

Briefing for Mayor

Southall Gasworks Hearing

25 March 2010

Greater London Authority reference number: PDU/2310

Key issues for Ealing Council

1. Traffic impact on Beaconsfield Road

Resolved:

- One vehicle access from site onto Beaconsfield Road already exists. However, two new vehicle access points are proposed by demolishing 137-143 (odd) and 249 Beaconsfield Road. All three accesses would be one-way system only with central access being entrance only and other two restricted to exit only.
- Traffic calming measures would be used on the three accesses to constrain traffic flows through these access.
- The primary accesses onto Pump Lane (western access) and South Road (eastern access) will ensure that the Beaconsfield Road accesses are not abused.
- £100K has been secured for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Beaconsfield and beyond to ensure that parking on Beaconsfield Road is not abused.

2. Traffic impact on South Road

Resolved:

- Grampian condition to limit occupation to 2,500 development units until South Road bridge is widened
- £3.55 million Transport Management Fund to cover transport mitigation measures
- South Road corridor study conditioned to monitor traffic flow

- Three key junction improvements secured on South Road:
 - (1) Capacity and performance at the South Road/A4020 Uxbridge Road junction
 - (2) Capacity and performance at the South Road/Beaconsfield Road junction
 - (3) Capacity and performance at the South Road/Merrick Road junction

Key issues for Hillingdon Council

1. Impact on Minet Country Park

Resolved

- £1.84 million offered by developer to improve facilities and help ecological management.
- The development provides 24.4 hectares open space on site that will ensure that the entire future residents amenity needs will be met onsite and therefore the Minet Country Park will not suffer a harmful increase in visitor numbers.

2. Impact on character of Green Belt

Resolved

- Policy AM4 of Hillingdon's Development Plan has always safeguarded the Pump Lane Road extension works, which is within Green Belt.
- The footprints of the Canal side residential blocks have been designed so only 'fingers' of the development would extend towards the canal.
- In contrast the deeply recessed and much wider courtyard elevations, in between each 'finger', would be further set back from the Green Belt and hence less visible and would not harm the visual amenity of the Green Belt. This recessing of the courtyard elevations significantly reduces the overall bulk of these buildings located in this sensitive part of the site.
- The applicant also proposes significant landscaping with tree planting along the Canal towpath and within the recessed courtyards to act as a landscape buffer zone between the new buildings and the canal side environment and Green Belt beyond.
- To summarise it is recognised that the new development would be visible from persons using Minet Country Park, however this juxtaposition of buildings overlooking Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) in such an urban context like this is commonplace throughout London and the impact depends in part on the scale of the buildings, the quality of their design and the existing context that surrounds the Green Belt. This area of Green Belt is not physically connected to the wider Green Belt that surrounds London and has a distinctly different character because of its urban setting. A number of tall buildings and other buildings of varying design quality are already visible from the Green Belt including the Guru Nanak School to the north and the three 13 storey residential tower blocks of Glenister House, Fitzgerald House and Welling House located west across the Hayes Bypass. These tall buildings are very close and clearly visible from the Green Belt. Therefore the proposed height and massing of the development next the Canal and the quality of the design sought

through the outline consent would not harm the existing character of the Green Belt subject to the landscape conditions attached, but would instead enhance the views to the Canal from within the suite and views from the Canal towards the site.

3. Impact upon ecology and biodiversity in Minet Country Park

Resolved:

- £1.84 million offered by developer to improve facilities and help ecological management
- Raft of ecological conditions secured, including provision of an Ecological Management Plan, an Ecological Clerk of Works to oversee development on site and further biodiversity studies.
- The Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SINC) lost to the Pump Lane road extension has always been by Hillingdon Council's policy AM4.
- New 4 metre wide wildlife corridor proposed next to canal, which is greater ecology value than existing part of SINC lost for road extensions
- Been fully assessed and agreed by GLA's Biodiversity Officers.

Key issues raised by objectors (in addition to above issues)

1. Risk to human health from onsite contamination.

Resolved:

- Independent and comprehensive remediation strategy provided by applicant
- This was fully considered acceptable by both Council's environmental officers
- Council Members raised no objection to these professional recommendations
- Therefore no refusal reasons on contamination were included by either Council
- GLA has ensured the Strictest Grampian conditions are included for remediation works
- Remediation Officer employed to oversee all remediation works on site (highly controlled and regulated)
- Developer has factored £36.5 million to remove all contamination from site
- GLA welcomes this as an excellent opportunity to remove all contamination from this site in a highly controlled and regulated manner

2. Adverse retail impact on Hayes Town Centre and Ealing Town Centres

Resolved:

- Comprehensive Retail Assessment was provided by applicant
- This was fully considered acceptable by both Council's policy officers
- Council Members raised no objection to these professional recommendations
- Therefore no refusal reasons on retail impact were included by either Council
- GLA has also since tested Retail Assessment against new PPS4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Development' and is fully compliant
- The proposed retail element of the scheme would be effective in physically linking with the existing Southall retail area and the distinctly mainstream retail offer proposed on the site that would contrast with, and therefore strengthen, the specialist retail offer of the existing centre. Subsequently this would increase Southall centre's market share of the surrounding catchment, and would assist in providing long-term consolidation of the Major centre position within the shopping hierarchy.
- Although this application proposes the retail and leisure uses to be located at 'edge of centre' the strategic importance of the site is clarified by *table A1.1 of the draft London Plan* which states that 'there is great scope to enhance the local environment and complement Southall's current strengths, including its ethnic identity and links with South Asia, by introducing a more diverse retail offer... The imperative to deliver genuine linkages between the Southall Gasworks site and the existing Southall town centre must be secured'. The London Plan and Ealing's UDP policies recognise that the application site provides a unique opportunity whereby an 'edge of centre' retail development could serve to enhance the vitality and viability of Southall town centre.

3. Not enough social/community facilities proposed

Resolved:

- New junior school proposed
- £5,131,456 contribution to secondary education
- New health care facility (8 GPs)
- Hotel and Conference centre / banqueting suite
- Open space equates to 24.4 hectares. This would include 4.6 hectares as communal garden space and 13.5 hectares as public open space. An additional 2.5 hectares of children's playspace would be provided on top of the open space provision.
- New pedestrian/cycle bridges to allow access into Minet Country Park
- New cafes/ Pubs / restaurants

- Moorings for canal boats
- Allotments
- Cinema
- Cricket pitch
- Sports pavilion
- 7 hard surface all weather pitches (MUGA)
- Youth/environmental centre
- Wetland area with board walks
- Community gardens
- Swimming pool contribution (£975k)

Southall Gas Works Site (West Southall)

25 March 2010

Greater London Authority reference number: PDU/2310/07

London Borough of Hillingdon: 54814/APP/2009/430 conditions section amendments

1 Add two extra bullet points:

- Pump Lane/ Bilton Way new signal junction
- Width restriction works in Pump Lane

London Borough of Hillingdon: 54814/APP/2009/430 legal agreement section amendments

2 Add bullet point:

- Hillingdon Council also has some control in spending of £3.55 million Transport fund

Transport section amendments

3 Add two additional condition bullet points to table on page 54 as part of the 1,750 development unit limit.

Retail section amendment

4 Part (b) page 39: Hounslow incorrectly termed as a 'Major Centre', it is a 'Metropolitan Centre'.

Climate change mitigation section amendment

5 Replace paragraph 367 with the following text:

"Strategy Option 2 is a near replica of the scheme being promoted by Blue-NG independently of the Southall Gasworks redevelopment proposal, under Blue-NG's own planning application, which is currently the subject of an appeal with the Secretary of State. Notwithstanding this, Strategy Option 2 would be an acceptable energy system for the gas works redevelopment."

6 Paragraph 370 amended so that the second sentence is replaced with the following text:

"These conditions would secure one of the two energy strategy options".

Hillingdon's draft decision notice: drawing numbers

- 52212/B/33 should be deleted and only 52212/B/33/A saved.
- 52212/A/77 which relates to the Pump Lane /Bilton Way junction should be inserted.
- 52212/A/74 which relates to a bus lane in Pump Lane is missing
- 4597-P-20 is listed twice, one to be deleted.
- 52212/B/32, which relates to A312/Hayes Road junction, should be inserted.

Heritage

7 PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Development' has been released after the stage three report had to be legally published, therefore the stage three report has made no reference to PPS5. Therefore all references to PPG15, PPG16 and draft PPS15 in the report must be deleted.

8 Paragraph 301 must be replaced with the following paragraph, which specifically refers to policies HE10 and HE7 of PPS5.

'Policy HE10 states "when considering applications for development that affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities should treat favorably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset". The heritage assets in relation to this application are the listed Water Tower and the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area and it has been demonstrated that the masterplan complies with policy HE10. Policy HE10 also states that "Local planning authorities should identify opportunities for changes in the setting to enhance or better reveal the significance of a heritage asset. Taking such opportunities should be seen as a public benefit and part of the process of place shaping". The masterplan has demonstrated compliance as the significance of the heritage assets would be better revealed for the public benefit and place shaping. Policy HE7 of PPS5 is also relevant in particular when "Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use". The master plan has taken these considerations into account in producing a development that would make a positive contribution'.

9 PPS5 now covers archaeology and therefore reference to PPG16 in paragraph 310 must be removed. The archeological assessment submitted by the applicant coupled with the archaeological conditions requested by English Heritage means that the proposal fully complies with policies HE6 and HE8 of PPS5.

for further information, contact Planning Decisions Unit:

██████████ Assistant Director, Planning

020 7983 ██████████ @london.gov.uk

██████████, Senior Manager (Planning)

020 7983 ██████████ @london.gov.uk

██████████ Strategic Planning Manager (Planning Decisions)

020 7983 ██████████ london.gov.uk

████████████████████
020 7983 ██████████ ██████████ @london.gov.uk

SOUTHALL MEETING WITH LB HILLINGDON (1st)

14 January 2010

1. Introductions
2. Overview of GLA Stage 3 process and hearing timetable
3. Hillingdon's 4 reasons for refusal
4. Hillingdon's position at hearing
5. Potential planning conditions
6. S106 matters to be resolved
7. Neighbour consultation in Hillingdon
8. Next steps and future meetings
9. AOB

1. Introductions
2. Update from GLA
3. Progress update by Savell Bird and Axon on addressing both refusal reasons
4. TfL response
5. LPA's response on refusal reasons
6. Discussion on transport heads of terms and delivery mechanisms
7. Discussion on transport conditions
8. Agreed actions and time lines

