

# Public Document Pack

## Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

**Date:** Wednesday, 22 June 2022

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

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

R Wall (Chair), J Ball, J Gallant, M Hamidi, M Iqbal, A Kelly, S Khan, T Mahmood (Vice-Chair), S Padda, M Rice, K Sahota and G Stafford

### **Apologies:**

A Young

**Also present:** Councillor F Conti

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

Councillor J Gallant substituted for Councillor A Young.

### **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 17 November 2021 and 16 February 2022.

### **RESOLVED:**

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

## **6 Site Visit Attendance**

The following Councillors had attended site visits on Saturday 18 June 2022:

Cllrs R Wall, Mahmood, Ball, Kelly, Iqbal, Padda, Rice, Sahota.

## **7 Hanger Lane Gyrotory, Hanger Lane, Ealing, W5 1DL**

Sean Moulton, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application site was currently being developed to a part 7, 9 and 13 storey student accommodation development containing 562 rooms. The application before the committee was for a 3 storey roof extension to the 13 storey building and alterations and two storey extension to the 7 and 9 stories buildings. Mr Moulton reported that the site was located within the Hanger Lane Gyrotory, north of Hanger Lane Underground Station and Underground railway lines and that the surrounding area contained a mix of land uses including residential, retail and commercial. There were two conservation areas nearby, Brunswick Conservation Area (to the south) and Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate (to the south-west) of the application site.

The Committee was informed that the proposal was for 144 student accommodation rooms (72 additional rooms per floor) and an additional level on the 'Sky Club' to provide an additional floor of amenity space. The proposal contained 35% affordable student accommodation in relation to the net increase in additional units. This equated to 50 rooms which would be affordable rent, subject to rent caps set out in the London Plan.

Weighing up all the material considerations, the proposed development was deemed by officers to be acceptable and would comply with development plan policies and the national guidance. 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 amendments to conditions of the application since the publication of agenda, as well additional information on disabled off-site parking provision and the mix of affordable units.

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

- The proposed new storeys and extensions were a big increase on the originally approved scheme. The proposal would lead to a significant increase in population on the site and could lead to overshadowing for the residential areas nearby.
- Sitting in the middle of a key roundabout on the A40, it was important that any development on the site was designed to be a gateway to Ealing. The proposal failed to meet this standard, with the design of the

building deemed to be monotonous and repetitive.

- The disabled facilities fell short of what was needed, with only two ramps included in the application.

Sunny Desai, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. Mr Desai raised the following key points:

- The applicant sought to meet the need for student accommodation, freeing up larger houses in the borough for local families.
- The application aimed to deliver more amenity space for residents, with the proposed ratio of amenity space to residents comparing well with similar student accommodation schemes.
- It was disagreed that the design was monotonous, and contended that this application included new design features, such as the elongated copper thins, which improved the visual quality of the building.

Councillor Fabio Conti, a local Ward Councillor, made a representation in objection to the committee, which included the following points:

- The scale, height and prominence of the building was deemed inappropriate for the area, particularly given the site was already on a hill.
- The proposed development was visible from the two local conservation areas and was likely to overshadow neighbouring streets, including Priory Gardens.
- The development would likely add traffic to the gyratory, which already suffered from congestion, with issues particularly with the increased number of deliveries likely to the flats.
- There were concerns about the design of the new proposal, with it noted that there were only single staircases after the seventh floor.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to the questions and points raised, officers made the following points of clarification:

- A legal agreement would be in place to ensure that 35% of the units were used for student accommodation. Anything outside of this proportion would have to be applied for.
- There were measures which could be taken to inhibit Airbnb's on the site.
- Whilst the Section 106 legal agreement was not able to include provision of more trees because all contributions must be necessary for the development, the agreement did require contribution to the Council's parks team.
- Concerns about congestion during the construction process would be managed through a construction management plan.

Following discussion, the committee proceed to vote on the application.

## **RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application REF **220091FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.
3. A Community Infrastructure Levy payment.

### **8 Site of Former Northolt Grange Community Centre and Part of St Raphael's Catholic School, Northolt, UB5 6NF**

Wade Banks, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee was for the development of 92 residential dwellings across three buildings. The buildings would range from two to five storeys in height, and 100% of the units would be affordable housing. The application included the demolition of the existing structures on the site, provision of amenity spaces, and public realm and landscaping works.

The application site was located at the former Northolt Grange Community Centre and at the eastern part of the St Raphael's Catholic School, in Northolt. The Northolt Grange Community Centre had been vacant since 2017 and all user groups of the facility were relocated at the time. St Raphael's Catholic Primary School was reducing from a 3 to 2 form entry school, based on the determined local need decreasing.

Officers acknowledged the 236 objections to the scheme received during the public consultation. However, the committee was informed that after careful consideration of the points raised, officers did not believe that the issues raised were sufficient to merit refusal, on balance. Officers recommended that the committee grant the application, subject to conditions of consent and satisfactory 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 amendments to officers' recommendations and amendments to proposed conditions. The briefing note also outlined additional representations which had been received since the publication of the committee report and it included officers' responses.

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

- There were already significant issues with congestion in the area, particularly during the school run and peak times, and this would be worsened by this new development. The parking was also deemed to be inadequate, with the likely consequence that residents of the development would be forced to park on neighbouring streets.
- The 4-5 storey building was deemed to be uncharacteristic and out of place in an area which was comprised mainly of 2 storey houses. The

tallest building would overlook the school.

- The influx of 300 additional residents was causing concern, with strain on local facilities like dentists, doctors and shops.

Mr Ian Anderson, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. His representation included the following key points:

- The development would be providing 84 affordable rent units, exceeding local plan targets and forming a key part of the Council's strategy to make affordable homes.
- The Grange Community Centre had been vacant since 2018 and developers had been assisting St Raphael's school as they downsized from a 3 form entry school to a 2 form entry school.
- The applicant had run several tests to investigate the issue of overlooking from the site and had found that the proposal would not lead to a lack of privacy for the school or for the surrounding area.

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

- Whilst there were some classrooms in the school which would be impacted by the shadows of the proposed development, these classrooms all had other windows from which they could get light.
- Local data and modelling had shown that the development would likely add around 40 cars to the local area. Given that the proposed car park for the development had capacity for 27 cars, and a traffic survey had shown that there was sufficient space for an additional 13 cars on neighbouring streets, officers had deemed the parking provision adequate.
- The application proposed to move the multi-use games area (MUGA) to a new location, closer to the road, since the old location had been out of sight and had become a hotspot for anti-social behaviour.
- The applicant had submitted an ecology assessment with the application, which considered the fauna and flora in the area. It found that the proposal was exceptionally unlikely to have a negative impact on local ecology.

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 **220545FULR3** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

## 9 West World, West Gate, Ealing, W5 1DT

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee was for the demolition of the existing, mostly vacant, 10-storey office building known as “Westworld” and the construction of an industrial building in its place.

Mr Holland noted that the application site existed within the Park Royal/West Gate/Quill Street Strategic Industrial Location. Whilst no potential occupant for the site had yet been secured, the development had been designed to optimise the site for potential industrial uses and to allow flexibility for future occupants.

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. On this item, there was no additional information included.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to questions asked, officers responded that, during the site visit many cars had been parked illegally which had created the perception that there was badly organised parking at 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 **216832FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

## 10 Former Northolt Park Social Club, Sussex Crescent, Northolt, UB5 4DR

Xanna Tan Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee sought permission for the demolition of the existing community building and the construction of a four-storey building in its place comprising 26 flats for London Affordable Rent. The development included associated on-street disabled parking space, cycle storage, refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping. The development would provide a unit mix of six one-bed, two-person units and twenty two-bed, four person units. The proposed number of units would sit comfortably within the site and would increase utilisation of an underdeveloped brownfield site.

In officers’ view, the impact of the development would be acceptably mitigated through conditions and Section 106 contributions, which would be directed towards local healthcare provision; post construction energy monitoring; town centre improvement; local schools, on-street disabled bays and restrictions to parking permits for future residents in the Controlled Parking Zone.

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 and clarification on corrections to the report, on the location of the lift on the site and on the recommended conditions relating to the lift.

The Committee asked questions and debated the proposal. In response to some of the questions and points raised, Officers confirmed that the proposed height of the building was deemed to fit well in the context of the area, with the flat roof making best use of space whilst preventing the building from being overbearing.

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 **221003FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

**11 The Straight, Southall, UB1 1QX**

Rohan Graham, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the committee sought permission for the approval of reserved matters in respect of phase 2 of the development of The Straight. Phase 2 sought to deliver 1,158 new homes (market and affordable), with associated parking, soft and hard landscaped public spaces and private amenity spaces. Additionally, 5,533sqm of commercial floorspace was proposed.

The outline consent for the overall scheme was granted in 2010. Mr Graham outlined the key changes to the development proposal which followed a previous consent for other reserved matters in phase 2 in 2019. Whilst the application maintained the key commercial centre of the development, and included provision of 'Affordable Workspace', Mr Graham informed the committee that the total floorspace for commercial use had been reduced in this phase. A hotel was no longer planned on the development, and there was to be a reduction in floorspace for the cinema. The proposal included a greater number of residential dwellings and a new community centre.

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 in the original report, amendments to the proposed conditions to the application and a summary of further representations from the NHS about the proposed Health Centre.

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

- The original outline consent had included several conditions which related to flooding. The consent anticipated the level of development being proposed and measures were agreed to fully mitigate the flood risks which accompanied the level of development.
- The provision of affordable commercial space was recommended by an external review body partly on the basis of the London Plan. The provision was aligned with Council policy although it was not yet in the Local Plan. It was considered that demand was likely, given that the recommendation was made.
- Whilst The Straight was part of the Southall Opportunity Area, it was not in a designated commercial area. Weight was given to the commercial floor space in considering the application, but this had to be considered considering all other factors.
- The outline consent gave two access points to the site. The intersections were nearing completion. Road improvements were included as part of the original Section 106 agreement.

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 **216077REM** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 Legal Agreement.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

**12 Date of the Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 20 July 2022.

Meeting commenced: 7.05 pm

Meeting finished: 9.40 pm

Signed:

R Wall (Chair)