

Briefing Notes

Items 03 – Hanson Gardens, Southall - 205302FUL

Further Written Representations

1. Ealing Civic Society submitted an objection to this application. This was not noted in the planning committee report because it was submitted after the formal consultation period had expired and not identified in the lengthy period between the officer's report being completed and it being brought to planning committee. The objection is set out below.

"Ealing Civic Society objects to this application. We note the planned reduction in the overall height of the development in comparison with that of a previous application for the site. However, we maintain that the proposals continue to be inappropriate overdevelopment on this location. We consider the proposed design of the buildings to be too blocky and, as such, very unsympathetic to the neighbouring houses. In addition, we maintain our concerns about the loss of biodiversity from the location through the removal of mature trees and lack of soft landscaping. Furthermore, we continue to object to the planned access to the development which the applicant concedes would be too narrow for refuse vehicles to enter. Presumably, then, emergency vehicles would be denied access, thus presenting potential safety issues with this constrained site. A development of lower density would be far more appropriate for this location and we urge the Council to respond to the applicant accordingly."

The objection is noted but the planning officer's view is that all these points are addressed in the report and no changes to it are required.

2. Further representations have also been submitted on behalf of the signatories of the previously submitted petition. These are set out below with comments from the planning officer.

Objection	Officer comment
The width of the site access is measured as 3.17m which does not meet the minimum requirements of 3.25m	The width of the access was measured from submitted drawings as 3.3m by the transport section and we are not able to verify what was measured on site. The applicants have submitted swept path diagrams to demonstrate that the access is suitable for various refuse and emergency vehicles.
The report is wrong when it says the inspector did not have the relevant	It may be that the inspector had access to this information but his report strangely made no reference to

Planning Committee: 19/05/2021

Briefing Notes

<p>information with regard to loss of social infrastructure use of the site</p>	<p>this important evidence and case law. This may have been because this issue was not emphasised in the planning officer's report. In any event, the planning officer's view, based on the evidence submitted and the referenced case law, remains that the former use can be considered to be abandoned and the policy on loss of social infrastructure would not apply.</p>
<p>4 of the 9 units do not meet the Policy 7D requirements for amenity space and 1 unit fails to provide even half the required space.</p>	<p>As the committee report makes clear, while 4 houses have gardens below 50 sq m, 3 of them are only slightly below it and another also has a courtyard bringing total provision over 50 sq m. It is not correct that 1 unit fails to provide even half the required space. This is an urban site where some flexibility is normally applied to the target provision. On balance, it is considered that the units would have adequate amounts of provision.</p>
<p>The development not having parking permits will not prevent residents parking outside CPZ hours when the parking spaces are hardest to find. We would not support an increase in CPZ operational hours.</p>	<p>The Council's transport officer has not raised any objection to the level of on-site parking proposed and it is London Plan policy to minimise parking for new developments. The CPZ will restrict parking for residents without permits for most of the day (10am – 8 pm) which should discourage such parking.</p>
<p>The development is seeking to remove a parking space on Hanson Gardens, which will exacerbate the issues we face with parking on the road.</p>	<p>The Council's transport officer has not raised any objection to the loss of this one parking space.</p>