

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 24 April 2013 at 7.00pm

PRESENT: Councillors Ray Wall, Gulaid, Kang, Murtagh, Rennie, Summers, Lauren Wall, Potts, Anderson, Ashok Kapoor, Reen, Stacey and Ball.

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Rajinder Mann and Bakhai

1. Apologies for Absence

There were none.

2. Urgent Matters

There were none.

3. Matters to be Considered in Private

There were none.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Ball declared a personal interest in Application 05, Warren Farm, by virtue of him filming occasionally at football club training grounds in the course of his work. Councillor Ball confirmed that he had not been employed by Queens Park Rangers (QPR) Football Club to film at their training facilities.

Councillor Ray Wall declared a prejudicial interest in Application 05, Warren Farm, by virtue of him being a member of QPR and lifelong supporter. Councillor Ray Wall confirmed that he would stand down for the item.

Councillor Rennie proposed a motion that Councillor Summers take the Chair for Application 05, Warren Farm in Councillor Ray Wall's absence. The motion was seconded by Councillor Gulaid and subsequently agreed to by the Committee.

5. Minutes

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2013 are agreed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

6. Site Visit Attendance

The Chair confirmed that he and Councillors Gulaid, Kang, Murtagh, Rennie, Summers, Lauren Wall, Potts, Ashok Kapoor, Reen and Stacey attended the site visits on 20 April 2013. Councillors Ball and Anderson did not attend the site visits.

7. **Planning Applications and Enforcement Reports**

The Head of Planning Services submitted reports in relation to the following planning applications for determination by the Committee.

Application 05 in respect of **Warren Farm, Windmill Lane, Southall UB2 4NE** (Ward: Norwood Green). Redevelopment of the site, following demolition of the existing buildings, to provide a first team training and academy facility for Queen's Park Rangers Football Club, incorporating a two-storey, with basement, training centre building, a three-storey multi-functional operations building, an indoor hall building, a single storey maintenance building and a single storey plant building, along with three First Team pitches and seven Academy/Youth pitches, plus the re-provision of community facilities incorporating a single storey Community Trust building linked to the indoor hall (shared with QPR), a single storey community building, incorporating changing rooms, showers, wc's and social space and eleven football pitches, including one artificial pitch, and three cricket wickets. In addition, the development proposes associated developments including 453 permanent car parking spaces (plus overspill parking for a further 259 cars), flood lighting, boundary treatments, an additional vehicle and pedestrian point of access onto Windmill Lane, hard and soft landscaping and engineering works to re-grade the site to provide level playing surfaces (Received: 21/12/2012) (Due: 22/03/2013).

Councillor Ray Wall left the meeting and Councillor Summers took the Chair at this point.

Nic Ferriday, speaking on behalf of Brent River and Canal Society and the Warren Farm Radio Flyers, outlined a number of points against the application. The airspace over the site is currently used by Warren Farm Radio Flyers. Under the plan there would be a massive reduction in the airspace allowed for flying. This is particularly important for people learning to fly as they cannot tightly control their plane. There is doubt whether youngsters could realistically be taught any more so an important community facility would be lost. The vast increase in parking is inappropriate and runs counter to sustainability policies including biodiversity, air pollution and climate change and is contrary to the spirit of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The planning report admits that the proposal would be an inappropriate development and then tries to argue that there are special circumstances which would allow for the inappropriateness criterion to be overridden. We show that there are no very special circumstances. There is no compelling need for development as what are being offered are football pitches that are already there and well used. Neither is there an overriding benefit to the community as claimed in the report. The community will have limited access to the facilities in return for losing two thirds of the land. Elthorne Sports Centre is less than half a mile away and already has a sports hall, grass and non-grass pitches and caters for women and the disabled. On there not being a suitable alternative brownfield site for QPR, this is not a justification for fencing off our open space and building over it. There are, therefore, no special circumstances that justify this inappropriate development.

Carolyn Brown, speaking on behalf of Hanwell Community Forum and Olde Hanwell Residents Association, outlined a number of points against the application. Paragraph 7.17 of the London Plan states that London's MOL should receive the same level of protection as green belt and essentially ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL. Paragraph 7.56 of the London Plan says appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. What is proposed is on a large scale with the majority of the buildings associated with the applicants and not the community's needs. The proposed indoor hall at 17m high is equivalent to a five to seven storey residential, significantly

higher than the existing building and positioned on the highest, most visible point. The design of these buildings would not look out of place at Heathrow Airport. Paragraph 3.1 of Ealing's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) states that appropriate developments on MOL should be of a small scale, height and design sympathetic to its setting in a major open area. This proposal patently fails here. At least two thirds of the site will also be surrounded by high, opaque security fencing which will restrict open access and, contrary to UDP 3.1, damage the landscape, openness and natural character of the area. The activities and services can only be reached by people with their own transport. The site has the worst possible Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of zero, Transport for London (TfL) will not be adding a bus route to the site and the offer of the applicants shuttle bus when not in use by them is risible. It is also likely that no more than a handful of the borough's youngsters will benefit from the premier facilities. Overall, the applicant has failed to prove, with reference to Paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), that any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. These are the borough's best football pitches. They are well drained and no matches have been cancelled due to water logging for several years. This is prime public land to be signed away, until 2213, at a peppercorn rent to a commercial organisation. Grants and other private partnerships should be sought to build and maintain sports facilities so that appropriate and exemplary facilities are provided on MOL for the community not a commercial organisation. It should remain protected MOL open to all and the application should be refused. Carolyn Brown then presented a petition of 108 signatures to the Chair calling on the Council to reject the proposal to fence off and build excessively on Warren Farm and to rejuvenate the site that they have poorly managed and re-open Warren Farm as a sport ground for the public, schools and community.

Patrick Grincell, speaking on behalf of Savill's, the applicants agents, outlined a number of points in support of the application. Warren Farm is the largest sports ground in the borough but it is under utilised and in need of development. QPR would be delighted to work with Ealing Council on significantly improving the facilities and pitches at Warren Farm. The club will base its Community Trust at Warren Farm and its rooms will be available to the community at no cost to the Council. With regards to the improved sports facilities, they will also be accessible to all including disabled people, older people, women and girls and those who may be socially excluded or out of education or employment. Overall, the project will improve residents health, provide space for seminars, education and ward forums and help Ealing meet various priorities. The project also includes various benefits to the surrounding area. A pedestrian crossing will be added on Windmill Lane, there will be improved pedestrian and cyclist movement along the front of the site and access to the site will be improved. On the points made by the objectors, the Warren Farm Radio Flyers will be provided for and, following an initial referral, the Mayor's office has accepted that special circumstances have been made out in this case. The Committee were urged to grant the application.

Lord Young, speaking on behalf of Norwood Green Residents Association, outlined a number of points in support of the application. The key question for local residents was whether they could trust Ealing Council and QPR to provide facilities that will benefit the community as a whole. The Council's track record in Southall, such as the development of facilities at Spikesbridge Park, has been good and the consultation on the Warren Farm proposals has been adequate and involved the local community. With regards to QPR, its trust has a good record of engaging with local communities. The existing facilities at Warren Farm are decaying, the pitches are not in a good condition with declining usage and the site costs the Council almost £70k per year to maintain. The new facilities, including disabled parking, improved pitches, indoor sports hall and improvements to paths and cycleways, will benefit Norwood Green. On the point made by an

objector that the site was being given away, QPR would be investing £30 million into much needed sports facilities for the borough. The Committee were asked to grant the application. Councillor Bakhai, Elthorne Ward Councillor, outlined a number of points against the application. Warren Farm needs to be improved and regenerated but there are a number of issues with the application. The height of the main building proposed is too tall. Paragraph 3.1 of Ealing's UDP states that appropriate developments on MOL should be of a small scale, height and design sympathetic to its setting in a major open area. The officer's report admits that what is proposed is not small and constitutes an inappropriate development on MOL. Councillor Bakhai queried why the height of the main indoor hall has to be 16m. The height of Tottenham Hotspur's main indoor hall at their training facilities situated on MOL is 10.5m, who must have to abide by the same Football Association regulations. Councillor Bakhai queried whether other clubs have better mitigated against the impact of their main halls. It is untrue, as stated in the officer report, that the impact of the proposals on the neighbouring Elthorne Ward will be minimal whose residents look up at the site. On access and transport, the site has a poor PTAL rating of zero. Despite Hanwell residents enjoying access to Warren Farm for years, the only proposed access will be via Windmill Lane. The proposals should include access from Hanwell and an improved path around the site. On the consultation exercise, only the residents of Trumplers Way in Elthorne were consulted and Olde Hanwell was ignored. If the Committee were minded to defer or reject the application on MOL grounds, consultation on future proposals should be much wider.

Councillor Rajinder Mann, Norwood Green Ward Councillor, outlined a number of points in support of the application. There has been good consultation on the proposals with 145 people attending a first meeting in his ward with 40 questions asked. Warren Farm is underutilised and in need of investment with £70K spent on it each year and no return to the Council. Since QPR were selected as partners, they have been working hard with Ealing Council to ensure that the facilities meet the needs of the local community. The development will provide enhanced training and community facilities that QPR will be responsible for maintaining at no cost to Ealing Council or council tax payers. In conclusion, the proposals will provide improved facilities for the borough that will be accessible for all. Councillor Mann thanked residents and Lord Young for their comments and said that the scheme would be good for both Ealing and Norwood Green. He said that he supported the application as a ward councillor and urged the committee to consider the application seriously and grant it without delay.

Aileen Jones (Head of Planning Services) introduced the application and explained to the Committee that they needed to make their decision in the context of policies including the NPPF, London Plan, Core Strategy, UDP, development plan documents and supporting guidance. The Committee were then referred to the briefing notes which include the heads of terms and further points raised since the production of the report. Two letters and an email received since the production of the briefing notes have also been circulated to committee members. Referring to various plans, maps and elevations the Committee were asked to note the details of the proposals which include a new access to the site from Windmill Lane, a pedestrian and cycle route across the front of site, parking for the community and QPR, an indoor hall, changing, ancillary and plant buildings and levelled off grass and all weather floodlit pitches.

Addressing some of the points raised by objectors, despite it being recognised that this may be an inappropriate development on MOL, officers believe that special circumstances do exist in this case and that the development is justified. There is a compelling need to develop the site following its deterioration and the Greater London Assembly (GLA) has said that they support this development on MOL in principle. On whether there has been enough mitigation of harm to

the MOL, officers have looked at the footprint, with all buildings concentrated in one place rather than sprawled across the site, and it is felt that the scale and design is appropriate. On the view from Hanwell, it is some distance away and openness will be retained. On travel and access issues, a travel plan has been drawn up following consultation with TfL, QPR and Ealing Council that includes use of the club's shuttle bus. The proposals include a new site access from Windmill Lane but, due to the access from Hanwell being informal, some of it will be stopped. There will, however, still be a wide area of Warren Farm open to the community. On the consultation exercise, all local groups and bordering buildings have been engaged with in a consultation exercise that went beyond what was required statutorily.

The Committee expressed a variety of views on the application.

Councillor Potts said that despite his inclination to support the application, because of the benefit it will bring to the community and borough, he thought the 51ft high indoor hall would be an eyesore and should be dropped by more than the 1.2m agreed with the applicant. He queried why it was not possible to locate the indoor hall at a lower point on the site, perhaps where the maintenance depot would be located. The height of the building, therefore, made him more inclined to oppose the application but, if it was approved, the improvement of the path from Trumpers Way should be added as a condition.

Councillor Kang said that the facility; located near deprived wards, would help the area grow and be used by local schools. On the indoor hall, it would a key facility for this type of club and its height means that more area is given over for the pitches and open space. On parking, because of the low PTAL rating the amount of parking space proposed is reasonable.

Councillor Ball said that the special circumstances hurdle is high for developing on MOL and he had concerns about the quantum and size of the proposed buildings, parking, fencing and loss of community space. If the application is granted, it is likely that large areas will be cut off from the public and he queried whether the public would in fact be able to use the facilities. On the loss of community space, residents will only be able to access two thirds of the existing site and the Warren Farm Radio Flyers will be left with inadequate space for training. On the quantum and size, more could be done to mitigate the impact of the indoor hall. Cobham, Chelsea FC's training ground, for example, looks like it is a one storey development but has two storeys underground. On the basis that more needed to be done to mitigate the impact of MOL he said that he was minded to refuse the application.

Councillor Rennie said that although he shared some of Councillor Potts concerns about the impact of the indoor hall he was minded to accept the application. He queried whether the impact on the Radio Flyers was a planning consideration, if mitigation measures had been looked into for the indoor hall and how QPR could be held to promises about community use of the facilities.

Aileen Jones and Neil Bleakley (Borough Major Projects Officer) addressed points raised by the Committee. On the height of the indoor hall, a minimum is required for such facilities and it is felt that the small sinking proposed, despite having a marginal impact, is appropriate in this instance. The applicant needs as much space as possible for training pitches and the location of the hall at the centre of the site will allow for landscaping round the boundaries. The Community Trust building can be set down a little because of the natural terracing effect in that part of the site. On access, there is no proposal to open up the informal access from Hanwell and it was not felt to be reasonable to seek this from the applicant. On holding QPR to account for its commitments,

this can be done through the Section 106 agreement and Condition 40, which concerns community use. Materials used will be agreed with the applicant in accordance with Condition 39.

Jackie Adams (Head of Legal, Planning and Property) said that the loss of an existing use, such as flying model planes, (which may or may not be lost or reduced), is a planning consideration but it is for the Committee to decide how much weight to give it. Aileen Jones said that it was her understanding that the Radio Flyers had reached an agreement with QPR. Neil Bleakley confirmed that an agreement had been reached and where they can fly will depend on which pitches are being used at a given time. Although the Radio Flyers will be more constrained, the two uses can be accommodated satisfactorily and they can continue operating at the site.

The Committee continued with the debate.

Councillor Reen said that, despite recreation being an appropriate use, he did not think that the very special circumstances had been satisfied for such an inappropriate development on MOL. He questioned whether there was a compelling need for development and said that what is proposed will lead to the fencing off of two thirds of the site and a reduction in community use. The traffic generated will also be significantly higher. On the indoor hall, what is proposed will not minimise harm to the MOL. Views will not be protected and the open nature of the MOL will be compromised. Overall, the case for special treatment has not been made out and he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Stacey said that he would support the scheme despite some concerns. The land is under-used and under-utilised and he hoped that, following £30 million of investment, lots of people will use the facilities. The location of the academy in Ealing should also give talented local players opportunities. He said that he thought officers were wrong about access from Trumpers Way and had failed to explain why formalising and improving the access was unreasonable. He would support the scheme on the condition that officers do more to encourage access to the site from Hanwell. Councillor Lauren Wall said that she agreed with the points made by Councillor Stacey and that the proposals represented an excellent opportunity for children in the borough. She said that she would be supporting the application.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to Referral to the Mayor of London and subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement and conditions as in the Report and with the heads of terms and amended and additional conditions as set out in the Briefing Note:

Heads of Terms

Grant subject to Legal Agreement, to secure the provision of:

- a right hand turning lane from Windmill Lane into the new site access,
- a new pedestrian crossing to Windmill Lane,
- a Green Travel Plan for the site,
- ‘Legible London’ signage to direct pedestrians to the site from bus stops in Uxbridge Road and Lower Boston Road;
- off-site investment in cricket provision elsewhere in the borough ; and

- the payment of the Council’s reasonable legal and other expenses incurred in preparing the agreement ;
- and referral of the application to the Mayor.

Amended conditions

Condition 2 to be amended to read:

“2. Approved Plans

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing title number(s) PDP_MP_PP_GA_00_EXISTING SITE Revision A;
PDP_MP_PP_GA_01_STRUCTURES TO BE DEMOLISHED Revision A;
PDP_MP_PP_GA_02_ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN Revision B;
PDP_MP_PP_GA_03_PLANNING APPLICATION BOUNDARY Revision A;
PDP_MP_PP_GA_04_BUILDING ZONES Revision A; PDP_MP_PP_GA_05_BUILDING HEIGHTS/SITE SPOT HEIGHTS Revision A; PDP_MP_PP_GA_06_MOVEMENT ACCESS Revision A; PDP_MP_PP_GA_07_SITE SECTIONS Revision A; PDP_TC_GA_00_BASEMENT PLAN Revision A; PDP_TC_GA_01_GROUND FLOOR PLAN Revision A;
PDP_TC_GA_02_FIRST FLOOR PLAN Revision A; PDP_TC_GA_03_ROOF PLAN Revision A;
PDP_TC_GA_04_SECTIONS Revision A; PDP_TC_GA_05_LONG SECTIONS Revision A;
PDP_TC_GA_06_SHORT SECTIONS Revision A; PDP_IH_GA_00_GROUND FLOOR PLAN Revision A; PDP_IH_GA_01_ROOF PLAN Revision A; PDP_IH_GA_02_SECTIONS Revision B; PDP_IH_GA_03_LONG ELEVATIONS Revision B; PDP_IH_GA_04_SHORT ELEVATIONS Revision B; PDP_CB_GA_00_PLANS_SECTION_ELEVATION Revision A;
PDP_GM_GA_00_GROUND FLOOR_ROOF_PLAN Revision A;
PDP_GM_GA_01_SECTIONS_ELEVATIONS Revision A; PDP_MF_GA_00_PLANS_SECTION Revision A; PDP_MF_GA_01_ELEVATIONS Revision A;
PDP_EF_GA_00_PLANS_SECTIONS_ELEVATIONS Revision A unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of proper planning.”

Condition 6 to be amended to read :

“6. No Amplified Sound

No sound amplification devices shall be utilised within the open areas of the site, without the prior, written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, in accordance with policies 7.15 and 7.17 of the London Plan (2011), policy 5.2 of the Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012), policies 3.1 and 4.11 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004) and the advice contained within the Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 11 : ‘Noise and Vibration’”.

Condition 10 to be amended to read :

“10. CHP Engine

Details, including a full feasibility and viability analysis, of the gas combined heat and power facility which shall provide for not less than 70 kilowatts electrical capacity and 109 kilowatts thermal capacity including:

- a) its location; specification and operation/management strategy;
- b) flue location, height and design; and
- c) the method of how the facility shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any decentralised heating and hot water network
- f) schematic demonstration of the energy centre and district heating infrastructure should be provided showing how the network evolves over

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any development, other than site preparation works, site remediation or the formation of accesses, on site and the facility shall be installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority

REASON: To ensure that the development hereby approved is energy efficient and to contribute to the avoidance of need for new fossil fuel or other primary energy generation capacity and to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, in accordance with policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London Plan (2011) and policy 2.1 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004)."

Condition 17 to be amended to read :

"17. Mitigation of Noise from Sports Pitches

Before the development, with the exception of site clearance, demolition or works of regrading, is commenced, a detailed analysis of potential noise impacts from the use of the outdoor sports pitches on adjoining noise sensitive dwellings shall be undertaken and a report provided to the Local Planning Authority indicating the findings of that analysis. Should a potential noise issue be identified then details of appropriate mitigation measures, including an acoustic barrier to protect adjoining noise sensitive dwellings from noise from the sports pitches shall be submitted for the approval. The noise barrier shall be manufactured and constructed to the Authority's specifications as specified at SPG10. The works should be completed before first use of the development and be permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to minimise the emission of noise from the development proposed to protect the amenities of the area and those of neighbouring residents, in accordance with policy 7.15 of the London Plan (2011), policy 4.11 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004) and the advice contained in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance note 11 : 'Noise and Vibration'."

Condition 32 to be amended to read :

"32. Use of Floodlighting

The football pitch floodlighting detailed in the application shall be designed to limit potential impact on local bat populations and details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, indicating the measures to be undertaken before the floodlighting is installed. Once approved the floodlighting shall be provided fully in accordance with the approved details and thereafter be so maintained. The floodlighting shall not operate beyond 22 :00 hours on any day unless otherwise first agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the Metropolitan Open Land, ecological interests and the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers, in accordance with policies 3.19 and 7.17 of the London Plan (2011), policies 5.2 and 5.6 of the Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012) and policies 3.1 and 4.12 of the adopted Ealing Unitary development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004).

Additional conditions :

40. Community Use Scheme

Prior to the commencement of the use of the site a Community Use Scheme shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access to the grass pitches and artificial grass pitch by non-school users/non-members, management responsibilities and include a mechanism for review. The approved scheme shall be implemented upon commencement of use of the development.

REASON : To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport, in accordance with policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.19, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.17 of the London Plan (2011), policies 1.1(e)(i), 1.2(d), 5.2 and 5.6 of the Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012) and policies 3.1, 3.5, 4.3 and 8.1 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004).

41. Construction of Playing Fields

The playing field/s and pitch/es shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with the standards and methodologies set out in the guidance note "Natural Turf for Sport" (Sport England, March 2012).

REASON : To ensure the quality of pitches is satisfactory, in accordance with policy 3.19 of the London Plan (2011), policy 5.6 of the Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012) and policy 3.5 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004).

42. Playing Field Drainage

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced a scheme for the improvement and maintenance of playing field drainage, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The playing fields shall thereafter be improved and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure the quality of pitches is satisfactory, in accordance with policies 3.19 and 5.13 of the London Plan (2011), policy 5.6 of the Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012) and policies 2.5 and 3.5 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004)..

Application 06 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Provision of new energy centre building, incorporating a 20.5 metre high emission stack, with associated access and hard and soft landscaping (Received: 28/09/2012) (Due: 23/11/2012).

Councillor Ray Wall returned to the meeting at this point and took the Chair.

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site, St. Bernards Hospital.

Carolyn Brown, speaking on behalf of Hanwell Community Forum and Ealing Civic Society Environment Committee, outlined a number of points against the applications. The Energy Centre is in the wrong location, nine storey buildings should not be erected on site and the proposals will result in a loss of mature trees. Not enough family units are proposed either and the level of parking provision is too low based on the sites PTAL rating of one to four. The grade two listed Mott House situated on site should not be demolished and there is insufficient Section 106 monies and school places for this size of development. It is positive that the listed asylum buildings will be restored but, overall, the changes proposed lack cohesion. The Committee were asked to turn down or defer the application to allow more time for further consultation and meetings with officers given the scale of the proposals.

Eric Munro, Director of Capital, Estates and Facilities at West London Mental Health NHS Trust (WLMHT), outlined a number of points in support of the application. Extensive consultation has been carried out since 2009 and the applications before the Committee are the outcome of that journey. The proposals will result in an investment of £110 million in housing, jobs and community infrastructure and enhance WLMHT's provision following sale of the site. The development includes 576 units (Applications 07, 08, 09 & 10) that will help Ealing meet its housing needs. On the number of affordable units, this is the maximum viable number because of the costs involved in bringing the listed asylum buildings back into use. The new East-West Road (Applications 11 and 12) and Energy Centre (Application 06) are central to the plans. The new road will separate trust property from the applicant's site whilst the Energy Centre will provide power and heating for the whole site. In conclusion, he said that the proposals had been subject to extensive consultation, were compliant with all plans and policies and should be approved as per the officer's recommendation.

Aileen Jones introduced the applications and referred the Committee to the briefing notes detailing amendments to Section 106 monies and conditions. It was explained, with reference to the briefing notes, that St. Bernards is a site for development contained within the Ealing Draft Development Plan Document, contrary to the indication in the Briefing Note. It was also clarified that the leaflet sent to members before the Committee was from the applicant, not the Council, and that it sets out the application from WLMHT's point of view, not the Council's. It was further explained, as per Eric Munro's submission, that the proposals are split over seven applications and that the Committee would be required to make separate decisions on each application. 27.6% of the 576 units across the site are affordable with 28.87% of rooms affordable. As to whether this is viable or not, the Council starts off at an expected level of 50% but, due to the conservation deficit and the monies that will be required to bring the listed buildings back into use at this site, the percentage had to come down in this case. The Council negotiated hard with the applicant on the affordable element and both parties agree on the current level. There is an uneven distribution of affordable housing across the site. Aileen Jones then provided an outline of the proposals contained in Applications 06 to 12 as detailed in the schedule. With regards to the Energy Centre (Application 06), the applicants looked at a number of locations for the facility but their preference was for location proposed near the footpath onto Fitzherbert Walk, which worked reasonably for the sites it was to serve. The Energy Centre is 6m away from the hospice at its nearest point and 9m from the hospices nearest window. The residential part of the hospice is on the side of the building furthest away from the Energy Centre.

The Committee expressed a variety of views on the application.

Councillor Stacey asked why, given the size of the St Bernard's proposals, it was not being considered at a special meeting as a standalone item. Aileen Jones said that other large applications had other applications on the agenda and she did not think that it was appropriate to delay this application on the basis that there were too many items listed. Plans have been available for some time there have been briefings to councillors on the proposals.

Councillor Potts said that he could see the justification for Applications 07 to 12 but he did not think Application 06, Energy Centre, fitted in with the rest of the site. The demolition of the listed A block and Mott House as part of Application 09 could have been an issue but the building replacing it will not front the site.

Councillor Kang said that he could not see any major issues with the proposals. There are no major objections and the plans seemed reasonable when they were explained to him at one of the briefings. It is a good development and he agreed with the officer's assertion that there is nowhere else to put the Energy Centre.

Councillor Ball said that although he was broadly supportive of the scheme, which will provide much needed housing in listed buildings, he was concerned about the demolition of the two listed buildings as part of Application 09 and that the justification for the demolition on p52 of the report seemed weak. He said that he would prefer a scheme that retains all the listed buildings.

Councillor Rennie said that, on the whole, he was pleased with the application and commended the good work that had taken place between the council and applicant. He was concerned, as per Councillors Potts and Ball, that listed buildings would be lost as part of Application 09 and asked whether trees would be lost as part of the proposals.

Councillor Reen broadly welcomed the proposals that will create affordable and private housing from decaying Victorian buildings and commended the collaborative work of the council and applicant in bringing the proposals forward. On Applications 07 and 08, they will not be materially higher than the H block and fronting Uxbridge Road lends itself to a higher density. On Applications 09 and 10, although the loss of two listed buildings is unfortunate, it is understandable and not such a significant issue because of the mitigation and attempts to preserve most of the heritage across the site. Councillor Reen asked whether the Energy Centre could be located with Ealing Hospital's energy source and if the level of affordable housing could be increased.

Aileen Jones addressed points raised by the Committee. With regards to the demolition of the two listed buildings as part of Application 09, they are not the most significant on site and English Heritage and Ealing Council's Conservation Officer have said that they are comfortable with the buildings being demolished. On the level of affordable housing, two sets of quantity surveyors have looked at the plans and they both agree that the applicant could not be expected to go any higher than the level agreed. Overall, the development will result in a loss of 48 trees, but 78 new trees will be planted as part of the new development. With regards to the Energy Centre, it will be built on WLMHT land and have nothing to do with the Ealing Hospital site. The Energy Centre will have enough capacity to provide power for all 576 units and the WLMHT site.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement and conditions as set out in the Report and the amended heads of terms and conditions as set out in the Briefing Note:

Amended Heads of Terms

- a) A financial contribution of £15,500 toward the provision of off-site tree and shrub planting alongside Fitzherbert Walk and the River Brent;
- b) The provision of a pedestrian access between the application site and Fitzherbert Walk across Council owned land; and
- c) The payment of the Council's reasonable Legal and other professional fees incurred drafting the S106 agreement.

Amended conditions

Details of CHP Engine

12. Details, including a full feasibility and viability analysis, of the gas combined heat and power facility which shall provide for not less than 70 kilowatts electrical capacity and 109 kilowatts thermal capacity including:

- a) its location; specification and operation/management strategy;
- b) flue location, height and design; and
- c) the method of how the facility shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any decentralised heating and hot water network
- d) schematic demonstration of the energy centre and district heating infrastructure should be provided showing how the network evolves over time

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any commencement of works on site and the facility shall be installed and operational prior to the first use of the development hereby approved.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority

REASON: To ensure that the development hereby approved is energy efficient and to contribute to the avoidance of a need for new fossil fuel or other primary energy generation capacity and to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, in accordance with policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of the London Plan (2011) and policies 1.1(k) and 1.2(f) of the adopted Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012)."

(The change to the wording of the condition reflects the fact that the building will not be 'occupied' so the approved details are required to be installed and operational before first use of the building, rather than first occupation).

Condition 18 should be deleted

Condition 19 should be renumbered to 18 and re-worded

CHP Plant and Boiler Emissions

19. Prior to the commencement of the development, details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the selected CHP and boiler plant

complies with best currently available technology for NOx emissions control and that such performance can be maintained for the life of the development.

REASON: To minimise potential air quality issues in this designated Air Quality Management Area, in accordance with policy 7.14 of the London Plan (2011), policy 1.1(j) of the adopted Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy (2012) and 'saved' policy 2.6 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, 'Plan for the Environment' (2004).

Application 07 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Demolition of a single storey extension to the North side and two storey extension to the South East corner, internal and external alterations to the gatehouse in conjunction with its uses as a retail shop, cafe, concierge accommodation and office, with external works. Internal and external alterations and external alterations and external works to the North House in conjunction with its use as 6 one-bed flats, erection of bin store and cycle store. External soft and hard landscaped works around the chapel (**Listed Building Consent**) (Received: 20/11/2012) (Due: 15/01/2013).

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT Listed Building Consent subject to conditions as in the Report, with the list of drawings amended to be used in the Decision Notice amended by the Briefing Note.

Drawings

GH010 Rev A06, GH 040 Rev A05, GH 050 Rev A07, GH051 Rev A07, GH 080 Rev A05, N 010 Rev A04, N 040 Rev A04, N 050 Rev A05, N 051 Rev A04, N 080 Rev A06,

Technical Documents

Design and Access Statement, including Landscape Strategy, prepared by David Morley Architects (DMA) and Fabrik, Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Fielden + Mawson

Application 08 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline element, with all matters reserved, for the demolition of Windmill Lodge, five buildings containing flats and bowling green pavilion and the resiting of an electricity substation, in conjunction with the erection of three buildings of up to 9 storeys high containing 260 residential units comprising private, affordable and 30 key worker units and up to 803 square metres of floorspace in B1/D1 use and 67 square metres of floorspace in A1/A3/B1 use, associated hard and soft landscaping including the removal of trees, surface and basement car parking, cycle parking, servicing, public realm, access and other associated works including the provision of a pedestrian access to Uxbridge Road and alterations to vehicular access onto the hospital access road to the East,

Detailed elements for

a) The demolition of a single storey extension to the North side and a two storey extension in the South East corner and internal and external alterations in conjunction with the change of use of the listed gatehouse from offices to a retail unit (Use Class A1), cafe (Use Class A3), concierge accommodation (sui generis) and offices (Use Class B1).

- b) Internal and external alterations in conjunction with the conversion of the listed North House to 6 one-bed flats, with external bin store and cycle store, associated hard and soft landscaping, access, 3 car parking spaces and associated works.
- c) Erection of a three storey building to provide 4 residential units (2 one-bed and 2 three-bed) with external bin store, associated hard and soft landscaping, access, 3 car parking spaces and associated works.
- d) Provision of 4 car parking spaces (2 disabled) and landscaping associated with the listed chapel.

(Received: 20/11/2012) (Due: 19/02/2013)

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to Referral to the Mayor of London, the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement and conditions as in the Report and with the description of the development, heads of terms and conditions amended as set out in the Briefing Note with an additional condition attached to cover a matter that was to be the subject of a head of term in the agreement.

Amended description

Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline element, with all matters reserved, for the demolition of Windmill Lodge, five buildings containing flats and bowling green pavilion and the resiting of an electricity substation, inconjunction with the erection of three buildings of up to 9 storeys high containing 260 residential units comprising private and affordable units and up to 803 square metres of floorspace in B1/D1 use and 67 square metres of floorspace in A1/A3/B1 use, associated hard and soft landscaping including the removal of trees, surface and basement car parking, cycle parking, servicing, public realm, access and other associated works including the provision of a pedestrian access to Uxbridge Road and alterations to vehicular access onto the hospital access road to the East, Detailed elements for a) The demolition of a single storey extension to the North side and a two storey extension in the South East corner and internal and external alterations in conjunction with the change of use of the listed gatehouse from offices to a retail unit (Use Class A1), cafe (Use Class A3), concierge accommodation (sui generis) and offices (Use Class B1) b) Internal and external alterations in conjunction with the conversion of the listed North House to 6 one-bed flats, with external bin store and cycle store, associated hard and soft landscaping, access, 3 car parking spaces and associated works. c) Erection of a three storey building to provide 4 residential units (2 one-bed and 2 three-bed) with external bin store, associated hard and soft landscaping, access, 3 car parking spaces and associated works. d) Provision of 4 car parking spaces (2 disabled) and landscaping associated with the listed chapel.

Amended Heads of Terms

- i) Provision of affordable housing, comprising a minimum of 22 units with 76 habitable rooms in 'Social Rent' tenure and 48 units with 125 habitable rooms in 'Shared Ownership/Intermediate' to be provided through a Registered Provider
- ii) Compliance with the Deed of Nomination Rights in respect of the affordable housing;
- iii) A financial contribution of £334,308 for funding school places in the Borough

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

- iv) A financial contribution of £3750 for Travel Plan monitoring
- v) Details to be provided of a car club scheme including the first 3 years membership for the initial occupiers and provision of 2 car club spaces
- vi) A financial contribution of £35,000 towards the consulting on and introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) on the Windmill Park Estate
- vii) A financial contribution of £35,000 towards the cost of junction improvements at Windmill Lane/Uxbridge Road (Iron Bridge), including changing the Pelican to a Toucan Crossing, lane marking changes, kerb realignment and at Windmill Avenue junction a staggered island.
- viii) A financial contribution of £12,937-50 towards Direct Support for Cycling
- ix) A financial contribution of £10,000 towards the installation of 2 bus countdowns outside Ealing Hospital and upgrade 5 bus stops at Ealing Hospital bus terminal to DDA standards.
- x) Details of the developer's participation in an Apprentice and Placement Scheme
- xi) Enter into a S38/278 Agreement with the Local Highways Authority in respect of the construction of a 3m wide right turn slip lane on the North side of the central reservation on Uxbridge Road on the West side of the gatehouse, as shown on Drawing No. T_01_SK_072 and other highways related matters; or for such other alternative works as may be agreed.
- xii) A financial contribution of £217,000 towards the provision of Healthcare facilities
- xiii) A financial contribution of £60,000 towards the improvement of local parks and public open space within the vicinity of the site to account for the under provision of private usable amenity space within the development.
- xiv) A financial contribution of £250,000 towards the improvement of children's play facilities within the vicinity of the site. to account for the underprovision of children's playspace at all age levels
- xv) Details of a Management Scheme for the operation, maintenance and pricing of the community facilities to be provided within the Chapel.
- xvi) Public access to the grounds between the Gatehouse and Chapel
- xvii) All contributions to be index linked; and
- xviii) Payment of the Council's reasonable Legal and other professional fees incurred drafting the S106 agreement.

Amended Conditions

Condition 4 – The list of drawings be amended to the following and this list be also used in the Decision Notice :

Drawings

0-100 Rev F, 0-101 Rev F, 0-102 Rev E, 0-104 Rev D, 0-105 Rev D, 0-103 Rev J, 01-100 Rev M, 01-101 Rev N, 01-102 Rev L, 01-103 Rev R, 01-104 Rev N, 1-105 Rev K, 1-106 Rev J, 01-107 Rev J, 1-017 Rev E, 1-018 Rev C, 1-019 Rev C, 1-020 Rev C, 1-021 Rev B, GH 010 Rev A06, GH 040 Rev A05, GH 050 Rev A07, GH 051 Rev A07, GH 080 Rev A05, N 010 Rev A04,

N 040 Rev A04, N 050 Rev A05, N 051 Rev A04; 080 Rev A06, , D1783 S1.L001 Rev E, D1783 S1.L100 Rev H.

Technical Documents

Design and Access Statement, including Landscape Strategy, prepared by David Morley Architects (DMA) and Fabrik; Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Feilden + Mawson Architects; Social Impact Statement, prepared by NLP; Transport Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Travel Plan, prepared by the West London Mental Health NHS Trust; Energy Statement, prepared by AECOM; Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Waste Strategy, prepared by AECOM; Sustainability Statement (including Ecohomes and Code for Sustainable; Homes Pre-Assessment summaries), prepared by AECOM; Sunlight and Daylight Assessment, prepared by NLP; Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, prepared by NLP; Nature Conservation Statement, prepared by AECOM; Noise and Vibration Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Air Quality Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Phase 1 Geotechnical & Geo-environmental Desk Study, prepared by AECOM; Geotechnical & Geo-environmental Interpretive Report, prepared by AECOM; Archaeology Report, prepared by Pre-construct Archaeology; Statement of Community Involvement, prepared by NLP; Summary of Planning Application, prepared by NLP; Design and Access Statement – Addendum prepared by David Morley Architects; Design Principles Document dated 16/04/2013, prepared by David Morley Architects

Condition 5: the Maximum Gross Floor Area (GIA) on plot 1 should be amended from 3700 sq. m to 3823 sq. m.

Condition 6: the Design Principles Document by David Morley Associates is dated 16 April 2013.

Condition 7: the following shall be added to the end of the condition :

“unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.”

Condition 8: in line 3 “...before each phase of the development is commenced...” is to be deleted and replaced with

“...the commencement of each building (for the detailed element) and plot (for the outline element) of the development...”

Condition 19: at the beginning, the following shall be deleted “Details shall be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority before each phase of development ...” and replaced with the following :

“Prior to the commencement of each building for the detailed element and each building plot for the outline element, details shall be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority...”

and “...of existing and proposed properties...” shall be added after noise sensitive facades on the penultimate line.

Condition 20: at the end of line 1, “...of Block 1...” shall be added.

Condition 21: at the end of line 1 “...of each residential block...” shall be added..

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

Condition 22: at the end of line 1 the following shall be deleted “...the development is commenced...” and replaced with :

“...prior to the occupation of any commercial use within Use Classes A3 or A5 ...”

Condition 23: in line 1 of the second paragraph “...or without...” shall be added after “...with...”

Condition 33: in line 2 the following after 4 is to be deleted “...or higher as required by the approved development plan standard at that time.”

Condition 34: in line 3 the following after Technical Guidance) shall be deleted “...or higher as required by the approved development plan standard at that time...”

Condition 35: in line 2 the following shall be added after clarifying information)

“...prior to the commencement of the outline element...”

In line 6 at the end after Building Regulations 2010, the following shall be deleted “...or the relevant Building Regulations and London Plan climate change policies updates at the time of the submission of the relevant Reserved Matters application...” and replaced with :

“...for the new build elements...”

In line 1 of the second paragraph “...relevant phase of ...” shall be deleted and replaced with:

“...outline element of the...”

Condition 38: in line 1 “...on-site CO2 reduction...” shall be replaced with :

“regulated CO2 emission savings...”

Line 4 to the end of the sentence shall be deleted and replaced with:

“A strategy for the location, details and phasing of delivery of the photovoltaic panels for each block shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and installed in accordance with the strategy.”

In b) on line 2 “...on site CO2 reduction shall be replaced with:

“...regulated CO2 emission savings...”

Condition 44 at the end of the condition the following should be added:

“..., unless some other alternative is agreed in writing by the local planning authority.”

Additional condition
Affordable Housing Provision

45. Prior to the construction of any works on any part of the outline element of the permission hereby granted, details of the siting, size, access arrangements and phasing of the provision of the social rent and shared ownership units shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason : To enable the local planning authority to assess the adequacy and detailed provision of the affordable units of accommodation in accordance with policies 3.5, 3.8, 3.9, 3.12, 7.1 and 7.6 of the adopted London Plan (2011), policies 1.1 (h), 1.2 (a), (f), (h) and 2.10 of the adopted Ealing Development (Core) Strategy (2012), policies 4.1, 5.2 and 5.5 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan (2004) and policies 7B, 7C and Variation to London Plan policy 3.5 within the Ealing Draft Development Management Development Plan Document (2013)

Application 09 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Demolition of listed A block and Mott House and extensions to blocks B, C, D, E, F, Library and Chaucer buildings including the link to K block, internal and external alterations to the listed buildings including extensions to blocks B, C, D, E and F and the demolition of the unlisted gym and Butler House in conjunction with the conversion of the Asylum buildings to 257 residential units and the erection of a wing at the Eastern end to provide an additional 50 residential units, conversion of ballroom to gym and alterations to landscaping and parking provision (**Listed Building Consent**) (Received: 01/10/2012) (Due: 26/11/2012).

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT Listed Building Consent subject to conditions as in the Report, with the list of drawings and documents to be specified in the Decision Note amended as in the Briefing Note.

General Arrangement

001 Rev A05 Existing Location Plan, 002 Rev A06 Proposed Location Plan, 003 Rev A00 Existing Block Plan

Ballroom

BR 010 Rev A05 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, BR 011 Rev A05 Existing Indicative Sections, BR 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, BR 050 Rev A05 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, BR 051 Rev A04 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, BR 070 Rev A05 Proposed Indicative Sections, BR 080 Rev A04 Proposed Elevations, BR 400 Rev A01 Existing and Proposed First Floor Window

Trust Headquarters

TR 010 Rev A05 Existing Plans Lower Ground and Ground Floor, TR 011 Rev A03 Existing Plans First and Second Floor, TR 040 Rev A05 Existing Elevations, TR 050 Rev A05 Proposed Plans Lower Ground and Ground Floor, TR 051 Rev A04 Proposed Plans First and Second Floor, TR 052 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, TR 070 Rev A03 Proposed Indicative Section, TR 080 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations,

F Block and Library

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

F 010 Rev A05 Existing Basement Plan, F 011 Rev A07 Existing Ground Floor Plan, F 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, F 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, F 014 Rev A04 Existing Roof Plan, F 030 Rev A05 Existing Sections, F 040 Rev A08 Existing Elevations F5-F13, F 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations F1-F4, F 050 Rev A05 Proposed Basement Plan, F 051 Rev A07 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, F 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, F 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, F 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, F 070 Rev A05 Proposed Sections, F 080 Rev A09 Proposed Elevations F5-F13, F 081 Rev A07, F 082 Rev A05 Re-fenestration Proposal, F 401 Rev A01 Existing Detail Section – Basement and Ground Floor F 402 Rev A01 Existing Detail Section – Second Floor and Roof, F 501 Rev A01 Proposed Detail Section – Basement and Ground Floor, F 502 Rev A01 Proposed Detail Section – Second Floor and Roof,

L Block

L 010 Rev A03 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, L 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, L 050 Rev A03 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, L 051 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, L 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations

Chaucer Wing and Former Laundry

CW 010 Rev A03 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, CW 011 Rev A02 Existing Roof Plan, CW 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, CW 050 Rev A03 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, CW 051 Rev A03 Annexe – Existing and Proposed Plans, CW 052 Rev A02 Proposed Roof Plan, CW 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations

E Block

E 010 Rev A06 Existing Basement Plan, E 011 Rev A09 Existing Ground Floor Plan, E 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, E 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, E 014 Rev A04 Existing Roof Plan, E 040 Rev A07 Existing Elevations E1-E8, E 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations E9-E12, E 042 Rev A01 Existing Elevations E1A-E4A, E 050 Rev A06 Proposed Basement Plan, E 051 Rev A09 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, E 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, E 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, E 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, E 080 Rev A08 Proposed Elevations E1-E8, E 081 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations E9-E12, E 082 Rev A04 Re-fenestration Proposal, E 083 Rev A01 Proposed Elevations E1A-E4A

D Block

D 010 Rev A04 Existing Basement Plan, D 011 Rev A06 Existing Ground Floor Plan, D012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, D 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, D 014 Rev A03 Existing Roof Plan, D 040 Rev A07 Existing Elevations, D 050 Rev A04 Proposed Basement Plan, D 051 Rev A06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, D 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, D 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, D 054 Rev A03 Proposed Roof Plan, D 080 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations

C Block

C 010 Rev A06 Existing Plans Lower Ground Floor, Ground Floor, C 011 Rev A05 Existing Plans First Floor, Second Floor, C 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations C1-C7, C 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations C8-C12, C 050 Rev A09 Proposed Plans Lower Ground Floor, Ground Floor, C 051 Rev A07 Proposed Plans First Floor, Second Floor, C 052 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, C 070 Rev A03 Proposed Indicative Section, C 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations C1-C7, C 081 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations C8-C12

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

B Block

B 010 Rev A06 Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan, B 011 Rev A05 Existing Ground Floor Plan, B 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, B 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, B 014 Rev A03 Existing Roof Plan , B 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, B 041 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, B 042 Rev A05 Existing Elevations, B 043 Rev A02 Existing Elevations, B 049 Rev A00 Existing and Proposed Indicative Basement Floor Plan, B 050 Rev A10 Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan, B 051 Rev A06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, B 052 Rev A06 Proposed First Floor Plan, B 053 Rev A06 Proposed Second Floor Plan, B 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, B 080 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 081 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 082 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 083 Rev A02 Proposed Elevations

A Block

A 011 Rev A02 Existing Ground Floor Plan, A 014 Rev A02 Existing Roof Plan, A 040 Rev A03 Existing Elevations, A 050 Rev A15 Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan, A 051 Rev A14 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, A 052 Rev A10 Proposed First Floor Plan, A 053 Rev A06 Proposed Second Floor Plan, A 054 Rev A06 Proposed Third Floor Plan, A 055 Rev A05 Proposed Roof Plan, A 070 Rev A09 Sections, A 080 Rev A12 Elevations, A 081 Rev A06 Context Elevations, A 095 Rev A01 Perspective – Courtyard View, A 096 Rev A02 Perspective – Courtyard View, 7256_A SK091 Rev A01

Landscape Drawings

D1783.S2.L 220 Rev N Disposal Site S2 – Hard & Soft GA, D1783.S3.L 230 Rev M Disposal Site S3 – Hard & Soft GA, D1783.S2-S3.L001 Rev E Planning Application Red Line Boundary, D1783.S2-S3.L.100 Rev H Disposal Site S2 and S3 Landscape Masterplan, D1783.S2-S3.L.120 Rev G, East West Road Elevation 1 of 2, D1783.S2-S3.L.121 Rev F East West Road Elevation 2 of 2, 7256_SK01 Rev.A01 Typical Binstore, 60165095-C-04(SK)-054 Rev P1 Existing Foul Drainage Layout

Phasing Drawing

IL 12015/13-001 (Indicative Phasing Plan (Asylum Buildings and East West Road) Rev 1

Technical Documents

Design and Access Statement, prepared by Feilden + Mawson; Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Feilden + Mawson; Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, prepared by Pre-construct Archaeology; Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, prepared by NLP; Daylight and Sunlight Statement, prepared by NLP; Transport Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Residential Travel Plan, prepared by WLMHT; Framework Residential Travel Plan, prepared by WLMHT; Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, prepared by AECOM; Air Quality Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Noise and Vibration Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Sustainability Statement; prepared by AECOM, Energy Statement, prepared by AECOM; Waste Strategy, prepared by AECOM; Phase 1 Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Desk Study, prepared by AECOM; Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Interpretive Report, prepared by AECOM; Nature Conservation Statement, prepared by AECOM; Toolkit Viability Assessment, prepared by Savills; Condensation Risk Analysis, prepared by BRE; Arboricultural Report, prepared by Quaife; Social Impact Statement, prepared by NLP; Statement of Community Involvement, prepared by NLP; and Planning Summary Statement, prepared by NLP. (All received 01/10/2012) and Landscape and Access Statement rev C, prepared by Fabrik, Schedule of accommodation, prepared by Feilden and Mawson, February 2013 rev 02 received 07/03/2013)

Application 10 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Demolition of A block, Mott House, the gym and Butler House, various extensions to the Asylum buildings and some detached buildings, internal and external alterations to the Asylum building including the erection of extensions to blocks B, C, D, E and F in conjunction with the conversion of the Asylum buildings to 257 residential units and the ballroom to a residents gym and erection of a three storey building and a four storey building with underground car parking area at the Eastern end of the Asylum buildings to provide an additional 50 residential units, provision of landscaping, 205 car parking spaces (including 21 disabled, 2 car club and 3 visitor spaces and 136 in the basement area and 364 cycle parking spaces) (Received: 01/10/2012) (Due: 26/11/2012).

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to Referral to the Mayor of London, the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement and conditions as in the Report, with the heads of terms and conditions amended as set out in the Briefing Note.

Amended Heads of Terms

- i) Provision of affordable housing, comprising a minimum of 50 units with 128 habitable rooms in 'Social Rent' tenure, 24 units with 72 habitable rooms in 'Intermediate' and 15 units with 46 habitable rooms to be 'Key Worker' accommodation, to be provided through a Registered Provider
- ii) Compliance with the Deed of Nomination Rights in respect of the affordable housing;
- iii) A financial contribution of £420,629 for funding school places in the Borough
- iv) A financial contribution of £3750 for Travel Plan monitoring
- v) Details to be provided of a car club scheme including payment of membership of the first 3 years from initial occupation and the provision of 2 car club spaces.
- vi) A financial contribution of £10,000 towards the cost of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements to Windmill Lane, including advanced stop lines at the junction with Windmill Avenue, dropped kerbs and widening of a section of footway to create a shared path on the East side of Windmill Lane between Navigator Drive and width restriction.
- vii) A financial contribution of £14,662-50 towards Direct Support for Cycling
- viii) A financial contribution of £75,000 towards the provision and/or improvement of playspace for the under 5s and over 12s within the area of the site, or elsewhere within the Borough to account for the underprovision of playspace within the application site.
- ix) A financial contribution of £60,000 towards the improvement of public open space within the locality of the site to account for the underprovision of private usable amenity space within the application site.
- x) A financial contribution of £260,950 towards the provision of healthcare in association with the scale of development proposed.
- xi) Details of the developer's participation in an Apprentice and Placement Scheme contributions to be index linked; and

- xii) Payment of the Council's reasonable Legal and other professional fees incurred drafting the S106 agreement.

Amended conditions

Condition 2: The list of drawings be amended to the following and this list be also used in the Decision Notice

General Arrangement

001 Rev A05 Existing Location Plan, 002 Rev A06 Proposed Location Plan, 003 Rev A00 Existing Block Plan

Ballroom

BR 010 Rev A05 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, BR 011 Rev A05 Existing Indicative Sections, BR 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, BR 050 Rev A05 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, BR 051 Rev A04 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, BR 070 Rev A05 Proposed Indicative Sections, BR 080 Rev A04 Proposed Elevations, BR 400 Rev A01 Existing and Proposed First Floor Window

Trust Headquarters

TR 010 Rev A05 Existing Plans Lower Ground and Ground Floor, TR 011 Rev A03 Existing Plans First and Second Floor, TR 040 Rev A05 Existing Elevations, TR 050 Rev A05 Proposed Plans Lower Ground and Ground Floor, TR 051 Rev A04 Proposed Plans First and Second Floor, TR 052 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, TR 070 Rev A03 Proposed Indicative Section, TR 080 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations,

F Block and Library

F 010 Rev A05 Existing Basement Plan, F 011 Rev A07 Existing Ground Floor Plan, F 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, F 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, F 014 Rev A04 Existing Roof Plan, F 030 Rev A05 Existing Sections, F 040 Rev A08 Existing Elevations F5-F13, F 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations F1-F4, F 050 Rev A05 Proposed Basement Plan, F 051 Rev A07 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, F 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, F 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, F 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, F 070 Rev A05 Proposed Sections, F 080 Rev A09 Proposed Elevations F5-F13, F 081 Rev A07, F 082 Rev A05 Re-fenestration Proposal, F 401 Rev A01 Existing Detail Section – Basement and Ground Floor F 402 Rev A01 Existing Detail Section – Second Floor and Roof, F 501 Rev A01 Proposed Detail Section – Basement and Ground Floor, F 502 Rev A01 Proposed Detail Section – Second Floor and Roof,

L Block

L 010 Rev A03 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, L 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, L 050 Rev A03 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, L 051 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, L 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations

Chaucer Wing and Former Laundry

CW 010 Rev A03 Existing Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, CW 011 Rev A02 Existing Roof Plan, CW 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, CW 050 Rev A03 Proposed Plans Ground Floor, First Floor, Second Floor, CW 051 Rev A03 Annexe – Existing and Proposed Plans, CW 052 Rev A02 Proposed Roof Plan, CW 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

E Block

E 010 Rev A06 Existing Basement Plan, E 011 Rev A09 Existing Ground Floor Plan, E 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, E 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, E 014 Rev A04 Existing Roof Plan, E 040 Rev A07 Existing Elevations E1-E8, E 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations E9-E12, E 042 Rev A01 Existing Elevations E1A-E4A, E 050 Rev A06 Proposed Basement Plan, E 051 Rev A09 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, E 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, E 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, E 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, E 080 Rev A08 Proposed Elevations E1-E8, E 081 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations E9-E12, E 082 Rev A04 Re-fenestration Proposal, E 083 Rev A01 Proposed Elevations E1A-E4A

D Block

D 010 Rev A04 Existing Basement Plan, D 011 Rev A06 Existing Ground Floor Plan, D012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, D 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, D 014 Rev A03 Existing Roof Plan, D 040 Rev A07 Existing Elevations, D 050 Rev A04 Proposed Basement Plan, D 051 Rev A06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, D 052 Rev A05 Proposed First Floor Plan, D 053 Rev A05 Proposed Second Floor Plan, D 054 Rev A03 Proposed Roof Plan, D 080 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations

C Block

C 010 Rev A06 Existing Plans Lower Ground Floor, Ground Floor, C 011 Rev A05 Existing Plans First Floor, Second Floor, C 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations C1-C7, C 041 Rev A06 Existing Elevations C8-C12, C 050 Rev A09 Proposed Plans Lower Ground Floor, Ground Floor, C 051 Rev A07 Proposed Plans First Floor, Second Floor, C 052 Rev A03 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans, C 070 Rev A03 Proposed Indicative Section, C 080 Rev A05 Proposed Elevations C1-C7, C 081 Rev A07 Proposed Elevations C8-C12

B Block

B 010 Rev A06 Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan, B 011 Rev A05 Existing Ground Floor Plan, B 012 Rev A05 Existing First Floor Plan, B 013 Rev A05 Existing Second Floor Plan, B 014 Rev A03 Existing Roof Plan , B 040 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, B 041 Rev A04 Existing Elevations, B 042 Rev A05 Existing Elevations, B 043 Rev A02 Existing Elevations, B 049 Rev A00 Existing and Proposed Indicative Basement Floor Plan, B 050 Rev A10 Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan, B 051 Rev A06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, B 052 Rev A06 Proposed First Floor Plan, B 053 Rev A06 Proposed Second Floor Plan, B 054 Rev A04 Proposed Roof Plan, B 080 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 081 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 082 Rev A06 Proposed Elevations, B 083 Rev A02 Proposed Elevations

A Block

A 011 Rev A02 Existing Ground Floor Plan, A 014 Rev A02 Existing Roof Plan, A 040 Rev A03 Existing Elevations, A 050 Rev A15 Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan, A 051 Rev A14 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, A 052 Rev A10 Proposed First Floor Plan, A 053 Rev A06 Proposed Second Floor Plan, A 054 Rev A06 Proposed Third Floor Plan, A 055 Rev A05 Proposed Roof Plan, A 070 Rev A09 Sections, A 080 Rev A12 Elevations, A 081 Rev A06 Context Elevations, 7256-SKA 091 RevA03 Perspective South-East Corner, A 095 Rev A01 Perspective – Courtyard View, A 096 Rev A02 Perspective – Courtyard View, 7256_A SK091 Rev A01

Landscape Drawings

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

D1783.S2.L 220 Rev N Disposal Site S2 – Hard & Soft GA, D1783.S3.L 230 Rev M Disposal Site S3 – Hard & Soft GA, D1783.S2-S3.L001 Rev E Planning Application Red Line Boundary, D1783.S2-S3.L.100 Rev H Disposal Site S2 and S3 Landscape Masterplan, D1783.S2-S3.L.120 Rev G, East West Road Elevation 1 of 2, D1783.S2-S3.L.121 Rev F East West Road Elevation 2 of 2, 7256_SK01 Rev.A01 Typical Binstore, 60165095-C-04(SK)-054 Rev P1 Existing Foul Drainage Layout

Phasing Drawing

IL 12015/13-001 (Indicative Phasing Plan (Asylum Buildings and East West Road) Rev 1

Technical Documents

Design and Access Statement, prepared by Feilden + Mawson; Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Feilden + Mawson; Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, prepared by Pre-construct Archaeology; Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, prepared by NLP; Daylight and Sunlight Statement, prepared by NLP; Transport Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Residential Travel Plan, prepared by WLMHT; Framework Residential Travel Plan, prepared by WLMHT; Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, prepared by AECOM; Air Quality Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Noise and Vibration Assessment, prepared by AECOM; Sustainability Statement; prepared by AECOM, Energy Statement, prepared by AECOM; Waste Strategy, prepared by AECOM; Phase 1 Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Desk Study, prepared by AECOM; Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Interpretive Report, prepared by AECOM; Nature Conservation Statement, prepared by AECOM; Toolkit Viability Assessment, prepared by Savills; Condensation Risk Analysis, prepared by BRE; Arboricultural Report, prepared by Quaife; Social Impact Statement, prepared by NLP; Statement of Community Involvement, prepared by NLP; and Planning Summary Statement, prepared by NLP. (All received 01/10/2012) and Landscape and Access Statement rev C, prepared by Fabrik, Schedule of accommodation, prepared by Feilden and Mawson, February 2013 rev 02 received 07/03/2013)

Condition 6 be deleted and replaced with the following :

“All residential units shall be constructed to Lifetime Homes Standards in accordance with the approved Schedule of Accommodation April 2013 Rev.03 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority . The approved details shall be implemented prior to first occupation.

Condition 12 : In the last two paragraphs the working phase plan is l) and not (m)

Condition 17 : section n) is to be deleted as it is considered to be unnecessary.

Condition 21 : in line 3 “...the development...” is deleted and replaced with “...Block A...”

At the end of line 5/beginning of line 6 “...and Interim Design certificates ...” is deleted and replaced with “...has been submitted to the BRE...”

An additional sentence is added to the end of the paragraph “The Interim Design Certificates shall be submitted thereafter.

Condition 22 :, in line 3 “...CHP DH...” be deleted and replaced with ...Combined Heat and Power (CHP) District Heating...”

Condition 23 : in line 2 delete "...submitted plan..." and replace with "...Drawing IL2015/13-001 (March 2013)

Application 11 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Construction of a new East-West estate road (with associated infrastructure); creation/retention of 51 car parking spaces (including 5 to disabled standard) and associated landscaping works following demolition of Mott House, The Gym and Butler House; demolition of single storey building links and tunnels between K block and E and F blocks and parts of K block; demolition of part of existing wall; and the dismantling and relocation of an airing court structure (Received: 24/10/2012) (Due: 23/01/2013).

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT with conditions as in Report, with condition 14 as amended in the Briefing Note

Arboricultural Method Statement

14. No operations (including initial site clearance) shall commence on site in connection with development hereby approved until a suitable scheme (Arboricultural Method Statement) for the protection of existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved protection scheme.

All tree protection methods detailed in the approved Arboricultural Method Statement shall be in place prior to the commencement of development and not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site, unless the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority has first been sought and obtained.

The land within the tree protection areas shall not be altered or used for any purpose in conjunction with the approved development

REASON: To secure the protection, throughout the time that the development is being carried out, of trees, shrubs and hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area in accordance with policy 7.21 of the adopted London Plan (2011) policy 1.1(i) of the adopted Ealing Development Strategy (2102), policy 4.5 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan 'Plan for the Environment' (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 9 'Trees and Development Guidance'.

Application 12 in respect of **St Bernards Hospital, Uxbridge Road, Southall UB1 3HW** (Ward: Norwood Green). Demolition of Mott House (Grade II Listed), single storey building links and below ground tunnels between K block and the former asylum ward buildings (E and F blocks) and parts of K block on the north facade (all Grade II Listed); demolition of part of wall to

the former airing yard to the east of K block and dismantling and relocation of airing court structure (Grade II Listed) along with other works to facilitate the provision of a new East-West estate road (**Listed Building Consent**) (Received: 24/10/2012) (Due: 19/12/2012).

Applications 06-12 were discussed together due to them concerning the same site. Please refer to the notes under Application 06 for further information.

Resolved:

GRANT Listed Building Consent with conditions as in the Report.

Application 02 in respect of **Land to rear of 1 Rosemont Road, Acton W3 9LT** (Ward: Acton Central). Construction of a two storey dwelling with associated landscaping/refuse arrangements Received: 19/11/2012) (Due: 14/01/2013).

Dan Warren, resident of Flat 3, 1 Rosemont Road, outlined various points against the application. He said that he only found out about the application after the official consultation period had closed and other residents have only been informed of the application in the last week. Residents deserve a proper consultation. The officers report quotes the NPPF which states that planning authorities should consider policies to resist the inappropriate development of gardens where, for example, a development may cause harm. The report does not address this point again but the correct conclusion would be to refuse the application on this basis. This garden grabbing will also destroy a valuable drainage area. Paragraph 2.5 of the Council's policy states that, before planning permission is granted for development, the Council will ensure that there is a sustainable management based on catchment management principles. The potential for flooding should be looked at now, rather than later as suggested by the officer, and the application should be refused on this basis. There are also huge concerns about access during and after the construction. Builders will have to use the narrow path down the side of the house to get on site, which he and his wife struggle to fit a pram and nine month old boy down never mind building equipment. If this is built, he and his wife will be forced to ascend seven concrete steps and exit through the house rather than use the side path, which is an accident waiting to happen. The report states that the proposed dwelling would not result in loss of light to the flats at 1 Rosemont but it is difficult to see how that conclusion has been arrived at because the officer has not been into Flat 3. Flat 3 is five feet below ground level so if it is built it will not be possible to see the sky anymore from large parts of the property. The impact on the quality of residents quality of life will also be massive and the value of homes will drop. This is planning blight for a property that will not solve any housing problems. The Committee were urged to reject the application.

Luke Pulham, applicant, outlined a number of points in support of the application. This will be a home for himself, his partner and new baby and he has no intention of creating something that is going to cause harm to others. The proposal is to build a contemporary, high quality and sustainable detached dwelling facing onto Springfield Gardens Park. The ground floor would be partly sunken in order to reduce the overall height of the building and work with the existing topography of the park. The dwelling would be set within two sunken courtyard areas including a landscaped private garden. The site used to form the rear garden of the house fronting onto Rosemont Road; however it was converted some time ago into a series of flats which provided all ground floor units with generous garden spaces of their own, which includes Flat 2. The remaining rear part of the site was separated at the time of that application and does not remove any of the existing amenity spaces and or form part of the application site at the time of the

Item 5 – Minutes of Previous Meeting

original flat conversion. The rear part is in separate ownership along with the passageway. The site faces onto Springfield Gardens Park and is approximately 3m below the park allowing the dwelling to sit and nestle into the landscape respecting the visual openness and character of the park. The vast majority of the dwelling is concealed behind the existing fence line of the rear gardens and is set back from the boundary. The part first floor element is set further back giving a separation distance of almost 16m to the existing building which has no facing windows. The planning authority has confirmed the proposal would not result in any loss of light, privacy or undue sense of enclosure to the windows or gardens of the existing flats because of the carefully considered design, the positioning, the sunken setting and overall distances. All trees would be retained which is to be enforced by planning conditions to ensure full protection is given to the trees/shrubs and hedgerow before any work commences which will be monitored during the works together with a comprehensive construction plan of how it is intended to be built before any work commences. The plan will focus on minimising the disruption to the existing neighbours and construction be completed within the minimum amount of time. The proposed building would constitute a good quality contemporary form, which has been sensitively designed in response to the particular constraints and opportunities of the site. We want this to be a positive addition to this area and we do hope you will support me and my family in this ambition.

Maggie Perry (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the application and referred the Committee to the briefing notes. The issue of whether harm will arise is addressed in the report and, with regards to the loss of light, it is the officer's opinion that overshadowing would not occur because of the passage of the sun at this location. On the concerns expressed about the impact of the build, there is a condition about the proposed methods. With regards to the concerns expressed about drainage, the site is not in an identified flood risk zone and the proposal constitutes a good mix of hard and soft landscaping. On the issue of harm caused by garden grabbing, there is no development plan policy that prevents in principle building on gardens.

Councillor Summers, Gulaid and Rennie expressed concern that neighbouring residents had not been properly consulted on the proposals and that a deferral may be appropriate. Aileen Jones said that Planning Services records show that residents have been consulted on this application but there could have been issues with the post. Most residents have had the opportunity to make comments but the Committee need to consider whether further issues might arise if the consultation period was extended. Councillor Stacey queried, subsequent to a discussion on the site visit, how many submissions were received by the consultation deadline. Neil Bleakley confirmed that a site notice was erected and that five consultation responses were received on 11/12/12, 15/12/12, 16/12/12, 19/12/12 and 20/12/12 in advance of the deadline of 21/12/12. Councillor Summers said that he would not be able to support a deferral in light of the clarification about the responses received.

Councillor Potts said that although he did not like the application, and was inclined to turn it down, there were not any planning grounds to refuse. The access is narrow but a recent application refused by the Committee on these grounds was overturned on appeal. He said that he may abstain because he did not like the application. Councillor Lauren Wall agreed that the application was difficult to refuse on policy grounds. The proposals are not on a big scale and have been designed to be sunken into the ground.

Councillor Gulaid said that he attended the site visit with an open mind but was concerned that this may constitute garden grabbing. Councillor Stacey, on whether this constituted a garden grab or back land development, sought clarification that the site is a legally separate piece of

land and whether it could be classed as backland. Jackie Adams re-iterated that Ealing Council does not have specific policies on garden grabbing but the Committee needed to look at whether harm would be caused on a case by case basis. Jackie Adams also confirmed that this piece of land has been legally removed from, and is not part of, the neighbours gardens, but that fact is not a planning consideration. Aileen Jones confirmed that this site would be classed as a backland development because it does not have its own access point onto a road. Maggie Perry, following a query from Councillor Kang, confirmed that the site and the access alley is owned by the applicant.

Resolved:

REFUSE. The proposal represents an unsatisfactory backland development that would be out of character with the form of development in the locality and provide an undesirable outlook from the rear of the existing flats on site that would be harmful to the amenities of the residents of these properties, contrary to policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the adopted London Plan (2011), policies 4.1 and 5.5 of the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan, (2004) policies 1.1(g) and (h) and 2.10 of the adopted Ealing Development (Core) Strategy (2012) and Draft Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document policies 7B and Ealing Local Variation to London Plan policy 7.4.

Application 01 in respect of **65-67 The Broadway, Southall UB1 1JY** (Ward: Southall Broadway). Extensions and alterations including a second floor extension, a part single/part-three storey side extension, and alterations to improve access to provide a 29-bedroom hotel with access from Punjab Lane (Received: 19/12/2012) (Due: 20/03/2013).

There were no objector or applicant speakers.

Councillor Stacey said that although the development was good overall, he asked whether the tidying up of Punjab Lane could be added as a condition.

Aileen Jones referred the Committee to the briefing notes and the amended heads of terms concerning street lighting and CCTV. It was confirmed that Punjab Street is in fact an adopted highway and it will be the responsibility of the Council to tidy and maintain it.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to Legal agreement and conditions, as in Report, with an additional Head of Terms for the Agreement and condition 13 amended as in in the Briefing Note.

The revised heads of terms are:

1. A Green Travel Plan (detailing measures, targets and monitoring tools to encourage green modes of travel aimed at patrons/employees. Measures to include actions to minimise use of Herbert Public Car Park for customer parking.
2. A £9,000 financial contribution towards the provision of disabled car parking facilities or other highways works to improve accessibility within the vicinity of the site.
3. Withdrawal of rights to business car parking permits in the local controlled parking zone/restricted parking areas.
4. Pay the Council's professional and legal costs in preparing the agreement.

5. The applicant shall enter into an agreement with the Council to enable wall mounted street lighting/cctv to be attached to the exterior of 65 The Broadway to enable adequate street lighting/cctv along the alleyway and the western end of Punjab Lane. The lighting will be installed and maintained by the Council at the Council's cost. The cctv will be installed and maintained by the developer at the developers cost.

Revised condition 13

13. Crime Prevention Measures

Details of crime prevention measures including physical security measures for doors and windows and details of cctv to cover the access area and the public footpath in between Punjab Lane and The Broadway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details, which shall thereafter be permanently retained, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development incorporates crime prevention measures to help prevent crime and disorder and to improve pedestrian accessibility in accordance with policies 4.1, & 4.3 of the Adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan 'Plan for the Environment' (2004), policies 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 & 2.8 of the Ealing Core Strategy (2012), policy LV 7.3 of the Ealing Draft Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), and policies 6.10, & 7.3 of the London Plan (2011), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Application 03 in respect of **Drayton Manor High School, Drayton Bridge Road, Hanwell, W7 1EU** (Ward: Hobbayne). Demolition of block B in north west corner and replacement with play area and erection of three storey teaching block on east side of site (Received: 08/02/2013) (Due: 10/05/2013).

There were no objector or applicant speakers.

The Committee moved straight to the recommendation.

Resolved:

GRANT with conditions, as in the Report and with an additional condition as set out in the Briefing Note.

Additional condition

Energy Monitoring

22. Upon final completion of the development, suitable devices for the monitoring of the renewable/low-carbon energy equipment shall have been installed, and the monitored data shall be submitted to the local planning authority at daily intervals for a period of three years from final completion. The installation of the monitoring devices and the submission of the data shall be carried out in accordance with the Council's approved specifications as published on its website."

REASON:

To monitor the effectiveness of the renewable/low carbon energy equipment in order to confirm compliance with energy policies and establish an evidence base on the performance of such equipment.

Application 04 in respect of **Magistrates Court, Winchester Street, Acton W3 8PF** (Ward: South Acton). Change of use from superintendent's house (part of Magistrates Court - Use Class D1) to Residential Use (Use Class C3) and three-storey rear extension to create a three storey 3-bedroom single family dwelling (following part demolition) and construction of three storey infill building to create 2 x two bed residential units with associated ground floor enclosed parking area (Received: 31/01/2013) (Due: 28/03/2013).

There were no objector or applicant speakers. Attention was drawn to the Briefing Notes.

The Committee moved straight to the recommendation.

Resolved:

GRANT subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement and conditions as in Report.

8. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 15 May 2013.

Councillor Potts (Opposition Spokesperson) noted that it was the last meeting of the 2012/13 and offered his thanks to the Chair, Vice Chair and officers for their work during the municipal year.

The meeting finished at 10:05 pm.

Councillor Ray Wall