

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Thursday, 19 October 2023

Venue: The Atrium - Perceval House

Attendees (in person): Councillors

R Wall (Chair), D Martin (Vice-Chair), K Sahota, T Mahmood, A Raza, Y Gordon, M Iqbal, S Padda, L Wall, M Rice, C Summers, G Busutil and A Young

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were none.

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 was asked to consider two sets of minutes, the first from the meeting on 7 June 2023 and the second from 19 July 2023.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings on 7 June 2023 and 19 July 2023 were agreed as a true and correct record.

6 Site Visit Attendance

The following councillors attended site visits on the weekend prior to the committee meeting:

Councillors R Wall, D Martin, Sahota, Mahmood, Raza, Gordon, Iqbal, Padda L Wall, Rice and Busutil.

Councillors Young and Summers sent their apologies for the site visits.

7 Planning Application - 232800FUL - 1 Stirling Road/1-9 Colville Road and 67-81 Stirling Road , Acton, W3 8DJ (South Acton)

Joel Holland Turner, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for the construction of a mixed-use development of two buildings, comprising 20 and 11 storeys respectively.

The development was going to be situated on two separate, unattached plots within an industrial block in South Acton. The first site had frontages to Bollo Lane, Colville Road and Sitrling Road. The second site had frontages onto Stirling Road and Bollo Lane. Both sites were designated as part of a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS), had an Archaeological Interest Area designation and were located within a Local Park Deficiency area. Officers considered the proposals were for well-designed buildings which would uplift the local area.

Mr Holland explained the plans for the two blocks. The proposed 20 storey block was known as block AB and was going to include industrial floor space at ground and first floor, with purpose-built student accommodation on the floors above. Block JK was the 11-storey block, and it was at the ground and first floor levels of this block that the existing industrial uses on the site were going to be reprovisioned. 95 homes were going to be provided above the industrial floors, of which 38% by habitable room were going to be affordable.

Mr Holland noted that it was a material consideration that a scheme on this site had previously been agreed by committee in November 2021. In the view of officers, the proposals for the height fell within the parameters set by the consented scheme. One of the key differences between the consented scheme and the proposed scheme was the provision of student accommodation in block AB. It was noted that a purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) needs assessment had been undertaken and had found that there was a relative lack of PBSA stock to meet the current and future need of Ealing's student population. In light of the findings of the needs assessment, officers considered the provision of student accommodation on the site could, in principle, be supported.

Overall, Mr Holland explained that officers found the scheme to be well-considered, with the benefits of delivering new homes and industrial space. It was well designed and was likely to uplift what had been an unwelcoming environment. Mr Holland recommended that the committee grant consent for the application, subject to conditions, the completion of a section 106 legal agreement and stage II referral 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 an amendment to the recommendation which added to the proposed Heads of Terms for the development.

Mr Neil Sheppard, an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- The buildings were too tall and risked compounding the issues South

Acton was facing as its population density increased. The height appeared to be in contravention of the Acton Gardens Master Plan, which required the height of buildings to be commensurate with local buildings, many of which were around 6 to 8 storeys tall.

- Given the increase in population these proposals were proposed to bring, there was not the necessary uplift in local facilities and infrastructure to support new residents.
- Residents risked being denied the choice of local amenities if new facilities were not brought forward in line with this development. It was a low-car development, which risked restricting the options residents had further, given they would not be able to travel as far to access amenities and community facilities.

Mr Harry De Lotbiniere, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The representation made the following key points:

- The proposals before the committee were amendments to a scheme which was proposed and consented in 2021. Economic, technical and regulatory changes had rendered the previous scheme undeliverable. The new scheme included a slight decrease in the height of the tallest block, an increase in collective affordable housing on the site, and the provision of purpose-built student accommodation.
- The application was part of the wider context of Hawkins/Brown masterplan for the area, which was a phased mixed-use re-development of the surrounding area, encompassing 10 sites.
- The development was in a prime location to provide accommodation for numerous higher education institutions in West London. The applicant had identified a need for student accommodation in the area with it estimated that, at the time of the application, there were 5 students for every purpose built student room in Ealing.

Following the presentations by the speakers, the Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to some of the questions and points raised, officers confirmed that:

- There was a wider initiative through the developing South Acton estate masterplan to bring forward opportunities for new infrastructure, facilities and green spaces in South Acton.
- The proposals for a car free development were in line with the London plan policy position on access to the use of cars through new developments. One factor offsetting the concerns about the development being car free was the site's proximity to 3 train stations.
- The site was not situated within the Acton Gardens Masterplan area.
- There was £15,000 allocated for children's play space through the proposed Section 106 legal agreement contributions. Work on the South Acton masterplan included considering how the Council could support new developments to propose buildings which left space for the creation of new pocket parks, for which contributions such as those from this development could contribute.

- The development site did not fall within a designated area for tall buildings. However, it was a material consideration that the height of the proposed scheme fell within the parameters of the height of the consented scheme from 2021. Notwithstanding this point, planning officer had undertaken a tall building impact assessment as part of the committee report and had concluded that any impact caused would be acceptable.
- It was planned that couriers to the development would avoid access via Bollo Lane given that this was an already busy road. It was expected that couriers would use the same entrances as would deliveries for the industrial areas of the development. This was considered acceptable given that couriers, particularly for take away food, often delivered at different times to delivery drivers for industry.
- The previously consented scheme had brought forward the affordable housing provision in a separate block from the private rental provision, in a similar way to the proposed scheme.
- The applicant was bound by legal agreement to provide the affordable housing as well as the other units, including student accommodation. Occupation of the student units would not be permitted until the affordable units were finished and ready to be occupied.
- The recommendation set out a number of use classes which would be allowed using the industrial floor space. The impact of the industrial uses on residents was mitigated through conditions such as requirements for sound insulation.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **232800FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

8 Planning Application - 232010FUL - Blueprint Southall (Former Honey Monster Foods), Bridge Road, Southall, Middlesex, UB2 4AB (Norwood Green)

Chris Maltby, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for a hybrid application for the phased redevelopment of the Former Honey Monster Foods site, on Bridge Road, Southall. The development was part of a wider industrial estate in Norwood Green ward and was designated as a locally significant industrial site. It was bordered to North by a railway branch line, to the east by Glade Lane Canalside Park, to the south by a spur of the Grand Union Canal and to the west the Middlesex Business Centre.

The redevelopment, which was going to comprise 3 phases, was for the

creation of a new employment campus comprising office and industrial uses and was going to cover a maximum of 39,628 square meters of floorspace. Mr Maltby explained that the applicant had submitted full details of phases 1 and 2 of the development, with outline permission sought for phase 3.

The proposals were considered to bring significant regeneration benefits, including the provision of a new east-west cycle path through the site, a new bus route connecting the site and neighbouring Middlesex Business Centre to south Southall, the provision of a new retail kiosk at the centre of the site, and the provision of affordable workspace on site. The proposals would also bring a brown field employment site back into use after having laid vacant since 2016.

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 clarifications to the report, additional consultation responses provided since the committee report was published, and amendments and additions to the conditions recommended.

Mr Maltby also updated the committee that since the briefing note was published, he had received confirmation from National Highways that they had no objections to the proposals.

Overall, given the public and regeneration benefits of the scheme, and its compliance with national and local planning regulations and policy, Mr Maltby recommended that the application was granted, subject to conditions, satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement, and a referral to the Mayor of London.

There were no speakers on this item.

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

- Affordable workspace was going to be provisioned by way of condition for a period of no less than 15 years from the date of occupation.
- 68 parking spaces were distributed throughout the site, with 2 nearby to affordable workspace. The affordable workspace was also adjacent to the proposed bus stop.
- The works to Bridge Road were to be completed by the time the development was occupied.
- The development was to be fully managed by the applicant, with it being their responsibility for maintaining the trees on the site. A condition secured the creation of site management plan, which would give details of how the site would be managed.
- The shuttle bus was going to be a temporary measure before the bus service commenced. The commencement of the bus service was dependent on the opening of Healum Avenue, which was being brought forward in coordination with the developer of the previously consented Middlesex Business Centre.

- Officers had secured by condition that the developer was to supply details of the interim shuttle bus service. This was likely to include details of the pick-up and drop off points, times, and the likely start date of the service. Officers could negotiate with the developer to bring the shuttle bus service forward so that it commenced from when construction started.
- Unlike residential schemes, where there was a demonstrable relationship between new residential units and requirements for community infrastructure like schools, this development (as an employment led development) did not have such a close link to require contributions to schools and local community centres. However, there were wider community benefits to the scheme, given its regenerative aims and the employment opportunities which were proposed.
- Concerns about contamination of the neighbouring canal were mitigated by the fact that there were robust procedures in place, including necessary licence applications, which the applicant would need to undertake before commencing work on the site.
- The proposals were going to cause a 10% biodiversity net gain on the site.
- An application for planning permission on this site had been agreed some years ago. The previous application had been submitted by a different developer.
- The developer was aware that there might be demand for film making space on the site. It was hoped that some of the proposed units would be suitable for such uses.
- There was going to be a cycle way through the site, with access to Glade Lane Canalside Park.
- There had been a positive response by the developer to the comments of the community review panel, particularly in relation to place-making on the site.
- The art strategy contribution was to fund local artists to produce work to be displayed around the site.
- The scheme included contributions to improve parking on Bridge Road. There was more work to be done by the Council after the committee meeting to confirm the best way to improve parking on the road, taking into consideration existing issues with parking enforcement on the road.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **232010FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

9 Date of the Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was scheduled for 1 November 2023.

Meeting commenced: 7.00 pm

Meeting finished: 7.59 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 1 November
2023

R Wall (Chair)