

## **Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Date:** Wednesday, 17 March 2021

**Time:** 19:00

**Venue:** Virtual Meeting

**Attendees:**

Councillor Josh Blacker, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Joanna Dabrowska, Councillor Stephen Donnelly, Councillor Tariq Mahmood, Councillor Shital Manro, Councillor Dee Martin, Councillor Aysha Raza, Councillor Miriam Rice, Councillor Chris Summers, Councillor Lauren Wall, Councillor Ray Wall, Councillor Anthony Young

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Shahbaz Ahmed with Councillor Aysha Raza 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 Site Visit Attendance**

There were none.

## **CP House, 97-107 Uxbridge Road, Ealing, W5 5TL - REPORT**

Gareth John, Planning Officer, introduced the report, explaining that this was a planning application for demolition of the existing 12 storey building and the construction of a part 11 and part 13 storey building to provide 30,452sqm of total floor space, flexible space on the ground floor, along with associated hard and soft landscaping.

It was explained that the site was located to the west of Ealing Town Centre, on the south side of Uxbridge Road, within the Office Corridor and it was listed within the Development Sites DPD as allocated for office led redevelopment. The site bordered Ealing Green Conservation area to the south; Exchange Plaza to the north; Dawley House to the east; and Hampton by Hill to the west.

The Committee was further informed that the proposed building would have the appearance of two buildings (blocks A and B) joined together. Block A would be 13 storey and approximately 51m. The 13th storey would be a 'false storey' used to conceal the plant equipment. Block A would be on the west side of the development. Block B would be 11 storey and it would have a height of approximately 44m. There would be an Urban Street through the middle of the development, providing a large pedestrian walkway. The walkway would lead to a 4 storey atrium with feature planting and access to a rear landscaped garden area. A small car parking area would be provided, with space for 15 cars of which 3 to be accessible. There would also be 486 cycle parking spaces.

The Committee was informed that the ground floor and mezzanine floors would be utilised for flexible workspace. A café, cycling and vehicle parking, Urban Street and office foyer would be located on the ground floor and mezzanine floors. Floors 1 to 13 were proposed as office space. It was explained that a Townscape and Heritage Analysis was provided by the applicant which identified no harm, however the case officers assessment was that the proposal would result in a less than substantial harm, at the low end, to nearby heritage assets. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment showed that it will not cause significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of Mattock Lane and Cavalier House.

The Officer reported that the proposal would result in significant benefits, including high quality office spaces within the Office Quarter, increased employment on the site, the provision of 1130sqm of affordable work spaces for Ealing businesses, improved Public Realm through supporting the boulevard strip, a reduction in onsite car parking and improvements through Section 106 contributions towards improved public transport and highways.

The Committee was further informed that, it had been concluded, that this would be a sustainable development in NPPF terms, on its merits and in balancing the impacts and benefits in applying the Planning Balance, it was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted, with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106, 38 and 278 agreements and Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London.

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 accessible parking, floor area, plan references, heads of terms, affordable workspace contributions, vehicle trips and parking, and amendments to conditions and informatives.

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

- This proposal, at 230,000 square foot, was an over development of the site as it would replace the current development (50,000 square foot).
- The proposal was a monolithic structure with no stepping back on the southern elevation on the first 10 stories so there would be a 120 foot (approximately) vertical wall on the southern elevation before any step back.
- The southern elevation was very close to the gardens of 28 – 34 Mattock Lane which would lose much of their aspect and daylight to the north and be severely overlooked, impacting privacy. Number 29 was a nursing home whose residents depended on the peace, tranquillity and aspect provided by the garden. Analysis of the daylight report identified significant breaches of BRE recommendations, but this harm was dismissed as outweighed by the alleged public benefits.

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

- The existing business had reached the end of its operable life. The spaces inside were inadequate, the site was significantly underused and energy performance was very low. A Needs Assessment undertaken in November 2020 showed that available space within Ealing was very low and limited.
- CP House was located within Ealing's Office Quarter, designated for redevelopment. The site allocation offered the opportunity to deliver significant additional office floor space to retain and attract business development in the borough.
- The building was designed with close collaboration with Council Officers and influence from the Community Consultation process.

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

- With regard to nearby residential properties, there would be no loss of direct sunlight and no overshadowing. There would be a noticeable reduction in vertical sky component. However, there were only a few windows which would have a reduction in the vertical sky component beyond 20%.
- The massing and density of the proposal had been thoroughly examined in terms of both, the constraints of the existing site and in terms of neighbouring developments. The proposed building was of a comparable height to neighbouring buildings.
- The current site had 156 car parking spaces and therefore the proposal of 15 car parking spaces was a significant reduction and it was well within the standard maximum under the New London Plan parking spaces in Outer London. The London Plan Publication Policy required 5% of parking spaces to be accessible and this policy had been met.
- The design had civil feature elements, notably the Urban Street. There would be a large atrium in the centre of the building itself which would hold a specimen tree. The atrium would allow sunlight to penetrate through the office. One of the blocks would be lighter than the other. It was also proposed that there would be terraces in the upper level, balconies and detailing in the brickwork. The design of the proposed building differentiated it from other buildings within the area.
- The proposed building would make more efficient use of the site and it would be carbon neutral. There would be 115 PV panels on the roof of the development to improve energy efficiency and there will be improved urban greening on the site. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application **REF**

**210030FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of Section 38,106 and 278 Legal Agreements.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent and Informatives as set out in the committee report and amended by the briefing note.
3. A Stage II referral to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

## **Dawley House, 91 – 95 Uxbridge Road, Ealing, W5 5TH - REPORT**

Wade Banks, Planning Officer, introduced the report, explaining that this application was for the construction of a 12 storey, part 11 storey, part 10 storey and part 3 storey, with basement level, hotel buildings to provide 170 rooms and provision of associated facilities and landscaping works.

It was explained that the application site was located on the southern side of Uxbridge Road. It was bordered by: CP House to the west; 85 Uxbridge Road (9 storey office building) to the east; Mattock Lane to the south, which comprised a series of semi-detached villas with long gardens; and Cavalier House (which was granted planning permission in 2001 for conversion from office to residential for 120 units) to the north.

The Committee was informed that the site was previously occupied by Dawley House, a 6 storey 1960's office building, that was demolished in 2015 following the grant of planning permission. The site was currently vacant.

The Officer reported that the site was located within Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre, the Office Quarter, the Uxbridge Road/Crossrail Development Corridor and an Archaeological Interest Area under the Development Plan.

It was explained that on the ground floor, there would be a restaurant, reception area, staff office with the property being serviced from the rear using the shared vehicular access to the west of the site. The first floor would mainly comprise of business services including offices and meeting rooms whilst the second floor would consist of a gym and prayer room for hotel guests. Floors 2 to 11 would host the hotel rooms and suites.

The Committee was informed that the building would comprise set backs at the 3rd floor level, along the centre of the western elevation. There would be further set backs on the 10th and 11th floors at the northwest and southeast corners to create terraces and to assist in breaking down the bulk in the proposed building.

The Officer further stated that the height, at a maximum of 12 storeys would not be in excess of heights already found along this section of Uxbridge Road. The proposed massing and height would therefore be in keeping with both the existing and emerging character and pattern of development of the surrounding area and related well to the form, proportion, scale and character of the adjacent buildings.

The Committee was made aware that the application site did not fall within a Conservation Area. It was however located adjacent to Ealing Green Conservation Area and it was approximately 310m away from Listed Building (Pitzhanger Manor). Any harm would be 'less than substantial' upon the nearby Ealing Green Conservation Area and Listed Building (Pitzhanger Manor) and that this limited harm would be outweighed by the significant benefits of the scheme.

The Committee heard that the proposed building would be visible above the houses on the north side of Mattock Lane. However, the development would be keeping with the hierarchy of neighbouring development along Uxbridge Road and it related well to the form, proportion, scale and character of the existing adjacent buildings. The views would not dominate the skyline and it would not result in an overbearing form of development.

The Officer reported that the Sunlight and Daylight assessment showed that where there was an impact on neighbouring properties, the scale of the impact was considered acceptable. The Committee was further informed that, it had been concluded, that this would be a sustainable development in NPPF terms, on its merits and in balancing the impacts and benefits in applying the Planning Balance, it was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted, following prior referral to the Secretary of State, with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106, 38 and 278 agreements, conditions of consent and Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London.

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 and a note regarding the description of the development.

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

- Some of the public benefit deriving from this development included: additional employment; efficient use of the site; improvement via Section 106 agreements to improve highways and link improvements; and the gifting of up to 3m of the front forecourt.
- There was insufficient space in the rear to provide a lot of landscaping. There was a thin strip of landscaping in the rear and the trees already in the rear side would be retained. The bulk of the landscaping would be towards the front of the site. The proposal also incorporated green roofs.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application **REF 201022FUL** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. Satisfactory completion of Section 38,106 and 278 Legal Agreements.
2. Successful resolution of Planning Conditions of Consent and Informatives as set out in the committee report and amended by the briefing note.
3. A Stage II referral to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

**8**

**The Straight, Southall, UB1 1QX - REPORT**

Rohan Graham, Planning Officer, introduced the report, explaining that this application was for the approval of reserved Matters pursuant to outline planning permission reference 171562VAR dated 16/10/2017, condition 2 pertaining to this third phase of development (Phase 3): details relating to Layout, Appearance, Scale and Landscaping of 8 new buildings. The 8 new buildings would range in height from 5 to 13 storeys, providing 645 residential units. 30% of the floor space for the residential units would be for affordable housing, being a mix of social rent and shared ownership. There would also be 2 small terrace blocks at 3 storeys. Landscaping, parking and road works would be developed in association with the proposal.

The Officer explained that the applicant had rebranded the site from the former Southall Waterside to The Green Quarter. Therefore, 'The Green Quarter' referred to the site formerly known as 'The Southall Gasworks site' and 'Southall Waterside'. The portion of the wider site that was the subject site for the purposes of this application (Phase 3), was located at the northern end of the site within a precinct identified as 'The Northern Quarter'. The approved Phase 1 Reserved Matters application delivered the first elements of the Northern Quarter which was a residential precinct that will integrate the existing urban fabric with the proposed streets of The Green Quarter. Phase 2 granted permission for 'The Emporium' character area which would establish an activity hub focused around a civic square. Phase 3 would be directly to the west of phase 1 and it would deliver the second portion of 'the Northern Quarter' with a development that mirrors the bulk and massing of Phase 1.

The Committee was informed that the building layout was designed in line with the Outline Consent and it was consistent with the building pattern established in Phase 1. All 8 buildings would have clear frontages to local road networks and open space.

It was explained that the appearance would be of a high standard. The material palette would be consistent with Phase 1. The following materials would be incorporated: primarily yellow, grey and red brickwork; warm grey material; vertically grouped punched windows; and simple bolt-on balconies.

It was further explained that the total number of storeys, height and massing had been developed having regard to the approved parameters for this site. The maximum and minimum height parameters were set out in the Outline Masterplan, approved in 2017. Buildings A and B would be 5 storeys, buildings C and F would be 6 storeys, buildings D and H would be 10 and 11 storeys respectively whilst buildings E and G would be 13 storeys. The townhouse buildings, sitting in between D and H and E and G would be 3 storeys. The heights would fall down towards the north, where the site adjoins the low-density residential buildings that front Beaconsfield Road. The tallest buildings would be located on the edge of the Central Gardens parkland.

The Committee was informed that the site would be heavily landscaped and incorporate a range of plants to create a high quality Public Realm, street network and private and public communal open space. The proposal had been supported by the Council's Landscape Architect.

It was further explained that, in terms of play space, the strategy balanced formal equipped play provision, aimed at older children, set within adjacent parks (which would be provided by different phases) with doorstep play for under-fives in the courtyards, which would be provided as part of this application.

The Committee was made aware that a green roof would be established above all 8 buildings proposed within Phase 3. Solar Photovoltaic (PVs) panels would be placed on the roof of each building above the green roofs.

The Officer explained that the application also addressed a range of other matters that were considered relevant. He stated that: all residential units would comply with the London Plan standards in terms of gross internal floor space and outdoor amenity space; car parking was supported by TfL and it would be provided at grade and beneath the landscaped podium, with the use of bikes and public transport being prioritised; 30% of the total floorspace would be affordable housing; the Council's Energy Consultant confirmed that the proposal was compliant with the Outline Consent, subject to a carbon offset payment; and remediation of the site had been completed.

The Committee was further informed that, it had been concluded,

that this would be a sustainable development in NPPF terms, on its merits and in balancing the impacts and benefits in applying the Planning Balance, it was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted, following prior referral to the Secretary of State, with conditions and subject a deed of variation (to secure carbon offset contribution) to the Section 106 Legal Agreement and conditions contained within Appendix A of the report.

A briefing note in respect of the application had been produced by Planning Officers, circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website prior to the meeting. It had provided details a note regarding Contamination & Remediation.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the Application.

**RESOLVED:**

That for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application **REF 205101REM** be **GRANTED** subject to:

1. A deed of variation (to secure carbon offset contribution) to the Section 106 Legal Agreement
2. Conditions contained within Appendix A of the report.

**9**

**Gurnell Leisure Centre, Ruislip Road East,  
West Ealing, W13 0AL - REPORT**

Gregory Gray, Planning Officer, introduced the report, explaining that the proposals were for demolition of all existing buildings and erection of a replacement leisure centre. The application site was 13.2ha, of which 4ha was proposed to accommodate built development with 1.42ha of that accommodating new buildings, facilitating affordable and market housing residential development in 6 blocks ranging from 6 to 17 storeys, flexible retail floorspace, plant room and energy centre, leisure centre coach parking, basement residential and leisure centre cycle and car parking, refuse/recycling storage, new servicing, vehicular and pedestrian accesses and associated highway works, new and replacement play space, public realm and public open space, landscaping and associated ground works to existing public open space.

It was explained that the site was on land designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and comprising public open space. London Plan Policy G3 afforded MOL the same protection as Green Belt and for the purpose of determining applications, directed applicants/decision makers to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF supported proposals that enhanced

MOL status and function and provided a wider range of benefits. The Officer outlined the several steps that were taken to establish if development on this MOL land would lead to any harm. The Committee was informed that a facilitating development was necessary to fund this development. The benefits for enabling this development outweighed the disbenefits from departing from planning policies. The Viability Assessment had been independently assessed for the Council by Lambert Smith. The Viability Assessment concluded that the application scheme represented the optimum scenario as it limited the quantum of inappropriate development on MOL whilst maximising the genuinely affordable offer secured. It was concluded from the Alternative Site Assessment process that there was no genuinely available alternative location for the replacement of the Gurnell Leisure Centre. Accordingly, it was considered that the existing Gurnell LC site represented a 'site of last resort'.

The Officer reported that there was extensive pre-application consultation with the GLA for a period of approximately 3 years, during which the design of the proposal was considered. The GLA insisted that any development should maximise its footprint with regard to previously developed land, i.e. the car park and existing leisure centre. Therefore, the application confined the new housing development to the existing developed land comprising the leisure centre car park.

The Committee was informed that the scheme would involve the construction of a total of 14,292sqm footprint of new buildings, hard-standings, car park and access roads, amounting to an increase of 77sqm (or 0.54%) over the existing 14,215sqm of 'previously developed land'. It was explained that the site was in an area of flood risk. However, there would be measures in place to mitigate the risk of flood. A balancing pond would be created and run through the site and flood water would drain into it. The balancing pond would contain the flood water and carry it out of the site. The applicant had undertaken consultation directly with the Environment Agency (EA). The EA was in support of the application, subject to the imposition of a condition concerning the provision and management of a buffer zone to the River Brent, which was included in the recommendation.

It was further explained that there were 387 existing trees at the site and under the proposal 141 existing trees would be removed and 198 trees would be planted. Therefore, there would be a net increase of 57 trees post-development. The landscaping plans were fully supported by the Council's Leisure Department and Natural England did not object to this application.

The Committee heard that the main pool in the proposed leisure centre would have a total area of 1,250sqm, with the length at 50m

and width at 25m. This was an increase from the existing pool at 760sqm, with the length at 50m and width at 13-15m. The new leisure centre would include a soft play area; café; and meeting rooms. The objective for this proposal was to create a leisure centre for the community for the long term.

It was explained that implementation of the development would commence with the construction of the shared basement. The current BMX track (as well as the play ground, and skateboard park) would need to be relocated to facilitate this.

The Committee was informed that there would be at least 196 affordable flats, equating to 34.5% by habitable rooms.

The Committee was further informed that, across the scheme: 40.6% were dual aspect residential units and 13.8% were single aspect and north facing residential units. There were 3 affordable units that were north facing and single aspect.

The Officer summarised his key points and stated that MOL policy had been applied sequentially and the harms had been weighed against the benefits secured; very special circumstances were demonstrated; the site was the appropriate 'site of last resort' to accommodate the replacement leisure centre and new housing; this was not an EIA development; the quantum of residential development did not exceed that necessary to facilitate delivery of the leisure centre, park improvements and an acceptable level of affordable housing; the level of facilitating development represented the optimum; the scheme minimised its impact on MOL openness; flood risks were effectively mitigated; the incorporation of tall buildings was carefully considered; representations were carefully and comprehensively assessed; and overall, in applying the Planning Balance, this would be a suitable development.

The Committee was further informed that this would be a sustainable development in NPPF terms, on its merits and in balancing the impacts and benefits in applying the Planning Balance, it was therefore recommended by Officers that full planning permission be granted, following prior referral to the Secretary of State, with conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement and a Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London. The Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London would be carried out if the Secretary of State declined to call-in the application for his consideration. 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 and further written representations.

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

- The housing mix and tenure did not meet the borough's needs: there were not enough 3 bedroom family units and only 34.5% would be affordable housing. The new community would be segregated due to a lack of pepper potting. The affordable units would be excluded from the parking facilities, residents hub and roof garden which would all be provided to the private units.
- Significant harm would be caused from the loss of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. The site was in a suburban area, however the assessments inaccurately used an urban baseline. BRE guidelines would be breached for 52 homes and the new development would get parkland views while the existing community would suffer.
- The proposal would cost £54,900,000, with half of the costs due to the expensive basement and underground parking. A comparable development by Sports England suggested that £18 million to £25 million would be a more appropriate figure.
- The proposed development would be inappropriate development of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), the Very Special Circumstances were not demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harms and there would be an adverse impact on MOL openness (visually and spatially).

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

- The existing leisure centre closed and was no longer fit for purpose or viable to operate. The proposed replacement leisure centre would be 45% bigger. It would still have a 50m pool but the width would increase by 40%. There would be a moveable floor which to allow multiple groups to use the main pool at the same time, for example, the pool may be used for school lessons, family days out and national competitions. There would be a soft play centre for younger children, a large gym and three studios with sprung floors.
- Since 2016, there had been 12 consultation events and engagement with local community groups. Where possible, the design was changed to reflect the feedback from this engagement. The applicant reduced height where possible, especially near to Peal Gardens and tried to balance height with the need to deliver the improved leisure centre and affordable homes whilst also trying to minimise the impact on the park.
- The project would deliver 599 new homes for Ealing, with 35% being affordable homes and half of these being London Affordable Rent. The 403 private homes would cross fund the affordable housing and the sport and leisure centre.

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

- Block A would contain the London Affordable Rent units and block B would contain the shared ownership units. The reason the units were separated, even though both blocks would be managed by the same Council-owned operator, was to secure as much high quality and affordable housing as possible. They believed it would be easier to reduce service charges if the two types of tenures were separated. They did not focus on pepper potting but rather on delivering high standard, tenure blind and mixed tenure housing across the whole development.
- Whether very special circumstances had been met or not was a matter for the Council to decide and not for the GLA to decide. If the Council did decide that very special circumstances were met then the GLA would take this into account in their decision-making process at stage 2.
- The scheme would include comprehensive flood risk management for the development overall so there would be measures to avoid the flooding of the basement.
- The Council would manage the flood risk as it would retain ownership of the land.
- The proposed development started as an enabling development because in 2015 the Council sought a development partner as a cross subsidy. However, following discussion with GLA in 2019, the Council required the developer to have affordable housing in the scheme to help the Council meet its objection to increase affordable housing provision. As affordable housing was not necessary to cross subsidise a development, the scheme was now a facilitating development.
- The whole of the proposed development, except the improvements to the park, would be inappropriate development on Designated MOL. The proposed scheme would replace the existing leisure centre and car park, both of which were also inappropriate developments.
- The site orientation was north-south and the sun path was primarily east-west and therefore shading would only take place at certain parts of the day and certain parts of the year. The site would remain primarily in sunlight.
- The service charges for the London Affordable Rent units for this scheme had not been determined yet.
- In the event of a flood, the proposal provided for a balancing pond running from the southeast to northwest through the park, containing flood water, carrying it away from the site and then discharging the water into Brent river.
- London Wildlife Trust and Natural England were consulted and had no comments on the application. The Council Leisure Department closely reviewed the application. The Environment Agency suggested conditions in terms of ecological improvement in area.

- The income cap, set by the GLA and endorsed by the Council, was £90,000 per year for a 2 bedroom shared ownership unit. The maximum earning limit for this proposed scheme was £66,000 per year for a 2 bedroom shared ownership unit, which was well within the income cap.
- The lifecycle of the proposed pool plant was estimated to be 30 to 40 years.
- The size of the current BMX track was 50m by 30m.
- The internal floor areas for the residential units met the standards set by the London Plan in terms of sizes.
- The 6 factors that were considered in determining the harm to MOL were not steps to be applied sequentially. They can all be considered concurrently. Therefore, the proposed development being inappropriate did not mean that the other 5 factors could not be considered. The core of the report was to show that even though the development was inappropriate, very special circumstances existed and therefore this application should be granted.
- The zero land value was given consideration by Lambert Smith in their assessment of the financial viability document.
- For the purposes of planning, officers conducted an independent financial viability assessment during which the land value was assessed. However, this was not to be confused with what was negotiated as part of the development agreement and the price agreed with developer.

It was moved by Councillor Dabrowska and seconded by Councillor Young that consideration of the application be deferred due to concerns about the accuracy of the information in the application regarding the land value, 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 for the reasons set out in the committee report, planning permission for the application **REF 201695FUL** be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

The NPPF indicated that inappropriate development was, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt (and by implication MOL which according to the London Plan is treated in the same way) and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In addition, there were adverse impacts on openness and by definition harm caused by the scale, massing and design of the development proposal. The benefits of the proposed development were therefore not deemed to outweigh the by definition harm to the MOL. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development did not exist.

**10**

## **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Wednesday 21 April 2021.

The meeting of the Committee concluded at 23:08pm