

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 21 September 2022

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

Attendees (in person): Councillors

R Wall (Chair), P Anand, J Ball, F Conti, T Mahmood (Vice-Chair), D Martin, S Khan M Rice, M Iqbal, A Kelly, S Padda, S Kohli and F Mohamed

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were none.

2 Urgent Matters

The Chair informed the committee that the agenda had been published with less than 5 clear days' notice of the meeting. However, with the agreement of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, the meeting had been allowed to go ahead.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Rice declared that she had a prejudicial interest in item 10 of the agenda, relating to Ealing Town Hall. She explained that she sat on the Victoria Hall Trust and had sat on Ealing Council's General Purposes Committee, which had been acting as trustees to the Victoria Hall.

Councillor Mahmood also declared that he had a prejudicial interest in item 10 of the agenda, relating to Ealing Town Hall. He explained that he also sat on the Victoria Hall Trust.

Both Councillor Rice and Councillor Mahmood informed the Committee that they were going to remove themselves from the committee whilst item 10 was considered and voted upon.

4 Matters to be Considered in Private

There were none.

5 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of meeting held on 17 August 2022 were approved as a correct record.

6 Site Visit Attendance

Councillors Conti, Mahmood, Martin, Padda, Rice, Wall, Iqbal, Kelly and Kohli had attended site visits prior to the committee meeting.

7 Planning Application - 216991FULR3 - Land South of Park Avenue, Southall, Middlesex, UB1 3AD

Gregory Gray, Planning Officer, introduced the item and explained that the application before the Committee was for the demolition of existing buildings on the land south of Park Avenue, Southall and the phased development of 5 blocks between 5 and 25 storeys in their place. The proposal was for a mixed-use development, which included affordable flats and flexible commercial and/or community floorspace. At least 233 of the proposed 516 flats were going to be affordably priced, which equated to 50% affordable housing by habitable room. Mr Gray informed the Committee that discussions were ongoing with the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to use part of the commercial/community space for a healthcare facility. The scheme was designed to be part of the redevelopment designated by Ealing Development Sites DPD Allocation SOU4, with the inclusion of housing on Milan Road.

The site, which was located to the south side of Southall Town Centre and close to Southall Crossrail Station, was comprised of a large yard, a car park and 23 affordable dwellings on Milan Road. The Merrick Road foot and cycle bridge had its northern land point on the western flank of the site and an application for 460 new flats in blocks between 4 and 16 storeys to the eastern side of the site had been approved in January 2022. The site formed part of the wider Southall Opportunity Area.

The Committee was informed that planning officers considered the proposed development provided significant regeneration benefits, in accordance with the London Plan and its SOU4 Allocation. It contributed to the provision of affordable homes, optimised brownfield land, and was in keeping with further planned developments in the area. Mr Gray recommended to the Committee that it grant permission to the application with conditions, completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement and subject to Stage 2 Mayoral referral.

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 report, which included an amendment to the recommendation.

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

- Because Milan Road was a private road, parking arrangements for its residents were arranged privately and may not be carried forward if the residents decant to a flat in the new development. Despite engagement by the applicant with Milan Road residents, no individuals had expressed an interest in decanting into the new flats.

- The existing affordable housing on Milan Road was built in around 1994. Whilst the new development was going to be made with higher standard building materials than those used in the existing development, the application included a condition which required the construction to re-use materials where appropriate.
- The scheme was independently able to provide its own cycling parking and provision for cycle use, without dependence on neighbouring developments.
- No further details were able to be given on the potential for a healthcare facility on the site because this was subject to further discussions and agreements between the applicant and the CCG. It was noted that the proposal included space for use class D, which allowed significant flexibility in the use for the spaces on the site.
- The proposal included 1239m² of community and employment space.
- With respect to the Section 106 Legal Agreement contribution to pedestrian crossings, the funding was a contribution; the applicant was not taking on responsibility for the upkeep of the crossing.
- The Merrick Road foot and cycle bridge was not within the development site, but the access to it was on the site.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **216991FULR3** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
2. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
3. A Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.

8 Planning Application - 214465OPDFUL - Castle Hotel, Victoria Road, Acton, London, W3 6UL

Chris Maltby, Planning Officer, introduced the item and explained that the application before the Committee was for the demolition of the existing public house and for the redevelopment of the site to provide a part 32, part 27 storey building. The application site was occupied by a two-storey building built in the 1930s which had been a pub until it closed in late 2020. Since the pub closed, the site was surrounded by a secure site hoarding. The proposed building was going to comprise 462 co-living rooms shared over floors 4 to 30, with associated communal amenity spaces shared between floors 1, 2, 3 and 31. The proposal included a replacement public house on part of the ground and first floors.

The site was located in North Acton, within the North Acton sub-area of the Old Oak and Park Royal Opportunity Area. Whilst this Opportunity Area was under the planning authority of the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC), planning applications within the North Acton sub-area have been delegated to the London Borough of Ealing for determination.

The proposal did not include provision of affordable housing directly due to the nature of the housing product which was proposed. A financial payment of £13.1 million was secured in lieu of affordable housing, which was measured to equate to 72 on site (co-living) affordable housing units. The Section 106 Legal Agreement secured early and late stage reviews of the viability of further contributions to affordable housing.

The consultation on the scheme resulted in 31 objections. Amongst those objections, Mr Maltby noted the objection that the scheme included the demolition of the public house, which was locally listed. Whilst this carried weight in officers' assessment of the proposal, officers believed that, on balance, the considerable increase to housing stock, the contribution to off-site affordable housing and the provision of a new public house (with community space in the upstairs area) outweighed the negatives of the proposal. Mr Maltby therefore recommended that the Committee grant the application, subject to conditions, 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.

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 corrections to the committee report, details of further written representations, and additional information relating to neighbouring sites.

There were no speakers on this application. The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the proposal. In response to some of the questions posed, officers confirmed that:

- Co-living was a relatively new model for developments and officers were not aware of feedback on existing schemes. There was likely to be significant demand for this kind of development, otherwise the application would not have been brought forward.
- The financial contributions were going to be shared between Ealing Borough and the OPDC.
- Minor impact had been identified relating to wind as a result of the development. Although it was deemed a small issue, the applicant agreed to respond with mitigation measures.
- After consultation with the Mayor of London, the proposal's urban greening factor and impact on the value of the site's trees were

identified for improvement. In response, a condition had been included (outlined in the briefing note) to ensure further maximisation of urban greening. With respect to the trees on the site, there was going to be 6 replacements trees which were to be of equal or greater value of the existing trees on the site.

- Officers were unable to give details of the contributions to North Acton station, although they would be developed in coordination with Transport for London.
- The applicant had increased the proposal's kitchen space after comments from the Greater London Authority (GLA). There was enough kitchen space such that half its residents would be able to be accommodated in the kitchen area at one time, albeit that not all would be able to use the cooking facilities simultaneously. In addition to the kitchen facilities, each unit had its own basic kitchenette.
- Although officers were unable to give an exact price range for the rent of a standard room in a co-living arrangement, it was emphasised that the price included access to a range of facilities like a cinema and gym.
- A management plan for the proposal was being produced, and this was going to outline to the mitigations against issues such as further pandemics and security risks.
- The heating solutions for the development were standard arrangements, with gas boilers intended to be top ups. This was deemed acceptable by officers given the constraints of the site.

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 **214465OPDFUL** 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).

9 Planning Application - 222328FUL - Cavendish House and Century House, Uxbridge Road, Ealing, W5 5SA

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the item and explained that the application before the committee was for the change of use of two vacant buildings, Cavendish House and Century House, from office space (Use Class E(g)(i)) to education/office space (Use Classes F1/E(g)(i)).The

developed buildings were going to be for use by the University of West London.

Cavendish House and Century House were two large, adjoining office buildings in Ealing Town Centre on Uxbridge Road, both between 5 and 6 stories. They had been vacant for 3 years. Despite evidence of active marketing for over 2 years, there had been no interest in occupying the buildings as offices. The only interest in occupying the buildings was from the University of West London for mixed office and educational uses, after it had vacated its existing campus at Villiers House and Haven Green.

There had been no objections to the proposed development. Officers believed that there was clear policy support for increased provision of education facilities in Ealing Town Centre. Noting the potential loss of dedicated office space in the area, officers recommended that the proposal be allowed on the basis of a personal permission to University of West London. This was deemed to mitigate concerns about the long-term provision of office space in the town centre, whilst retaining University of West London as an important civic and economic institution in the borough and securing new jobs.

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 corrections and updates to the report, including information about the split between the intended educational and office uses for the proposal, the proposed number of cycle parking spaces and a Travel Plan for the development.

Patrick Chapman, a resident who registered to speak on the application, informed the committee that he was in favour of the development.

Victoria Bennion, representative of the applicant, addressed the committee. Ms Bennion outlined some of the benefits of the scheme, which included bringing vacant buildings into use, economic benefits for the Ealing Highstreet, and the provision of space for higher education.

The Committee did not have questions about the proposal.

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 **222328FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent, including a condition to make the permission personal to the University of West London.

Gregory Gray, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the item and explained that the application before the Committee was for listed building consent for the partial demolition, conversion, alteration and extension of Ealing Town Hall to provide a new hotel whilst retaining community and publicly available facilities on the site. Mr Gray explained that planning permission and listed building consent had been granted for this proposal in November 2019 and May 2019 respectively, although work had not been able to start as due to the pandemic restrictions and tribunal enquiries relating to the development. Due to the time elapsed, the listed building consent had run out and was therefore brought to this committee for consideration of its renewal.

The proposal was to provide a 120-room hotel, together with space for a health and fitness club, bars and bistros. The London Borough of Ealing was going to retain space for its democratic services, including the provision of committee and meeting rooms. The works were going to include internal and external demolitions and the erection of part 6, part 8 storey extensions. The existing Town Hall building was a Grade II listed Landmark in the Ealing Town Centre Conservation Area, Civic Quarter and Metropolitan Town Centre. Mr Gray noted that the proposal's heritage impact had been deemed by both Heritage England and the Council's independent heritage advisor (in 2019) as having a less than substantial impact and he confirmed that this continued to be their view with the current application.

Mr Gray emphasised to the committee that there was no material change in the application since it was originally agreed in 2019 including in consideration of current London Plan policy. The application submission also complied with the registration requirements of the London Borough of Ealing. Officers continued to consider that the public benefits of the scheme outweighed the harm to heritage building. Having considered all relevant national and local planning policy and advice, officers recommended that the Committee grant listed building consent subject to conditions following notification to the Secretary of State under the Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications.

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 representations relating to the application since the publication of the committee papers.

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

- Since the permission and listed building consent were granted for the proposal in 2019, there had been relevant changes in the London Plan and the Council's conservation management plan which rendered it an unacceptable application.
- The extensions to the Town Hall were damaging to the heritage of the building taken as a whole. It did not make a difference that parts of the building were going to remain as they had been.

- Whilst it was not directly related to Planning matters, there was ongoing court case relating to the ownership of the Victoria Hall. Mr Chapman believed a decision on the application was best to wait until the result of the case.

No representative of the applicant had registered to speak. There were no questions from the committee on the application.

It was moved by Councillor Ball that consideration of the application be deferred until the court case relating to the ownership of the Victoria Hall was concluded. The motion, on being put to the vote, was declared **LOST**.

The committee then proceeded to vote of the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, listed building consent for application **223130LBC** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
2. Notification to the Secretary of State under the Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications – Notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction, 2021.

**Councillors Mahmood and Rice removed themselves from the meeting whilst this application was considered and voted on by the committee.*

11 Date of the Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was 19 October 2022.

Meeting commenced: 7.00 pm

Meeting finished: 8.56 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 19 October 2022

R Wall (Chair)