

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 1 March 2023

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

Attendees (in person): Councillors

R Wall (Chair), J Ball, D Martin, S Padda, A Young, M Hamidi, M Iqbal, A Kelly, S Kohli, G Shaw, Y Gordon and C Summers

Apologies:

T Mahmood (Vice-Chair)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillor Mahmood 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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting on Wednesday, 18 January 2023 were agreed as a true and correct record.

6 Site Visit Attendance

It was noted that the following members attended site visits prior to the Committee:

Councillors Wall, Martin, Padda, Hamidi, Iqbal, Kelly, Shaw, Gordon and Summers.

7 Planning Application - 224785REM - Plots A and B, Middlesex Business Centre, Bridge Road, Southall, UB2 4AB (Norwood Green)

Chris Maltby, Planning Officer, introduced the item and explained that the application before the Committee was for Reserved Matters Approval for the first phase of development of Middlesex Business Centre. Outline consent for the development was granted in November 2019, and it outlined a mixed-use redevelopment which comprised the demolition of most of the existing buildings on the site and their replacement with a mix of residential units, hotel floor space, flexible office space, flexible retail space and community floor space. Mr Maltby noted that the Margarine works Factory façade, and the Sunrise Radio building were not going to be demolished. The outline permission also included the proposed Maypole Park.

The wider Middlesex Business Centre site was 4.82 he in size and was located off the north-eastern end of Merrick Road. Its southern boundary bordered Bridge Road, its northern boundary was with the overground railway and its eastern boundary was with the former Honey Monster Factory development site. From the boundary with Merrick Road, Southall Station was approximately 300 metres to the east. The site was approximately 700m from Southall Town Centre, which was designated as a “Major” Centre in the London Plan.

Mr Maltby continued to detail the reserved matters application which was before the Committee for their determination. The application related to Plots A and B of the development, located in the northern part of the wider site. The reserved matters included approval of layout, access (within the site), scale, appearance, and landscaping. This phase was going to deliver 867 dwellings (of which 282 were going to be affordable), a new internal road network with integrated cycle lanes, bus stops, service bays, extensive shared amenity spaces, dedicated play spaces, a 180-bedroom hotel and a variety of units for commercial uses.

In addition to the above developments, the proposals were also going to bring forward the first tranche of benefits secured by the Section 106 Legal Agreement agreed as part of the outline permission. In addition to a community infrastructure levy, this phase was going to trigger funding of £6.13 million to be used towards key transport infrastructure, bus service improvements, education, healthcare and nearby parks and open spaces.

In light of the considerations he had set out, Mr Maltby informed the Committee that it was the opinion of officers that the proposals were going to provide a significant economic boost for Southall and bring what had been a long term underutilised site back into productive use. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in Annex 1 of the committee report.

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 clarifications to the report, further written representations and amendments to the proposed conditions.

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

- The new buildings were going to have a negative impact on the hours of daylight and sunlight on neighbouring buildings, compromising residents' right to light. Residents had conducted a solar study and found that on the longest day of the year the lower floors of Donniford House (a neighbouring block) were only likely to receive around one hour of direct sunlight.
- The height and footprint of the proposed buildings risked the privacy of residents in neighbouring buildings.
- The application did not sufficiently address the impact which the proposals risked having on already strained public services in Southall such as health care facilities, dentists and schools.

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

- Phase 1 of the development had been carefully designed to adhere to the existing outline consent and to fit well with wider development in the area.
- The applicant had engaged extensively with local stakeholders through consultation, including with a design review panel and a community review panel. The applicant had introduced a public arts strategy for the development which was going to celebrate the culture of the site and help to integrate new residents.
- Sustainability was a key aspect of the development, and this was reflected through the submitted designs and plans. The application supported sustainable travel, and there were going to be around 1600 cycle spaces provided and a new cycle route along the proposed Healum Avenue.

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

- Although during this initial phase Healum Avenue was going to terminate in a roundabout, the intention was that the road would extend beyond the roundabout and will come forward through the development of the neighbouring site (Former Honey Monster Factory).
- The availability of healthcare and community resources as impacted by the proposed new development was a relevant planning consideration for the Committee. The developer had agreed to make significant section 106 contributions to offset any negative impact additional residents in the area might have.
- Of the 116 parking spaces proposed, it had not yet been agreed at this stage how many would be reserved for hotel guests.
- Daylight and sunlight assessments had been submitted and independently verified as part of the outline application. It was deemed

at the outline stage that the new development was not going to have any adverse effects on day light and sun light on neighbouring blocks. The proposals were subsequently reassessed in respect of this application and again no significant adverse impacts were identified.

- A construction management plan was going to be submitted by the applicant to ensure that minimal impact was caused to residents during the construction phases of the development.
- The position of the buildings, their widths, depths and heights were all considered and agreed previously at the outline stage and were not before the Committee for their determination as part of this item.
- The broad strategy which informed the way the heights of the buildings had been set was that the tallest buildings were placed closest to the railway and that the buildings closer to the road were shorter.
- It was a London Plan minimum requirement that 20% of all parking spaces were going to be provided with electric vehicle charging points. The development included further passive provision so that if demand increased in the future, it was going to be possible to provide more charging points.
- Whilst it was possible that some of the commercial units on the site could come forward as healthcare facilities, this was not mandatory and hence Section 106 contributions had been secured in relation to healthcare in the area.
- Given that the outline permission for the Middlesex Business Centre development was granted in 2019, officers advised that it was likely that buyers of flats in nearby residential blocks would have been made aware through conveyancing enquiries that the Middlesex Business Centre site was likely to be developed.

The representative of the applicant, Ms MacMillan, was invited to clarify a question relating to Maypole Park which Mr Maltby was not able to answer. Ms MacMillan confirmed that the creation of Maypole Park was going to take place in a later phase of the development and details of its facilities would become available as future phases came before the Committee.

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 **224785REM** be GRANTED subject to successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent.

8 Date of the Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was Wednesday, 5 April 2023.

Meeting commenced: 7.02 pm

Meeting finished: 7.47 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 5 April 2023

R Wall (Chair)