

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 28 October 2020

Time: 19:00

Venue: This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical venue. Please see Page 2 of the agenda for a link to the webcast of the meeting.

Attendees:

Councillor Shahbaz Ahmed, Councillor Praveen Anand, Councillor Josh Blacker, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Stephen Donnelly, Councillor Shital Manro, Councillor David Millican, Councillor Aysha Raza, Councillor Miriam Rice, Councillor Chris Summers, Councillor Nigel Sumner, Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Simon Woodroffe

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillor Mahmood with Councillor R Wall as his substitute.

2 Urgent Matters

There were none.

3 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

4 Matters to be Considered in Private

There were none.

5 Minutes

The Chair confirmed that the minutes of the last meeting would be considered by the Committee at its meeting scheduled for 18 November 2020.

6 Site Visit Attendance

There were none.

7 202231FUL - 51-56 Manor Road and 53-55 Drayton Green Road, West Ealing, W13 0LJ

Katie Crosbie, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, explaining that the proposal was for a residential-led mixed use redevelopment of the site at the junction of Manor, Drayton Green and Argyle Roads adjacent to the planned West Ealing Crossrail Station. One building would be constructed with two flexible-use commercial and social infrastructure units on the ground floor and 144 homes on the upper floors. The building would have a basement level, and a double-height ground floor with part mezzanine floor. Above the double-height ground floor would be an additional 18 floors for the tallest element of the building, and an additional 12 floors for the shoulder volume.

It was explained that, all of the proposed homes would be affordable, with 50 'London Living Rent' homes (35 percent by unit) and 94 shared ownership homes (70 percent by unit). Whilst they would all be intermediate tenure; Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing Association would enter into a nominations agreement with the Council to ensure that those working and living in Ealing would benefit from the proposed housing. Council officers considered the offer acceptable, subject to the standard early stage review mechanism to incentivise timely delivery.

It was further explained that, the proposed development would be taller than was typical of the low-rise residences in the surrounding area. However, the scale and height had been designed to integrate with a cluster of tall and large buildings in the vicinity forming a railway/Uxbridge Road corridor towards Ealing Broadway. As a standalone building and within this group of buildings, this reinforced the spatial hierarchy of the Metropolitan town centre location as a main centre of activity and would also provide a visual reference point for the Crossrail Station interchange. The proposal on balance represented a good example of optimisation, balancing policy, amenity and site constraints, whilst maximising the delivery of affordable housing.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided details of amendments to the recommendation, Conditions and Informatives, further representations received and clarifications as necessary.

The proposal was consistent with the aims of the relevant adopted policies and documents of the Local Plan, relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance, the National Planning Policy Framework and emerging planning policy documents and Officers therefore recommended that the committee grant consent subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent and subject to a Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London.

Nicholas Grant of Landmark Chambers on behalf of 'Stop The Towers' an objector to the development, made a representation to the Committee which included the following key points:

- That 'Stop The Towers' were not disputing the principle of redevelopment of the site but had concerns about whether the proposed development was acceptable.
- The proposed development was contrary to the Development Plan and the Intend to Publish London Plan.
- The proposed development would be in an area which was not allocated for tall buildings. It would be taller than the majority of 2-3 storey residential units in the area and would not be in keeping with the area.

A video which had been provided by the Applicant was broadcasted to the Committee and included the following key points:

- That the scheme had been developed over a three-year period and had taken into account comments that had arose from the public consultation, Ealing Council and the GLA.
- The proposed development would accord with policy and had been robustly assessed and tested for key environmental factors which included daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, wind, over-heating, townscape and heritage.
- The proposed development would provide homes for local people providing 50 London-living rented homes and 94 affordable shared ownership homes.

Councillor Burke, a local Ward Councillor, made a representation to the Committee which focused on the following key points:

- That the design and density of the proposed development were completely unsuitability for the area and did not meet planning requirements or those of the London Plan.
- There was a lack of any real social affordable housing which did not meet with Ealing Council's planning requirements for a development of this size and scale.
- That consideration of this application was premature. Ealing Council was in the process of setting up Design Review panels and therefore to put this proposed development for approval before this has been established would go against the Council's own process.

James Murray, Member of Parliament for Ealing North, made a representation to the Committee which focused on the following key points:

- That the proposal offered 100% affordable housing, however, it was all intermediate tenure with no homes for social rent. Policy H6 of the draft plan had set out the importance of development including social rent properties.
- There were great concerns of the height and design of the proposal which was unsympathetic to the surrounding area and did not comply with Policy D3.
- That tall buildings should only be developed in locations identified in the development plan as per Policy D9 and this site had not been specifically allocated.

Officers provided clarification with regard to some points and issues raised during public speaking.

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

- Although the proposed development was not fully compliant with the adopted plan, Policy H5 in the Intended to Publish London Plan recognised that schemes that provided over 75% affordable housing had flexibility in their tenure split.
- The proposed development was not considered to be out of context with the immediate area and following various assessments and considerations it had been concluded that the tall building in its entirety was suitable for the location.
- The impact on the Conservation Area would be less than substantial and would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.
- The London Living Rent was a new form of tenure which offered subsidised rent to occupiers over a ten-year period.
- Officers were satisfied that the proposed development would provide a good quality standard of living.
- The London Plan requirement for blue badge car parking spaces was 3% from the outset which would mean that four car parking spaces should be provided as part of the development. Three on street Blue Badge parking spaces would be provided and due to the close proximity of the level access Crossrail station which would offer an alternative means of transport for less abled people, it was considered acceptable.

It was moved by Councillor Summers and seconded by Councillor Woodrooffe that consideration of the application be deferred due to concerns with the tenure mix and lack of genuine affordable accommodation which motion on being put to the vote was declared **LOST**.

Following further discussion, the Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendation as outlined in the report and amended in the briefing note.

RESOLVED:

That contrary to the recommendation of approval, planning permission for the application REF **202231FUL** be **REFUSED** due to the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not propose an adequate provision of affordable housing, specifically an element of london affordable rent tenure and is therefore contrary to the policy 1.2(a) of Ealing Development Strategy 2026 DPD (2012); Policy 3A of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD); Policy 3.11 of the London Plan (2016) and the Affordable Housing & Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance 2017 (SPG) and policy H6 of the intended to Publish London Plan (ITPLP).
2. The proposed development is of the scale and density that is considered would have detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to policy 1.2(h) of Ealing Development Strategy 2026 DPD (2012); Policy 3.5 (Ealing Local Variation to London Plan) and Policy 7.4 (Ealing Local Variation to London Plan) and Policy 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD); Policies 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 of the London Plan (2016); and

Policies GG2, GG4, D1, D4, D8 and D9(B)(3) of the intended to Publish London Plan (ITPLP).

8 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 18 November 2020.

The meeting of the Committee concluded at 21:49pm