactory completion of Section 106, Section 38 and Section 278 Legal Agreements.
3. A Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.
4. A Community Infrastructure Levy payment to the Greater London Authority (GLA).
5. The Chair and the Head of Development Management to liaise with the relevant Officers and the Developer with regard to tree quality and traffic calming measures.

**8      Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 15 March 2022.

The meeting of the Committee concluded at 8:52pm.