

# Public Document Pack

## Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

**Date:** Wednesday, 19 July 2023

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

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

R Wall (Chair), D Martin (Vice-Chair), S Khan, S Kohli, A Kelly, A Raza, Y Gordon, M Iqbal, S Padda, L Wall, J Ball and J Gallant

### **Apologies:**

M Hamidi

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Monica Hamidi, with Councillor Muhammad Iqbal present as 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**

There were none on this occasion.

#### **6 Site Visit Attendance**

The following Committee members attended site visits prior to the Committee meeting:

Councillors R Wall, Martin, Ball, Gallant, Gordon, Kelly, Khan, Kohli, Mahmood, Padda, Raza and Iqbal.

Cllr L Wall had sent her apologies.

#### **7 Planning Application - 225069FUL - 239 Horn Lane, Acton, W3 9ED**

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the

application before the Committee was for the construction of a building ranging between 6 to 15 storeys, providing a builders' merchants at the ground floor level and 185 self-contained residential units. The development site was located in Acton, fronting onto Horn Lane with the main line railway to the rear. The site currently included a builders' merchants and 5 commercial units. The builders' merchants was going to be reprovisioned and there was going to be a small uplift in space allocated for commercial uses.

The site was a designated development site under the current local plan and continued to be designated as such in the emerging Draft Local Plan. Mr Holland explained that the proposal was for a tall building by London Plan standards and that, although the site was not designated for the construction of a tall building in the existing local plan, it was listed as an area which was potentially appropriate for a tall building in the Draft Local Plan. It was the opinion of officers that a tall building on the site was going to be in keeping with the emerging context of the area, particularly with the developments in the nearby Friary Park site.

Of the new homes to be provided, the development was going to include 35% affordable housing by habitable room and was going to have a 60/40 split in favour of London Affordable Rent over intermediate housing products. Although the proposal was going to see an increase in residential uses on the site, officers did not consider that the proposal was going to have a negative impact on railway and industrial uses existing on the site and in the area. On account of London Plan requirements, it was the responsibility of the developer to mitigate against impacts of existing noise on the site. The applicant had submitted a revised Noise Assessment for the development during the application process as part of mitigation against this concern.

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 originally set out in the Committee report, additional representations, and the withdrawal of an objection from Firstplan.

Mr Holland informed the Committee that, overall, it was the opinion of officers that the proposal would fully optimise the opportunity of the site, delivering additional housing and providing a more modern space for the Builders' Merchant to occupy. The proposal was recommended for approval, subject to conditions, a Section 106 legal agreement and a stage II referral to the Greater London Authority.

Ms Emma Boyling, an objector to the development who attended virtually via a video link, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- Local services and infrastructure were already overloaded and would be further stretched by a residential development of this scale on the site.
- The building was not an appropriate height for the local area.

- The development risked worsening existing issues relating to highway safety and public transport. The contributions to pedestrian crossings and local transport infrastructure were not sufficient for mitigating the concerns.

Mr Tim Holtham, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. The representation made the following key points:

- The proposal was in-keeping with Ealing's development aims, particularly its Draft Local Plan.
- The proposal was going to provide new affordable housing in an area which was well served in terms of transport links.
- The development was going to maintain the building merchant on the site, which was important given the importance of industry in the local area.

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

- Access to the site was going to be gated to ensure the security of the site and to prevent parking.
- The permission for the development was going to expire after 5 years from the date of the decision.
- Figure 25, page 45 of the officer's report, showed how traffic was going to be managed around the site.
- Officers considered that it was acceptable to have a builders' merchants underneath the development, noting that once the development was finished, merchant traffic was no longer going to be visible from the surrounding areas.
- Whilst the development would see a reduction in daylight and sunlight in some neighbouring windows, it was considered that their retained levels were acceptable.
- The developer was required to submit a ventilation strategy as part of the proposal. It was confirmed that all flats were going to have mechanical ventilation.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **225069FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent;
2. Satisfactory completion of Section 106 and 278 Legal Agreements;  
and
3. A Stage II referral to the Mayor of London.

## **8 Planning Application - 231604FUL - Smiths Farm, Kensington Road, Northolt, UB5 6AH**

Prior to officer's presentation for this item, there was a short adjournment from 7.39pm to 7:42pm.

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for a mainly residential redevelopment of a previously developed industrial site within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The site was located in Northolt and adjoined open land to the north, east and west, including Northala Fields and Marnham Fields.

Mr Robertson informed the Committee that the proposal constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, he explained that this was a brownfield site which had been allocated for residential-led development in the emerging local plan. Mr Robertson explained that it was the view of officers that a range of very special circumstances applied in the case of this proposal which, on balance, outweighed any harm to the Green Belt. Mr Robertson outlined the very special circumstances as follows. The proposal was going to provide:

- 110 units of market housing;
- 111 units of affordable housing;
- 0.5 ha of new, public open space;
- improvements to public accessibility, landscaping and connections between Northala Fields, Marnham Fields and the Grand Union Canal, supported by S106 financial contributions;
- the refurbishment and re-use of Locally Listed Heritage Assets on the site;
- remediation of a contaminated and unsightly site within the Green Belt;
- a biodiversity net gain which would exceed the 10% policy requirement.

Mr Robertson gave further details about the application, including the height, design and layout of the proposal, officers' consideration of the impact of the development on local infrastructure, and the proposed allocations of contributions through a Section 106 legal agreement.

Mr Robertson informed the committee that, overall, it was the opinion of officers that the proposal was going to provide a number of planning and regeneration benefits. In conjunction with the contributions secured through Community Infrastructure Levy payments and Section 106 legal agreement contributions, officers recommended conditional approval subject to Section 106 and 278 legal and highways agreements.

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

- Given there was a long history of industry on the site, it was likely there was contamination on the site. Mitigation against this concern had been secured by way of a condition to the recommended consent.
- The Section 106 legal agreement contribution towards improving parking in the area was likely to go towards investigating the suitability of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and if possible, starting on a consultation on the introduction of one. There was no guarantee that a CPZ would be implemented.
- £220,000 had been secured through Section 106 contributions which was going to be allocated to improving the frequency of bus services from the site to the town centre. The exact nature of improvements to Northolt Town Centre was a matter which was going to be defined at a later stage.
- There had been a previous application on this site which had been rejected in November 2022. That decision had been appealed by the applicant.
- In addition to the very special circumstances noted in the officer's report, the Committee was asked to take into account the non-availability of information from the Greater London Authority about the Council's Housing Land Supply.
- It was the opinion of officers that the difference between the present scheme and the one which had been refused in 2022 a year prior was largely because the previous scheme had a much denser urban layout dominated by car parking and its design did not appear as in-keeping with a Green Belt location as the present scheme.
- Improvements to the locally listed building on the site included demolishing an extension which had been added and changing the use of the building to make it a café.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **231604FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent;
2. Satisfactory completion of Section 106 and Section 278 Legal Agreements; and
3. A Stage II referral to the Mayor of London

**9 Planning Application - 225080FUL - 131-137 Broadway, West Ealing, W13 9BE**

Jenny Knox, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for the construction of a 4 to 9 storey building comprising 94 co-living units and ground floor commercial space in West Ealing. The site was currently occupied by a Kwik-Fit tyre and exhaust repair shop and comprised a single storey workshop building, which would be

demolished if the application was granted consent.

Ms Knox described the co-living product which was being proposed as part of this scheme. The scheme comprised shared working spaces, kitchens, dining areas, lounge, quiet area and games space. Each room would comprise a sleeping area, living area, kitchenette, shower room and built-in storage.

Ms Knox noted that 4 representations had been received in relation to the application. It was the opinion of officers that many of the concerns raised in the representations were mitigated by the conditions proposed. Ms Knox noted that Section 106 legal agreement contributions had been secured. Amongst these contributions, officers had negotiated an offer of £500,000 in place of provision of affordable housing.

Ms Knox also noted the impact of the scheme on the visual amenity of the area and heritage assets. Officers considered that the scheme was not going to have a negative impact on local heritage assets, and that the building's proposed design could improve the appearance of the Broadway and act as a "gateway" to the Town Centre.

Overall, Ms Knox informed the Committee that it was the opinion of officers that the scheme was going to provide a number of planning and regeneration benefits. On balance, officers considered that the proposal was consistent with the relevant plans and legislation and recommended that the Committee approve it subject to Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements.

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 description of the scheme in officers' report, amendments to the recommendation and additional clarifications about references to the London Plan.

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

- The Council had separate flood risk conditions to those which would be set by Thames Water. The applicant was going to have to go through a separate process with Thames Water to satisfy them that the impact of the proposal in terms of flooding was not going to be adverse.
- The visual impact of the proposal was considered acceptable by officers, particularly given its design with a stepped height at the back of the building to ensure lesser impacts on the local parks and housing estates.
- There was going to be a £41,000 contribution by the applicant towards sports recreational facilities. This contribution was going to be ring-fenced to the local area, although the exact area had not yet been defined.
- It was typical for co-living units to include a kitchenette. Officers were satisfied that the kitchenettes, given their size and the facilities in them,

did not render the units self-contained.

- There was no proposed amenity space for children, given that the co-living product was for age range 16 – 25 and not for young children.
- The Community Review Panel was not consulted during the application process.
- The applicant had complied with their duties to publicise their development plans, and the Council took steps to ensure that this had been the case.
- If, in the future, an occupier wished to change the use of the commercial units on the ground floor of the development to residential units, an application for a change of use would have to be made.
- The applicant did attempt to negotiate with landowners of the surrounding areas to the development site to propose a development with a wider footprint, although these attempts were unsuccessful.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **225080FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

**10 Date of the Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 16 August 2023.

Meeting commenced: 7.00 pm

Meeting finished: 9.04 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 6 September  
2023

R Wall (Chair)

This page is intentionally left blank