

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 1 November 2023

Venue: The Atrium - Perceval House

Attendees (in person): Councillors

R Wall (Chair), D Martin (Vice-Chair), T Mahmood, A Kelly, A Raza, M Hamidi, M Iqbal, S Padda, L Wall, G Shaw, A Steed and F Conti

Apologies:

K Sahota, S Khan, S Kohli and Y Gordon

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillors Gordon, Kohli, Sahota, and Khan.

Councillor Iqbal substituted for Councillor Gordon, Councillor L Wall for Councillor Kohli and Councillor Raza for Councillor Sahota.

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 19 October 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

6 Site Visit Attendance

The following councillors attended site visits for the applications on the agenda prior to the meeting:

Councillors R Wall, Martin, Mahmood, Kelly, Iqbal, Padda and Conti.

7 Planning application - 223090FUL - Sherwood Close (Former Dean Gardens Estate), West Ealing, London, W13 9YP (Walpole)

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for the redevelopment of the site, including the demolition of the existing building and the construction of two buildings in their place ranging from 6 to 14 storeys. These buildings were proposed to provide 185 self-contained residential units. The development site was located in West Ealing, with the site having frontages onto Northfield Avenue, Tawny Close and Sherwood Close. Northfield Allotments were to the east of the development.

Mr Holland outlined some of the history to the development, noting that the proposals related to Phase 3 (the final phase) of the Sherwood Close (Dean Gardens) estate redevelopment. Phase 3 had been covered by a planning permission consent given in October 2015. The updated proposals involved an increase in the number of units to be created as part of phase 3, an increase in the height of the development, and a change in the massing of the buildings.

The increase in the number of proposed units was accompanied by proposals for affordable housing to be brought forward in this phase, which had not originally been planned. The 10 3-bedroom units were all going to be affordable housing, which was particularly desirable as this would supply housing for low-income families. Despite the increase in height, Mr Holland explained that officers considered that the proposals were an improvement on the design of the original scheme, particularly in that the new proposals included staggered building heights and opportunities for new cross development links and public realm improvements.

Overall, officers considered that the development constituted one which maximised the opportunity for housing on the site and which was well-connected to public infrastructure. It was considered to be a significant improvement to the consented scheme, and was accordingly recommended for approval, subject to conditions and 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 an amendment to the officers' recommendation and additional clarifications to the report.

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

- The proposed buildings were too tall in the context of the local area, with buildings near to the estate tending to range between 5 – 7 stories. The heights of the proposed buildings were taller than those recommended for West Ealing in Ealing's tall buildings strategy 2022.
- The proposals were likely to change the scale and character of the local area, with particular risk to the character of the community allotments next door to the site.
- Whilst residents were supportive of redevelopment for the local area, it

appeared to them that the planning process had been rushed with little time for engagement and consultation with local residents ahead of the decision.

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

- The proposals formed the third phase of the Dean Gardens Estate regeneration scheme. The proposals were designed to maximise the potential of the site, which was brownfield and highly accessible.
- There was a historic planning permission for the scheme which was granted in 2015. The new application was an improvement on the existing consent, comprising 37 new social rent units of which 10 were going to be 3-bedroom family units. There had been no affordable housing proposed in phase 3 of the original scheme.
- Other benefits of the scheme included the planting of new trees, a biodiversity net gain, new employment opportunities, as well as the provision of a new pocket park and community garden.

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

- In the committee report, officers acknowledged the provisions of the Local Plan in relation to tall buildings and their suitability for this site. On balance, given the findings of the townscape impact assessment, officers considered that the proposed heights were acceptable in this case.
- Officers disagreed that the application had been rushed, given that the original application had been submitted in July 2022 and that the duration of the application had been longer than statutory timeframes.
- Page 9 of the report was corrected to state that “Of the uplift in units between the approved and proposed schemes, the development provides for 68% affordable housing, which are all within a social rent tenure”.
- The development site was a brownfield site because it had been developed on before.
- Consent had been given to planning applications for buildings in the local area taller than the proposed 14 storeys of this development. One example was the consent given to the last phase of the Green Man Lane Estate, with buildings in this development to be up to 16 storeys.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **223090FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent;

1. Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement; and
2. A Stage II referral to the Greater London Authority.

8 Planning application - 223545FUL - The Hambrough Tavern, The Broadway, Southall, Middlesex, UB1 1NG (Southall West)

Joel Holland, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for the demolition of existing buildings on the application site and the construction of a part 5, part 17 storey building comprising build to rent resident units, community space, and the re-provision of an existing public house on the site. The site was located in Southall West, close to the canal, with prominent frontages onto both Bankside and The Broadway. Officers considered it had the potential to become a gateway building to Southall, given its prominent position on the border with the London Borough of Hillingdon, and its location in an area which played a historically important role in the development of Southall.

Mr Holland described the residential units which would be created as part of this development. They were going to be build to rent units, which were considered to be strategically important in both the London Plan and the Draft Local Plan. Although the site was not allocated for development in the existing Local Plan, it was part of a potential allocation within the Draft Local Plan. It was also noted that there was an existing consent for a hotel scheme of up to 15 storeys on the site, although officers were satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that a hotel scheme was no longer viable on the site, allowing the principle of this residential led development to remain acceptable.

Mr Holland provided an overview of officers' assessment of the design, scale and height of the proposed development. Officers believed that the scheme did not depart significantly in terms of scale and height from the existing consent for a 15-storey building on the site. Mr Holland also noted some of the key strengths of the design, including an interesting façade design which used ceramic panelling glazed with terracotta. The use of these materials were a reference to the heritage of Southall.

Overall, it was the view of officers that the scheme was well considered. Officers found no reasons that would warrant refusal of the application. Mr Holland therefore recommended that the committee grant the application, subject to conditions, a Section 106 legal agreement, and a 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 notes and clarifications to the committee report.

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:

- There was a supportive policy context to the re-provision of the public house on the site. The London Plan sought to support the operation of public houses through planning policy, with public houses understood to be spaces for community gatherings.
- In order for the applicant to change the use of the ground floor from a public house to another use, for instance a commercial use, the applicant would have to make an application to change the use class. As part of the application, the applicant would have to supply robust evidence that a public house was not viable on the site.
- The proposals for the unique cladding design were brought to the Council by the applicant rather than the proposals being requested by the Council. Officers were confident that this indicated that the applicant was serious about delivering on the design that was proposed. In any case, there were conditions on the materials the applicant could use for cladding.
- Given the proximity of the territorial army centre to the development site, officers consulted the Ministry of Defence of the proposals. The Ministry of Defence requested a bird hazard management plan to be produced.
- There was a community asset separate to the public house.
- It was a common design of tall buildings to include a roof terrace communal space on the top level of the building. Any such roof terraces were required to comply with building regulations in order to ensure the safety of the areas.
- There was a contribution of £50,000 towards the canals and river trust. This had been requested to expand the scope of the Southall Wellbeing Way project.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **223545FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

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

9 Planning application - 216215FUL - 13-15 The Green, Southall, UB2 4AH (Norwood Green)

John Robertson, Planning Officer, introduced the report and explained that the application before the Committee was for the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a part 23, part 19 and part 14 storey building on a derelict commercial site just south of Southall town centre. The

proposals were for a residential-led redevelopment comprising 95 residential units, with flexible community/amenity space on the ground floor available for residents and the local community. There was also going to be communal outdoor amenity space in terraces at the first and fourteenth floor levels.

Mr Robertson noted that an application had been approved by the planning committee in July 2022, although this had required revision due to changes in fire safety regulations. The proposals had been amended to provide a second staircase in the building, which had led to changes in the shape of the building and an enlargement of its core area.

Some key aspects of the proposals remained unchanged from the consented application. The proposed tenure split remained unchanged, with 70% intermediate and 30% London Affordable Rent. This was not the preferred tenure split of the Council, although officers were satisfied on the basis of the evidence submitted by the applicant that this was the best tenure split which was financially viable for the applicant. Mr Robertson also noted that the proposed height of the building was unchanged from the existing consent. Whilst the site was not within a site identified as appropriate for tall buildings, it did lie in the Southall Gateway character area and was close to other sites in the area which had gained consent for similarly tall buildings.

Mr Robertson noted the public realm improvements secured through the scheme. These included widening pavements, tree planting, new benches, and integrated street lighting between public realm area and the raised highway. Whilst the urban greening factor was below what the Council would usually expect, Mr Robertson noted that this was likely due to small size of the site. There were also going to financial contributions as a result of the scheme through a Section 106 Legal Agreement and a Community Infrastructure Levy, with contributions overall in the region of £1.2 million.

Overall, it was the view of officers that the scheme was likely to provide a number of planning and regeneration benefits. On balance, it was considered that the proposed development accorded with relevant planning policy. Mr Robertson therefore recommended that the committee grant the application, subject to conditions, Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements, 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 amendments to the recommendation in the committee report and details further comments which had been received. Mr Robertson explained that the London Fire Brigade had raised concerns about lobbies to the fire evacuation lifts and the 14th floor amenity area. Mr Robertson explained that the applicant had provided a response to the concerns and had satisfied officers that the proposed design was compliant with the London Plan and relevant fire safety legislation. It was also noted that no objections had been raised by the Health and Safety Executive in relation to the scheme and that the proposals were to be reviewed by the Greater London Authority as part of a Stage II referral.

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

- Because of the size of the site, it had not been possible to offer on-site parking. It was proposed for one parking bay on Hortis Road to be converted into a disabled parking bay.
- There had been discussions about the potential for additional disabled parking bays being allocated on The Green. However, there was a risk that parking pressures in the local area could worsen if additional bays were converted to disabled bays. Officers were asked to probe this issue further and to feedback to the chair and vice-chair of the committee on any developments in provision of parking for the scheme.
- There had not been any agreed parking for the consented scheme, so it was officers' view that the agreed disabled parking bay on Hortis Road was an improvement on the original application.
- Loading and servicing areas were planned to be on-site at the ground floor level. Entrance to the site for these areas was considered adequate by the Council's highways team.
- Because there were two fire evacuation lifts rather than one, and each one was in a separated ventilated corridor, these corridors provided the dedicated lobby area noted by the London Fire Brigade and these would be suitable for refuge for all fire scenarios considered by fire safety guidance.
- The ground floor amenity area had not changed from the previous consent. It was available for use by residents of the flats in the buildings and by any community groups which came forward.
- It was common for tall building developments to propose amenity areas for their residents on a top floor terrace. There were conditions proposed to ensure high balustrades were installed to ensure the safety of the terrace and it was noted that the plans were to be scrutinised by building regulations and the Health and Safety Executive.
- Public realm landscaping was going to be managed and maintained by the development's managing agent, whilst works to the area outside of the applicant's control were going to be dealt with by a Section 278 Agreement.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for application REF **216215FUL** 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 Greater London Authority.
4. A Community Infrastructure Levy payment to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

10 Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 13 December 2023.

Meeting commenced: 7.00 pm

Meeting finished: 8.26 pm

Signed:

Dated: Wednesday, 13 December
2023

R Wall (Chair)