

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee

**Date:** Wednesday, 17 November 2021

**Time:** 19:00

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

**Attendees:**

**Councillor Shahbaz Ahmed, Councillor Jon Ball, Councillor Fabio Conti, Councillor Tariq Mahmood, Councillor Dee Martin, Councillor David Millican, Councillor Swaran Padda, Councillor Miriam Rice, Councillor Kamaldeep Sahota, Councillor Chris Summers, Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Simon Woodroffe**

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies were received from Cllr Shahbaz Ahmed with no 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 Tuesday 20 October 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:

Cllr Tariq Mahmood (Vice-Chair), Cllr Jon Ball, Cllr Fabio Conti, Cllr Dee Martin, Cllr David Millican, Cllr Swaran Padda, Cllr Miriam Rice, Cllr Kamaldeep Sahota and Cllr Chris Summers.

## **8 93 Bollo Lane, Chiswick**

Joel Holland Turner, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the proposed development constituted a co-located industrial and residential development that would be constructed following demolition of the existing buildings. The site was unconventional both through its shape and the fact that it was located between two level crossings on Bollo Lane. The site was located within a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS) and the development therefore relied on the provisions of Policy E7 of the London Plan, which sought to encourage developments to increase their industrial capacity and allow for their co-location with residential uses, subject to the Agent of Change principles. It was not considered that the proposal to introduce residential uses on the site would compromise the functionality and operation of the LSIS, given its island-like location and its distance from nuisance-generating activities within the South Acton Industrial Estate.

It was explained that the principle to co-locate residential uses on the site was acceptable as not only would the development result in a net increase in the amount of employment space it would also make a good contribution to meeting the Council's 10-year housing target. The development would make a very good offer of 38% Affordable Housing and the tenure split was also considered to be very positive with a rate of 74.5/25.5 skewed heavily in favour of London Affordable Rent and provided a good provision toward genuinely affordable homes within the Borough. All of the 3-bedroom units within the development would be within the LAR tenure, therefore would provide genuinely affordable family homes to residents.

Based off the assessment of the proposal undertaken, it was considered that the proposed development accorded with the objectives of all relevant planning policy, and 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 some clarifications and the addition of a condition.

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

- Local residents were not against development in general and understood the need for housing, however, they were truly appalled by the proposed development and disappointed that their views had not been taken into account during the consultation phase. A development of this kind would have a significant impact on existing residents, and they feel that the planning process had not reflected the scale of the proposal.
- The proposed development would cause up to 67% loss of light to some residents.
- The proposed development would cause an impact on privacy due to overlooking.

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

- The proposed development would make efficient use of an underutilised brownfield site and would help improve the character and appearance of the local area.
- The proposed development would intensify the light industrial use on the site and would deliver a significant number of new homes which would help towards the Council's 10-year target. The proposed affordable housing and tenure mix would help meet local needs.
- Any impacts on light to neighbouring properties would be of a level which would preserve their amenity in living conditions and was largely because of the low baseline of a single-story building on the existing site. Amenity of neighbours would also be preserved through separation distances which far exceeded the minimum standards as set out in the London Plan.

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

- The site was unsuitable, between two level crossings.
- It was optimistic to assume that the proposed commercial spaces would be let out.
- Residents living on Western Road would be impacted by the proposed development by suffering from loss of light and loss of privacy.
- The proposed development did not fully comply with the London Plan Policy E7 as it was not part of a plan led process of LSIS intensification and co-location.
- The site was not within a location specifically identified as suitable for tall buildings.

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

- The application had been through an extensive pre-application process and earlier versions of the proposal had been deemed unacceptable due to design and height taking into account the impact on the residents of Western Road in particular. It was felt that the proposal now being considered had addressed those issues.
- Thames water had been consulted on the application and had recommended some conditions.
- There was no provision and no possibility of providing 7% disabled parking as there was no space to allocate it.

- There would be possible ways of introducing new parks into the area in the coming years.

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 **214710FUL** 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.

## **7 1 Stirling Road, 1-9 Colville Road and 67-81 Stirling Road, Acton**

Joel Holland Turner, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the proposed development constituted a co-located industrial/residential scheme within a designated Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS), commonly known as the South Acton Industrial Estate. It had formed part of an emerging character in the area, which included residential, industrial and commercial development along Bollo Lane, in close proximity to the Acton Town Underground Station and South Acton Overground Station.

It was explained that the application site had consisted of two separate, unconnected sites within an urban block that was bounded by Bollo Lane, Roslin Road, Sterling Road and Colville Road. The existing character of the area was predominantly low scale industrial buildings that did not contribute positively to the visual amenity of the area, although were consistent with the area's designation as an industrial site.

It was further explained that the proposal would demolish all the existing buildings and would result in no net loss of industrial space, with the existing space to be integrated within the proposed buildings. There would be a small uplift in industrial space of 30sqm. The proposed industrial space would accommodate the maximum degree of flexibility possible with a wide variety of configurations, more open plans and greater floor to ceiling heights than the existing buildings. The Commercial Strategy provided in support of the application made note of the demand for such spaces within the area that could accommodate a variety of uses to accommodate small and medium sized enterprises, including creative, music and film spaces, craft food and drink production, gallery space, maker spaces and hybrid combinations of them. The Commercial Strategy was supported by Council Officers and has also received support from West London Business (WLB).

The Committee was informed that the proposal also included co-location, with the introduction of residential flats to the site. Accordingly, it was considered appropriate that the 'Agent of Change' principles should be followed, which had occurred in this instance. The 'Agent of Change' assessment had identified sources of noise, vibration, dust, light and odour within the vicinity of the site, with relevant Technical Assessments provided to ensure that any existing sources of nuisance could be effectively designed out to ensure that

the introduction of residential uses would not compromise the continued function of the LSIS, and future occupants would enjoy a high standard of amenity. Appropriate conditions had been recommended in accordance with Pollution-Technical Officer advice.

The Committee was further informed that it had been noted that the design of the buildings, particularly the Colville Road site, would introduce significant bulk, scale and massing to the area based on current circumstances. However, it was considered that the overall height, massing and scale were consistent with the emerging character of the area, taking account of existing approvals near to the site and within the surrounding area. The taller building would act as an opposing book end to the urban block, to the building already approved at 2-10 Roslin Road and its design approach utilised a high degree of articulation and variance in materiality in the overall façade design to ensure that it would make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the wider urban context. The proposed building at 67-81 Stirling Road would have a different architectural narrative that would use strong industrial elements to reinforce the character of the area. Both buildings would introduce active frontages to the street, where they didn't currently exist, and the overall design approach taken was consistent with the indicative master plan that had been used as part of other development approvals and current applications.

It was explained that the principle of providing housing on the site was welcomed, given its brownfield nature and its proximity to high frequency public transport infrastructure. The 237 units proposed would alone contribute 1% to Council's 10-year housing targets as required by the London Plan. The proposal would provide Affordable Housing at a rate of 38%, with a tenure split of 55/45 in favour of London Affordable Rent. Therefore, the proposal would make a sizeable contribution to providing Genuinely Affordable Housing to Ealing Residents and it would offer a good housing mix, with several family units proposed. The proposal would also provide excellent amenity spaces for residents, with roof top spaces maximised to provide good quality communal spaces across both buildings. The Energy Strategy was also strongly supported by Council's Energy Consultant with an overall site-wide cut beyond Part L of the current building regulations of at least 57.3%. The relevant carbon offsetting contribution had been recommended and the energy measures had followed the GLA hierarchy.

The proposal represented a sustainable form of development, that would provide for better quality industrial spaces and an increase in housing, with a good affordable housing offering. The proposed development, whilst a significant increase in height, bulk and massing, represented a coherent architectural narrative that would be consistent with the emerging character of the area and would improve the visual amenity of the area. It was therefore recommended by Officers that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions contained within Annexe 1 to the report and the financial contributions and obligations that were outlined within the Heads of Terms of the 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 an amendment to the Section 106 contributions and the addition of a condition.

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

- As part of the application, there was no need to relocate the bus stop.
- The employment land would benefit from a net uplift of 30 square meters and the proposed floor to ceiling heights on the ground and first floor level would be much more significant as it would allow for more modern types of industrial uses.
- The London Plan required that on locally significant industrial sites where the industrial space was not being re-provided you need to provide affordable housing at 50% to be fast tracked, not 35%. In this instance the industrial space would be re-provided and so the application was eligible for 35% affordable housing at the fast-track rate.
- Air quality would be monitored by the Council's Pollution Technical Team. The Applicant would be required to set up monitors and provide data.
- The Local Plan required that all new disabled parking bays should have electric charging points 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 **214611FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

#### **9 3-15 Stirling Road, Acton**

Joel Holland Turner, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application sought to demolish the existing buildings on the site and construct a building that would co-locate industrial uses with residential uses. The site was designated within LSIS. The introduction of residential uses to the site was considered to be acceptable in principle by Policy E7 of the London Plan and the applicant had followed the Agent of Change process, which demonstrated, subject to conditions, that the proposed residential uses would not compromise the continued functionality of the LSIS, and future residents would be provided good quality living conditions.

It was further explained that the commercial space had been developed as the focus of the scheme, with a strong street presence to both Bollo Lane and Sterling Road. The commercial spaces had been designed to have open floor plans to allow for the greatest amount of flexibility and the increased floor-to-ceiling heights would also improve its useability, to accommodate a number of different industrial-type activities. Not only would the development result in no net loss of industrial floorspace, but the proposal would also result in an uplift of 57%, with an increase from 1,112sqm to 1,954sqm. The servicing and delivery arrangements for the industrial space would be from Sterling Road and the type of uses that could accommodate this space had been identified

as bicycle repair shops, recording studios, art storage and auction, furniture repair and retail, plumbers, and welders.

The Committee was informed that the proposed residential units would provide compliant internal and private amenity areas that would provide good quality living conditions for future residents. The communal amenity spaces had been formed with the site constraints in mind and had utilised roof top spaces to provide communal amenity. A good affordable housing offering had been made, with 35% AH by habitable room, with a tenure split in favour of LAR (London Affordable Rent) at 61.5% to 38.5%.

It had been concluded that, overall, the development presented a sustainable form of development that would intensify the industrial capacity of the LSIS site, as well as contributing to the Council's housing targets and made a good affordable housing offering. It was therefore recommended by Officers that planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement 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 about an additional condition.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **214991FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

#### **10 Land and Buildings to the rear of the Red Lion Public House & 94 High Street, Southall**

Rohan Graham, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application had been presented to the Planning Committee on 21 July 2021 and 14 September 2021. The application had been deferred from consideration in July in order for clarification to be provided on the total number of habitable rooms across the development and the proportion of those that were proposed to be affordable housing. Prior to the September meeting, one additional Shared Ownership dwelling was provided. The application was subsequently deferred from consideration in September with further clarification sought as to how the proposal would provide an improved affordable housing offering.

It was reported that the application had been amended since the September Planning Committee meeting in the following manner:

- Increase of 31sqm floorspace and two additional habitable rooms.
- Altered tenure mix in the following manner:

- Affordable Rent: One additional 3-bed unit. One less 1-bedroom unit.
  - Shared Ownership: Three additional 3-bed units. Three fewer 1-bedroom units.
  - Private Housing: Reduction of 145sqm floorspace and six habitable rooms.
- Minor alterations to storage space, maintenance equipment and corridor widths.

The Committee was informed that the proposal comprised a Section 73 'Minor Material Amendment' application for amendments to the scheme previously approved under reference 192888FUL. The previous application had comprised a detailed proposal for the redevelopment of the site to provide 149 residential dwellings and one ground floor flexible retail/professional services/café or restaurant unit with associated landscaping and car parking. The previous application was presented to the Planning Committee on the 19 February 2020. Following referral to the Mayor of London and the completion of the Section 106 agreement, the planning permission was issued on the 2 March 2021.

The proposals that were subject of the Section 73 application included amendments to the previously agreed scheme comprising of:

- Design refinements to massing and façade design.
- Reduction in size of the commercial unit by 37sqm.
- Amendment to the mix of residential units to reduce the number of studios and two-bedroom units and increase the number of one bedroom and three-bedroom units.
- Reduction in height of Block B by 1 habitable floor and increase the height of Block C by 2 habitable floors.
- Building entrances relocated within Block B and C accessed from central courtyard.
- Cycle storage in blocks B and C relocated adjacent to main building entrances.
- Cycle storage for blocks B and C located within the buildings.

The Committee was made aware that the design refinements had sought to improve the overall massing, materiality and presentation of the building as viewed from Southall Park, the street scene and surrounding sites. The two taller buildings would incorporate a more logical, coherent layout and massing and utilise a more neutral colour palette, in order to allow the colour of the existing landscaping within Southall Park to resonate.

The amended unit mix was a logical response to a slightly altered building footprint. The revised affordable housing mix was a direct result of this response. The affordable housing provision had been assessed against a variety of different measures and it had been determined that the proposal represented an improvement in the affordable housing offering in the following manner:

- Total affordable housing dwellings - increase from 40 to 41 dwellings.
- Percentage of habitable rooms - increase from 35.0% to 36.8%.
- Total floorspace - an increase from 2,417sqm to 2,617sqm.
- Affordable floorspace - an increase from 28.6% to 28.9% of total floorspace would be affordable.

- Total number of persons - an increase from 114 persons to 121 persons within the affordable housing.
- Total number of bedrooms remained exactly the same - 74 affordable bedrooms.

The affordable housing offering was considered to remain equivalent to, or an improvement upon, the offering approved under planning permission 192888FUL. All other aspects of the development would remain consistent with the extant approval and were not matters for consideration within the application.

The Committee was informed that the Section 73 application had been considered against the relevant criteria set out within the London Borough of Ealing's Protocol for minor material amendments following a Grant of planning permission (2011).

On balance the proposal would accord with the relevant National, Strategic and Local Planning policies and guidance and approval could reasonably be granted. It was not considered that there were any other material considerations, which would warrant a refusal of the application. It was therefore recommended by Officers that 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. There were no further updates or amendments.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

#### **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, the minor material amendment for the application REF **213386VAR** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. A Deed of Variation
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent and Informatives.

#### **11 Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Wednesday 15 December 2021.

The meeting of the Committee concluded at 9:14pm.