

## **Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Date:** Wednesday, 20 July 2022

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

### **Attendees (in person): Councillors**

R Wall, P Anand, L Brett, G Busuttil, J Gallant, M Iqbal, A Kelly, S Kohli, D Martin, F Mohamed, S Padda and M Rice

### **Apologies:**

T Mahmood (Vice-Chair)

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Mahmood. Councillor Padda was his substitute.

#### **2 Urgent Matters**

There were none.

#### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Wall and Brett both declared that they had once been parishioners of St Joseph's Church. However, they did not deem these to be pecuniary or prejudicial interests in the application.

Councillor P Anand declared that he had previous acquaintances with the owner of the site. However, Councillor Anand confirmed that he had no pecuniary interest in the development, nor had he discussed this application with the owner or the developer.

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

There were none.

#### **5 Minutes**

There were none on this occasion.

#### **6 Site Visit Attendance**

Councillors Brett, Busuttil, Gallant, Iqbal, Kelly, Kohli and Padda had attended site visits prior to the meeting.

**Gold's Gym, 54-62 Uxbridge Road, Hanwell, W7 3SU**

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee involved the redevelopment of the existing Gold's Gym site on Uxbridge Road in Hanwell to include extensions to accommodate a nine-storey building and part 4 and part 5 storey outrigger. The proposal also involved alterations to the front elevation of the existing building. The site would continue to be occupied by Gold's Gym over the ground and first floor levels, but the existing commercial unit would be relocated to a more centralised location at the frontage of the site. The extensions to the building would enable the building to accommodate 43 residential units, providing a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom flats.

It was further explained that the site was well connected in terms of public transport, being a short distance from Hanwell Crossrail Station on the Elizabeth Line and existing on a high frequency bus route which offered express services along the Uxbridge Road corridor. The site was also located within the Hanwell District Centre, which the London Plan supports for optimisation and mixed-use developments. It was noted that the site was surrounded by a number of heritage assets, which included the Church of Our Lady and St Joseph (Locally Listed), St Mellitus' Church (Grade II Listed) and the Hanwell Clock Tower and Hanwell Cemeteries Conservation Areas. Mr Holland highlighted that the associated report on this application contained extensive assessment of the proposal's impact on these assets.

The Committee was informed that planning officers considered the proposed development to represent a high quality development, which would regenerate the large site with a compliant amount of affordable housing. It was therefore recommended by officers that the application be approved subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 legal 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 additional objections received and officers' responses to them and an amendment to the justification given by officers in the report.

Margaret Jones, an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- The proposal impacted on the character of the Uxbridge Road, with the proposed building deemed to relate badly to the neighbouring churches and heritage assets.
- The outrigger was deemed to protrude too far out towards the street, and concerns were raised that parts of the building were overshadowing the neighbouring presbytery.
- The proposal was compared to the Marshall Street Tower, with it suggested that the proposal was for a taller building which protruded into the road and neighbouring areas far more.

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

- Hanwell was a hidden treasure in London but had limited opportunities for the necessary new housing schemes to be developed. The proposal optimised the existing site, meeting the 35% affordable housing requirement in a location well placed to address transport and environmental issues.
- The scheme sought to maintain the positive aspects of the Marshall Street development and did not have a significant impact on the conservation areas or neighbouring church.
- The outrigger on the south wing of the building had been the subject of much debate, and several modifications to the proposals had been made to assuage concerns of nearby residents and church goers. The applicant remained open to further dialogue on this issue.

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

- Although some development on the site was not objectionable, a 9-story tower block was deemed to be overdevelopment in an area where there were already many new developments being built.
- The Marshall Tower, from which it was suggested this proposal took precedent, had been an unpopular development amongst local residents. It was also different in that it was further back from the road than this proposal.
- The height and bulk of the proposal was a problem and could impact the light through the skylights of the neighbouring church and the local residents on nearby roads.
- The flats were too small, with the mix being only 1 and 2 bedroom flats.

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

- Following confusion over the PTAL rating of the site, it was confirmed the site had a PTAL rating of 4.
- The only church windows overlooked by the proposed building were skylights. The skylights looked onto the internal ceiling of the church and as such there was loss of privacy to church goers.
- The proposed development would be wholly contained within the site boundary, with no parts overhanging into church property.
- There had been discussions of adding 3 bed flats to the unit mix at the pre-application stage. However, it was emphasised that 2 bed 4 person flats can still be classed as family flats.

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 **215983FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
2. Satisfactory completion of Section 106 legal agreement.

## **8 Manhattan Business Park, Westgate, Ealing, W5 1UP**

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee sought permission for the demolition of 8 industrial units and 10 flats in the Westgate Triangle and the construction of a mixed-use development ranging between 7 and 13 storeys. The new development comprised of new light industrial floorspace, office floorspace, café floorspace and 326 flats, including 112 affordable units.

It was further explained that the site lay on the north side of the A40 just west of the Hanger Lane Gyratory. The Central Line railway adjoined the southern boundary and part of the HS2 rail line ran below the site. Part of the site was able to be seen from the nearby Brentham Garden Estate, Brunswick and Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Areas. It was noted that the site formed part of a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL), and, given the application included an increase of industrial units, the applicant had carried out work in consultation with the GLA, Ealing Council and adjoining landowners to identify opportunities for industrial intensification elsewhere in the vicinity.

On balance, officers considered that the proposed development provided several planning and regeneration benefits. 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 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 late objections to the application and corrections to the original report.

Rosanna Fullerton, an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- Residents were opposed to the size and density of the development, with concerns about the practicality of the mix of uses on the site. There had been comparisons with repurposed office buildings on Ealing Road, but it was emphasised that the two sites had different contexts.
- Access to the site was not suitable, with the road noted as narrow. Whilst a report had noted that there had only been 2 accidents on the road, this was deemed to mean little given that no families lived in the area.

- Since the residential areas were bounded mostly by industrial units, there was doubt whether the area would be nice to live in for families. The amenity spaces appeared to be designed more for aesthetics than for use.

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

- The proposal aimed to optimise the use of the site, providing better quality industrial floor space, new office space and important new affordable housing.
- The site was suitable for mixed use development because of its unique location on transport routes and the range of office spaces already in the area. The applicant had produced a masterplan for the site which demonstrated that the mixed use development would not prejudice the development of other industrial sites in the strategic industrial location.
- Although the buildings would be visible from the nearby conservation areas, this was acceptable because they were sufficient far away from them and had been designed to form part of the emerging townscape of taller buildings in the area.

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

- The proposed development included buildings which were too high and too bulky. There would be a significant visual impact from nearby conservation areas, particularly with the views from Clarendon Road. The buildings made no architectural reference to the nearby buildings in the conservation areas.
- There had been significant concern from Transport for London regarding pedestrian safety, and despite measures put in place to mitigate these, there were still concerns about healthy street indicators in and around Hanger Lane Gyratory.
- Congestion at the Hanger Lane Gyratory was already bad, with the new development likely to make it worse.
- Air pollution on the site was raised as a concern, with it noted that the flats would be designed such that there would be no need to open the windows. This was not seen as a satisfactory response to the problem.
- The affordable housing mix was below Ealing Council's preferred mix.

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

- There had been significant interest in using the industrial and office spaces, including interest from companies in the film industry.
- Planning officers had deemed it acceptable for the applicant not to meet the affordable housing target because the development would incur exceptional costs due to its location on top of HS2 tunnelling. The applicant had submitted that the development would not be viable if it

was to encompass the affordable housing target, and this had been verified independently twice by the Council.

- The GLA had imposed the requirement that the development was not able to begin until the Westworld development had been completed because the proposed mixed use development was only acceptable if there was a net increase in industrial space in the strategic industrial site.
- Traffic impacts during construction would be mitigated by a construction management plan.

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 **212468FUL** 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.

**9 13-15 The Green, Southall, UB2 4AH**

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee sought permission for a residential led redevelopment of a derelict commercial site just south of Southall town centre.

The proposal was to provide 95 flats by way of a part 23, part 19 storey and part 14 storey building. A flexible community/amenity space was proposed at ground floor level for use by residents and the local community. The development would be car free and included 181 cycle parking spaces. Communal outdoor amenity space was proposed on the first and 14th floor levels. It was noted, however, that whilst 35% of residential units by habitable room would be affordable, the proposed tenure split was 30% London Affordable Rent and 70% shared ownership. It therefore did not meet the Council's preferred tenure mix.

The Committee was informed that it was considered that the proposed development would provide a number of planning and regeneration benefits, including a sizeable increase in the housing stock, provision of community space and positive contributions through section 106 legal agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy. It was therefore recommended by officers that the application be approved subject to conditions, the completion of Section 106 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 amendments to the recommendations since the report was published, noting that the application sought permission for one less flat than originally stated in the report.

Alexander Forbes, an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- It was disagreed that the building was compliant with London Plan Policy D9 regarding criteria for tall buildings.
- The addition of a tall building on the site threatened the heritage of the Southall, and would impact on its historic townscape and residents' sense of place.
- The proposal did not include enough affordable housing.

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

- Placing emphasis on social value, the applicants had consulted with the local community and decided to include the ground floor community space.
- The existing derelict building was a blight; the proposed development would be an improvement, with high calibre architecture.
- The application included sizeable financial contributions to the local community through section 106 legal agreement, which included funding for a review of the nearby parking zones.

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

- The existing building was neither in a conservation area nor locally listed. The committee was informed that, in any case, the applicant had already received approval to demolish the existing building.
- The affordable mix had been accepted by officers because the Council had verified that providing the preferred affordable mix for this proposal would be unviable for applicant.
- Although the ground floor community space was not big enough for all sports, it was still deemed to be a useful space for a range of sports, as well as for meetings and events.
- The housing department had commented that providing 3 bed flats as part of the scheme would have been beneficial for the housing stock. It was considered that the location of the development on a busy road and its proximity to further tall buildings dampened the case for including 3 bed flats.
- Whilst an answer was not given on whether approaches had been made by the applicant to buy the two-story building next door to the proposed development, acquisition of the property by a compulsory purchase order had not been pursued by the applicant.
- There would be no parking on the site, with the Section 106 legal

agreement would prevent residents accessing parking permits for parking nearby. However, residents would be given free membership to a car club for several years.

- It was the opinion of officers that there was a reasonable case to demonstrate that the proposal complied with London Plan Policy D9 criteria for tall buildings. With regards to the visual amenity of the building, high quality architecture was generally looked for over attempts to make the building fit in with other buildings in the area.

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 **216215FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

- 1.Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
- 2.Satisfactory completion of Section 106 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).

**10 Portrush Court, Whitecote Road, (Golflinks Estate), Southall, UB1 3NR**

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that there were two related applications before the committee on this item. The applications were for a non-material amendment (221396NMA) and for the approval of reserved matters (221501REM) relating to the outline consent for a residential led mixed-use development on the Golflinks Estate. The outline consent, reference 195348OUT, was granted on 30 April 2020.

It was explained that the first application for a non-material amendment sought to non-materially amend the consented maximum built envelope and protrusion lines on the northern and western edges to allow for entrance canopies as well as an oriel bay to mark the corner of the development.

It was further explained that the reserved matters application sought approval for the Means of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale in relation to the construction of three buildings up to 3 storeys in height comprising 143 new homes and 140 sqm of flexible non residential floorspace. The proposal included a mix of 1-, 2-, 3- and 4- bedroom apartments and a mix of tenures, including affordable rent and shared ownership. The scheme provided 100% affordable housing. The scheme also provides 26% family sized homes, in accordance with the identified need within Ealing.

The committee was informed that the applications were dependent on one another insofar as it had to either grant both applications or refuse both applications.



Planning officers informed the committee that they considered that the non-material amendment application raised no strategic planning issues. Furthermore, officers considered the Reserved Matters proposal to provide a high-quality residential development that would positively contribute to the wider aspirations for Golflinks estate and would continue the Council's Estate Regeneration Programme. It was therefore recommended by officers that the committee agreed the non-material amendments of application 221396NMA subject to the amendments to the original conditions of consent and that it granted reserved matters approval subject to 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 amendments to the recommendation set out in the committee report, including information on the agreed financial contributions for the scheme.

There were no speakers on this application. Following questions from the committee, officers made the following clarification:

- The proposal included a compliant amount of wheelchair accessible units.

The committee proceeded to vote on the applications.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **221396NMA** be **GRANTED** amendments subject to the amendments to the original conditions of consent.
2. That for the reasons set out in the committee report, reserved matters approval for the application REF **221501REM** be **GRANTED** subject to successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

**11 Date of the Next Meeting**

The date of the next scheduled Planning Committee meeting was Wednesday 17 August 2022.

Meeting commenced: 7.03 pm

Meeting finished: 9.34 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 17 August 2022

R Wall (Chair)