

**References:** P/2014/1883 01217/C/P41

**Address:** Reynard Mills, Windmill Road, Brentford, TW8 9LY

**Application received:** 13/05/2014

---

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing units and construction of 195 residential units, a D1 non-residential institution unit, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
- 1.2. Objections have been received from 16 local residents, raising concerns chiefly relating to the scale of the development, its impact on local parking and highways conditions and the accompanying pressure on local services. A further 18 representations have been received in addition to that of the Windmill Road Action Group, which gives qualified support.
- 1.3. The proposed development is considered to be a significant improvement compared to the previous appeal scheme for 275 units on the site. Its contribution to housing supply in the Borough, in particular affordable housing supply, is particularly welcome.

1.4. The application is recommended for approval, subject to safeguarding conditions and a S.106 agreement following referral to the Greater London Authority (Stage II), is recommended.
---

## **2.0 SITE**

- 2.1. A 2.4 hectare site occupied by ten commercial and industrial units with either B1 (office) or B8 (warehousing) uses, of which only one is currently occupied. The units are of a substantial bulk and floorspace, though none are more than two storeys in height. The parts of the site not taken up by buildings are almost entirely covered in hardstandings for parking or servicing. There are two points of entry to the site, both via constrained accesses from Windmill Road to the east.
- 2.2. The area surrounding the site is primarily residential in character. The rear gardens of terraced housing abut the site to the east whilst blocks of flats back onto the site to the west and south, including a four storey block within the Paragon development. To the north-west is the Gunnersbury Catholic School whilst to the southwest is the Our Lady and St. John Primary School. St. Faith's Church, its church hall and vicarage adjoin the southern entrance to the site.
- 2.3. The A4 (Great West Road) is less than 200m to the south of the site along Windmill Road. The boundary with the London Borough of Ealing abuts the northern entry point to the site.



Figure 1: Proposed Site plan

### 3.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

3.1. **01217/C/P38:** Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 229 dwellings (Outline application including means of access). **Withdrawn 13/05/2013.**

3.2. **01217/C/P37:** Outline planning application for the demolition of the existing buildings at the site and the erection of 275 dwellings with all matters other than access and layout reserved. **Refused 17/04/2012 for the following reasons:**

1. The proposal, due to its density and excessive amount of development and the relationship of the site to neighbouring properties, would result in a layout that includes buildings of an unsatisfactory height, bulk, and scale that would be incongruous features in the townscape and inappropriate in their context, which would be harmful to neighbours' outlook and the character of the area. It would therefore fail to take to the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area and integrate with the

surrounding development. The proposal is therefore contrary to the objectives of policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), H.4.1 (Housing Standards and Guidelines) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan; Brentford Area Action Plan policies BAAP1 and BAAP2; and policies 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 7.1 (Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.5 (Public Realm), and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan 2011.

2. The proposal, due to its density and excessive amount of development would create a layout that would create internal street scenes that are dominated by car parking and that fails to provide sufficient areas of good quality amenity space for all future occupants due to excessive overshadowing of communal spaces, undue overlooking of the southernmost private rear gardens and the inadequate area of some of the northernmost private rear gardens, thereby failing to provide a satisfactory good quality residential environment for all occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), H.4.1 (Housing Standards and Guidelines) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan; Brentford Area Action Plan policies BAAP1 and BAAP2; and policies 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.6 (Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation Facilities), 6.10 (Walking), 7.1 (Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.5 (Public Realm), and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan 2011.
3. The proposed development would fail to provide adequate levels of off-street parking for the number of future residents and visitors to the site, which is likely to lead to overspill parking on nearby streets that are heavily parked and not subject to parking controls, whilst the level of traffic generated from the amount of development proposed is likely to unduly add to existing peak hour traffic congestion on adjacent roads. Therefore the proposed development is likely to adversely affect existing traffic and parking conditions on the adjacent roads, contrary to policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), T.1.2 (The Movement Implications of Development), T.1.4 (Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments), T.4.2 (Oppose Overall Increases in Highway Capacity for Private Vehicles and Seek Reduction in Traffic Levels), T.4.3 (Traffic Implications of New Development) and T.4.4 (Road Safety) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan; Brentford Area Action Plan policy BAAP7; and policies 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential), 6.3 (Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity), 6.12 (Road Network Capacity), and 6.13 (Parking) of the London Plan 2011.
4. The proposed development would, in the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure necessary planning obligations, put undue strain on the existing local education facilities and health facilities, and fail to provide affordable housing at an appropriate level, contrary to policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), H.4.5 (Associated Facilities for Residential

Developments), C.2.1 (Educational Facilities), C.3.2 (New or Extended Health Facilities), and IMP.6.1 (Planning Obligations) of London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan; and policies 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.12 (Negotiating Affordable Housing on Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Schemes), 3.13 (Affordable Housing Thresholds), 8.2 (Planning Obligations) the London Plan 2011; and the Brentford Area Action Plan.

5. The proposed development would, in the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure necessary planning obligations, fail to secure the improvement of pedestrian, cycling and public transport facilities and provision of a comprehensive travel plan for the development, thereby failing to assist in limiting the use of the car and contributing to use of more sustainable modes of transport. This would be contrary to policies ENV-B.1.1 (New Development), T.1.2 (The Movement Implications of Development), Policy T.1.4 (Car and Cycle Parking and Servicing Facilities for Developments), T.2.2 (Pedestrian Safety and Security), T.2.3 (Strategic and Local Cycle Networks), T.2.4 (Public Transport Infrastructure), T.4.3 (The Traffic Implications of New Development), T.4.4 (Road safety), and IMP.6.1 (Planning Obligations) of the London Borough of Hounslow Unitary Development Plan; Brentford Area Action Plan policy BAAP7; and policies 6.9 (Cycling), 6.10 (Walking) and 6.13 (Parking) of the London Plan.

3.3. A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed on 21/03/2013 following a public inquiry and referral to the Secretary of State. The appeal decision broadly concurred with the Council's reasons for refusal.

3.4. **01217/C/P36:** Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 315 dwellings (Outline application for layout and access). **Withdrawn 26/08/2011.**

#### 4.0 DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

4.1. The proposal seeks planning permission for the demolition of all the buildings comprising the existing industrial estate and the construction of 195 residential units and a D1 (non-residential institution) unit on the site. The mix of residential units would be as shown in the following table:

	Market housing	Affordable rent	Shared ownership	Total
One bedroom flats	25	0	20	45
Two bedroom flats	17	26	19	62
Three bedroom flats	0	16	0	16
<b>Total flats</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>123</b>
Three bedroom	53	0	0	53

houses				
Four bedroom houses	19	0	0	19
<b>Total Houses</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>195</b>

- 4.2. Houses: The 72 houses would be provided chiefly in two and three storey terraces around the edges of the site. All would have private gardens to the rear and most have allocated off-street parking, in a front forecourt and some with an integral garage. The 19 four bed units would have an off-street parking space and 13 of which would also have an integrated garage. Two sets of housing on the northern and southern edges of the site would be of a 'mews' type.
- 4.3. Flats: The flats would be provided in three blocks. Blocks A and C would be four storeys in height whilst the larger block B would be four and five storeys in height and occupy the centre of the site. Each block would have access to its own shared private amenity space and parking spaces. The amenity space and parking for blocks A and C would be located adjacent to the buildings whilst block B would be designed around a central 'podium' courtyard, with parking located beneath. There would be a total of 118 parking spaces serving the flats and a few of the houses where on plot parking is not possible.
- 4.4. D1 unit: 100sqm of floorspace on ground floor of block B would be set aside for an unspecified D1 (non-residential institution) use. The D1 use class encompasses a broad range of possible uses, though the developer envisages that a nursery/crèche would be the most likely occupier.
- 4.5. Street design/access arrangements: The development would use the existing two accesses from Windmill Road, with the southern one being access only and the northern one solely for exit for motor vehicles. A cycle contraflow would be provided on both accesses. Within the development, the streets would have a Home Zone arrangement, with shared surfaces and parking areas interspersed with planting. A pair of small parks would be located in the western and southern corners of the site.
- 4.6. Amended Plans: Some limited modifications to the scheme have been provided since the application was submitted, the most significant being a decrease in the number of parking spaces from 205 to 200 to provide additional street landscaping and the increase in the number of wheelchair accessible units to 20.

## 5.0 CONSULTATION

- 5.1. 1,793 neighbouring addresses and respondents to the previous application were notified by letter on 21/05/2014, site notices were placed at the entrances to the site on 29/05/2014 and a notice was published in the local press on 30/05/2014.

5.2. 16 letters of objection have been received. The following concerns and comments were raised:

#### Scale and design

- Overdevelopment of the site and excessive density.
- The blocks of flats are an eyesore, being too large and "blocky".
- A lower number of residential units would be supported, i.e. 50 units.
- The Reynard Estate is surrounded by 2 and 3 storey buildings. High flats are not in keeping with this suburban area.
- The blocks will appear as a continuous mass dominating the sky line resulting in a visually intrusive development completely out of character for the area.
- Housing should be a maximum of three floors and of good quality.
- The large central blocks are to be built on raised ground above a basement car park, adding an extra storey. The heights will be further increased by the solar panels. Thus the central tallest block will effectively be 6 or 7 storeys.
- Pictures of other NHHT developments show a variety of facades and finishes. Some look very dull, others rather fussy. Clapham Park is by far the best model with good quality facades and light and greenery.
- The London Housing Density Matrix definitions show that the site is overwhelmingly in a 'Suburban Setting'.
- Family houses and lower densities will be far more in keeping with the local context, physically and socially, than the planned mixture.
- To reduce the number of homes from 210 to 195 is a paltry and insignificant reduction for this small site.

#### Transport issues

- Additional Traffic and congestion.
- 300 extra cars would be trying to access Windmill Road each morning.
- Insufficient parking is provided.
- The area already has a parking problem.
- Taking the train isn't much of an alternative either as the Brentford to Waterloo train is standing only now during rush hour.
- Local buses, i.e. 65, E2 and E3 cannot accommodate the number of people already living in this area.
- The development needs to include space for parking to the extent of 2 spaces per household (390 parking spaces).
- Windmill road and roads off windmill such as Darwin Road and Murray Road need to have a CPZ in place.

#### Pressure on local services:

- Already too many schools and school children in the area.
- Older residents find it increasingly difficult just to walk on the pavements because of the number of mums with buggies and children riding bicycles and scooters. Using the local shops on Northfield Avenue is impossible.
- Thames water would not be able to provide for so many new homes.
- GP surgeries, hospitals, dentists and schools are already oversubscribed.
- In advance of any agreement being made it needs to be stated which catchment area the houses fall under for primary and secondary schools.
- Potential for flooding from the main sewer under the site.

- Currently drains overflow when it rains.
- We welcome the proposal for a D1 nursery, however this will not solve the problems of increased demand for health and education services.
- Concern about squashing a further 500 - 600 residents into an area that is fully developed.
- There would need to be additional public transport capacity.

#### Impact on neighbouring residents:

- At present the site, being industrial, is silent from 7pm until 7am.
- Loss of light/privacy to Paragon B.
- Overlooking to houses on Windmill Road. Residential development must go back at least another 15 metres in order to prevent overlooking,
- At night there is a lot of vandalism down Windmill Road and more residents would add to this.
- Damage to health and property during and as a result of the demolition and construction processes.
- The distance between the back of Windmill Road houses and planned houses should be more than the minimum 21m.

#### General issues

- The developers seek to make as much money as possible without proper consideration being given to the community in which they hope to build.
- Block B Paragon which borders the site is continually referred to in the plans as student housing. It is in fact occupied by Shared Ownership leaseholders and market rent tenants.
- There has been no consultation from NHHG directly with residents of Block B Paragon and in fact many residents are unaware of their involvement.
- Possible reduction of value to surrounding properties.
- The plans show many bike sheds in and near the blocks. They will become dark and murky spaces perfect for unsafe, anti-social and criminal behaviours.
- Reynard Mills should be left as a commercial property or turned into a school.
- The proposed Block B plans show access corridors to the individual homes. These will lead to anti-social and criminal behaviour. Modern residential development should be able to avoid these corridors.
- Development is contrary to the BAAP and MLP.
- Disappointed that consultation approaches 1 and 3 have been rejected in favour of 2. The majority preferred approach 1 in which the houses would be built perpendicular to our house on Windmill Road.
- Hounslow Council recommends back gardens to have at least 70sqm. The proposed have less than 45-50sqm gardens.
- No modern development can justify the existence of alley paths as they exist now, behind the houses on Windmill Road. We are pleased that developer will make these more secure and take responsibility for their upkeep.
- There is evidence of dangerous contamination on the site.
- Trees on adjacent land should be retained during construction.
- Relevant planning obligations are additional educational provision and financial support for health services should be enforced.
- Only 41.5% affordable homes is low given the current difficulties for people seeking a home in London.

- The justification for this development in light of the number of unfinished housing projects locally, particularly along the Great West Road.

5.3. 18 letters commenting on the application have been received. These make the following points:

- All parking spaces must be sold with and included in the prices of the houses and flats. They must not be sold as an extra.
- Houses with an internal garage must be prevented from converting this to a habitable room to prevent any future reduction in on-site parking capacity.
- There must be a legal restriction preventing the residents of Reynard Mills, or their visitors, from parking in neighbouring CPZ zones. This restriction should apply to existing and future CPZ zones in Brentford and Northfields.
- The perimeter houses will not be allowed to construct dormer windows on their rear roofs which overlook the surrounding houses and schools.
- Residents will not be allowed to access the flat roofs of the apartment blocks.
- That there will be a controlled and efficient release of sewage and rainwater from the site to prevent the local sewers being overwhelmed.
- The density and scale would be more in keeping with the surrounding area if the blocks were no more than four storeys high.
- Relieved to hear that the number of dwellings has been considerably reduced, and that residents' views on the inappropriateness of high storey buildings have apparently been heard.
- Concern regarding control of noise during the construction process.

5.4. 3 letters of support have been received, making the following comments:

- Scheme shown is a vast improvement over previous applications.
- The architectural character of the development is sympathetic with the adjacent existing buildings, sensitively arranged by locating the taller block in the centre surrounded by lower units.
- The provision of adequate vehicle parking within the development has been admirably addressed.
- The architects have produced an excellent scheme for the developer.
- CPZs might have a role in reducing additional parking pressures.
- Proposal would make a positive contribution to the supply of affordable housing.

5.5. Windmill Road Action Group: The scheme has much to recommend it compared to the previous applications, although it does deviate from a solely 2/3 storey scheme which would be an ideal. Comments are as follows:

Design:

- The following elements of the application are supported: 1) The buffer zone of inward facing houses around the boundary; 2) There will not be any windows in the roofs of the houses which face towards the neighbouring housing, preventing overlooking of the neighbouring residential properties and primary school; 3) The reduction in the number of flats and houses to 195; 4) The increase in the number and proportion of homes suitable for family

accommodation. Further reduction in 1 bedroom flats and an increase in 2 or 3 bedroom units would be welcomed; 5) The adoption of a semi-vernacular style of brick ridge-roof houses and brick clad apartment blocks. Some supporters have reservations over the darker colour of the proposed brick cladding, when compared to the brickwork of recent nearby developments.

- We remain concerned that the central apartment blocks are not limited to 4 storeys, which would have been more consistent with the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State's Decision. It would have also minimised their visibility from the surrounding streets.
- We request that careful consideration is given to the wording of planning conditions in order to protect key features of the design, in particular conditions which will; 1) prevent the construction of dormer windows in the outward facing roofs of the perimeter houses; 2) Prevent residents from using the flat roofs of the apartment blocks in order to prevent overlooking of neighbouring homes.

#### Parking:

- Parking remains a major concern for the residents of the surrounding side streets. We note that the London Plan would permit up to 247 on-site spaces for the proposal and that Hounslow's policies would permit up to 294 spaces. These numbers are likely to be indicative of a significant unmet demand for parking provision, and would therefore result in off-site parking pressures on the already stressed surrounding residential side streets.
- Independent surveys by Hounslow and Ealing Councils have confirmed high levels of parking stress on the residential side streets to the east.
- Given the significant increases in property values since the scheme was designed, we ask that the financial viability of the scheme is reviewed to see if it would be possible to introduce a basement car park.
- The need for residents to operate motor vehicles will in part be determined by the ability of the site to accommodate internet delivery vehicles. We suggest revisiting the short term parking provision alongside the entrances for the apartment buildings so that deliveries by more than one vehicle can be accommodated without blocking the service roads.
- The extent of parking stress from Reynard Mills residents and visitors will be significantly influenced by planning conditions. We ask that the following are recommended by officers; 1) All on-site parking spaces will be included within the prices of the houses or flats; 2) Houses with a garage be prevented from converting this to a habitable room; 3) A legal restriction preventing residents and their visitors from parking in neighbouring CPZ zones.
- It would be beneficial if the annual Reynard Mills service charge could make a contribution to the costs of administering the neighbouring CPZs, especially if they incur the additional costs of operating for an hour in the early evening.

#### Traffic

- Windmill Road and the surrounding area is highly congested during the morning and afternoon peaks. We ask that particular consideration is given to incremental pressures from the exit of vehicles from the site and their subsequent need to turn at the junction of Windmill Road with the A4.

- We hope that realistic contribution will be sought to easing the problems at the Windmill Road / A4 junction.
- We ask that consideration is given to any methods which might restrict increases in “rat-running” along the east-west residential side streets between Windmill Road and South Ealing Road.
- We suggest that consideration is given to introducing an additional pedestrian crossing on Windmill Road immediately to the north of the northern exit. This could provide a pause in the traffic on Windmill Road and provide gaps for Reynard Mills vehicles to join southbound traffic. It could also serve as a traffic calming measure in the off-peak periods.

#### Sewerage and Drainage

- The lack of capacity in the local sewage and drainage system is an unresolved problem. Not only are the neighbouring houses regularly flooded, but the BBC Archives experienced frequent inflows of flood water onto the site via the drains when they occupied Reynard Mills.
- We note that the change of use of Reynard Mills to residential will significantly increase the volumes of sewage and domestic waste water leaving the site.
- We therefore ask that the greatest care is exercised to ensure that the proposed on-site waste and foul water holding tanks will have sufficient capacity to hold many days of waste.

#### Demolition and construction

- The backland nature of the site with its adjoining schools pose particular challenges in respect of demolition. These may be exacerbated by the former industrial use of the site. We therefore ask that the closest consultation is undertaken with both school communities and the surrounding residents when drawing up the Demolition and Construction Statement.

Conclusion: While overwhelmingly welcoming this application, we draw your attention to the above concerns and ask that they are addressed by either modifications to the application or by detailed planning conditions.

- 5.5. The application was placed on the weekly list commencing 01/08/2014 (week 31). It was not referred to the Area Forum.
- 5.6. External Consultees
- 5.7. The Greater London Authority (Stage I): London Plan policies on housing, urban design, inclusive design, sustainable development and transport are relevant to this application and overall the scheme is supported. However, there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved before the decision making stage and these and their potential remedies are set out below:
  - Principle of development: The general principle of a residential redevelopment of the site has been previously supported in strategic planning terms helping London meet its housing need as prioritised by London Plan Policy 3.3 and it is clear from the planning history of this site that there are no strategic policy objections to the loss of employment generating uses on this predominantly vacant site.

- Housing: The proposed tenure split, unit mix and density are supported. The applicant should provide an accommodation schedule comparing the proposed unit sizes to the Mayor's space standards to verify compliance and provide further clarification on the stated density figures as requested above. Further detail should be provided on the design of the onsite children's playspace.
- Urban design: The overall layout height massing and scale is generally supported. However, there is concern regarding the pedestrian permeability through the site and the applicant is strongly encouraged to revisit the opportunity for including a future route through to Manor Vale at the western edge of the site to help promote mixed and balanced communities in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.9. In addition, concerns are raised over the dominance of on-street parking. These issues should be addressed prior to determination by the Council.
- Inclusive design: The proposals are considered generally acceptable in inclusive design terms. However, in line with previous comments, the applicant should reconsider providing a wheelchair adaptable unit with a garden to provide equality of choice and clarify why none of the intermediate units will be wheelchair accessible/adaptable. Further information should also be provided to demonstrate how those inclusive access issues associated with shared surfaces have been addressed within the landscape design.
- Sustainable development: The carbon dioxide savings meet the targets set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan, however, the applicant should confirm that the site heat network will connect all domestic and non-domestic building uses and further information regarding the heat and electricity loads for the scheme (including monthly profiles), the proportion to be met by CHP, the installed capacity of the plant, expected running hours and electricity sale and management arrangements.
- Transport: The trip assessment should be revised to reflect the current under occupancy of site. Furthermore, the applicant is recommended to reduce car parking levels and explore alternative and more sustainable ways to minimise the impact of overspill parking with the Council and submit an updated PERS audit. A construction logistic plan and delivery and servicing plan should be secured by planning condition and the framework travel plan and all agreed measures therein should be secured, enforced, monitored and reviewed as part of the section 106 agreement. Subject to these matters being addressed, TfL considers that this development could accord with transport policies in the London Plan.

5.8. Transport for London: comment as follows:

- Trip generation: A multi-modal impact assessment has been undertaken however only the net increase in vehicular trips has been provided and the existing occupancy levels have not been reflected. To ensure the assessment is sufficiently robust TfL requests that the applicant provides an impact assessment for all modes and modifies the baseline trips to reflect occupancy

levels. Nevertheless, TfL can confirm that there would be sufficient public transport capacity to accommodate this scale of development.

- Car parking: The applicant proposes 205 car parking spaces for 195 dwellings. The applicant cites on street car parking stress to justify such a high parking ratio. The supporting data however, was collected March 2011 and TfL therefore considers it expedient for an up to date survey to be undertaken. Should a high level of parking stress be identified, TfL considers that it would be more appropriate for the Council to secure post implementation monitoring from the applicant along with a contribution to enable them to consult on and implement a local controlled parking zone (CPZ) from which occupiers of this development would be ineligible for a permit. A CPZ would mitigate a need to provide on site parking to alleviate on street parking pressure and although similar parking ratios have been accepted by TfL at this location there is scope for a reduction of parking on site especially in consideration to the already congested local highway network.
- Cycle parking: The applicant proposes 288 cycle spaces in line with London Plan standards. However, the applicant should clarify their location to ensure that they are safe, secure and accessible.
- A4 corridor improvements: TfL is currently making improvements along the A4 corridor, including measures to smooth traffic flow and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. However it is considered the additional traffic from the proposed development could adversely impact the road network, resulting in longer queues on Windmill Road or delay to traffic on the A4 for example.
- Bus stops: The applicant should audit the condition of the two closest bus stops to the site and identify any schedule of works required to bring them up to current accessibility standards. A capped contribution of £20,000 per bus stop may be requested to deliver compliance with accessibility guidelines.
- Freight: The applicant proposes to undertake delivery and servicing on site which is welcomed. Due to the residential nature of the site the applicant does not propose to provide a delivery and servicing plan (DSP). TfL accepts that due to the unscheduled nature of residential deliveries and servicing, the influence of a DSP would be limited. Nevertheless, TfL recommends a DSP is provided as measures such as a concierge service, providing advice to residents and the consolidation of deliveries and tradesmen to the site can assist in reducing the number of vehicular trips to/from the site. The scale of the development would however, warrant a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP). A framework document should be provided for the Council's and TfL's approval with the final CLP secured by condition.
- Travel plan: TfL welcomes the submission of a framework residential travel plan, aiming to promote sustainable travel to and from the site.
- Summary: The applicant is recommended to reduce car parking levels to less than one space per dwelling and consider alternative, more sustainable ways to minimise the impact of overspill parking. Hounslow Council should also

secure mitigation in line with TfL's requests. Subject to these matters being addressed, TfL considers this development could accord with transport policies in the London Plan.

- 5.9. Environment Agency: Concerns were initially raised regarding flood risk. However, following the submission of a Flood Consequences Assessment by the developer, the EA's objection was withdrawn subject to a condition requiring the approval of a detailed surface water drainage scheme.
- 5.10. London Borough of Ealing: No objection to the revised proposal in principle. Should the London Borough of Hounslow be minded to grant planning permission then it is requested that consideration be given to seeking appropriate financial contributions currently estimated at £30,000 from the development to facilitate appropriate traffic management measures in the surrounding local road network, including:
- A financial contribution of £20,000 from the developers to mitigate the impact of the development on Windmill Road. This would go towards the introduction of pedestrian safety measures, for example tactile paving at junction corners and parking restrictions on Windmill Lane.
  - Measures to relieve congestion on Windmill Road which currently operates at capacity during peak periods, with a £10,000 contribution towards traffic calming measures in Murray Road, Carlyle Road, Darwin Road, Whitestile Road and Avenue Road.
  - Ealing would support the installation of a raised zebra crossing just north of the northern access instead of the proposal in Fig 4.3 of the Transport Assessment May 2014 prepared by Mayer Brown or an informal pedestrian crossing with pronounced build-out, raised table and waiting restrictions, final design subject to agreement. This can be carried out by the applicant entering into a Section 278 Agreement with Ealing Council. *(NOTE: The applicant has agreed to secure this via a contribution)*
- 5.11 Heathrow Airport Limited: No objection

## 6.0 POLICY

### **Determining applications for full or outline planning permission**

- 6.1 When determining applications for planning permission, the authority is required to have regard to (a) the development plan, so far as is material, (b) any local finance considerations, so far as is material, and (c) to any other material considerations. Local finance considerations means the Community Infrastructure Levy, or a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority (such as the Council, the Mayor of London, the Homes and Communities Agency, etc.) by a Minister of the Crown.
- 6.2 In addition, the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **The National Planning Policy Framework**

- 6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27 March 2012 and has replaced national policies and guidance formerly contained in Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance notes and some other documents. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers that, where pertinent, the NPPF is a material consideration and as such, it will be taken into account in decision-making as appropriate.

### **The Development Plan**

- 6.4 The Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Council's Unitary Development Plan (other than those policies that are wholly inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework), Employment Development Plan Document, Brentford Area Action Plan and the London Plan 2011 and Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2013.

### **The emerging Local Plan and London Plan**

- 6.5. There are three emerging new Development Plan Documents that are all now at an advanced stage of preparation.
- On the 20<sup>th</sup> August 2014 the Borough Council submitted the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination. When adopted this will replace the Council's three existing DPDs and amend the Proposals Map;
  - On the 31<sup>st</sup> July the Borough Council together with five partner authorities submitted a jointly prepared West London Waste Plan to the Secretary of State for examination. When adopted this will manage the land use implications of waste planning; and
  - On the 7<sup>th</sup> July the Mayor of London submitted Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) to the Secretary of State for examination, which will commence in September 2014. When adopted, this will further amend the London Plan.
- 6.6. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers that these three DPDs are capable of being regarded as material considerations in planning decisions which will be taken into account as appropriate; each policy will gain more weight as it progresses through the examination processes towards adoption (or publication in the case of London Plan alterations).

## **7.0 ASSESSMENT**

- 7.1. The main planning issues are:

- Previous appeal decision
- Principle of development
- The alternative use of the site as a school
- Affordable housing
- Visual impact
- Impact on residential amenity
- Traffic and highways
- Standard of proposed accommodation
- Public open space
- Trees and ecology

- Energy and sustainability
- Environmental considerations

### **Previous appeal decision**

- 7.2. The site has been subject to a number of planning applications proposing redevelopment of the site for housing. The preceding application was refused permission and appealed, with the appeal considered at a Public Inquiry. The appeal was dismissed owing to concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the townscape, the quality of amenity space and traffic and parking conditions. The current application has significantly amended the design of the proposal, altering its layout and reducing the number of dwellings and associated parking, in order to overcome the reasons for refusal.

### **Principle of development**

- 7.3. Loss of industrial floorspace: Policies EP4 (Change of use from offices) and EP8 (Other industrial land) of the Employment Development Plan Document seek to protect employment land from change of use unless it can be demonstrated that a site has been actively marketed for at least a year. A marketing report has been provided with the application, which demonstrates that the site has been marketed since May 2011. The report describes demand for the industrial units as ‘virtually non-existent’, despite a recent upturn in marketing conditions with former employment uses having relocated. The availability of alternative premises close to the application site of more modern specification and superior access arrangements are cited as the main reasons for the lack of demand for the Reynard Mills units.
- 7.4. Furthermore, it should be noted that the emerging Local Plan identifies the site for redevelopment for residential and/or educational use, anticipating a move away from its current use. The appeal decision on the previous application ref: 01217/C/P37 also concluded that “the prospects of the viable re-use of this site for commercial development are at best limited”. In light of this, the loss of the existing employment use is considered acceptable.
- 7.5. Principle of residential use: Policy SC1 of the emerging Local Plan seeks to maximise the supply of additional housing in the Borough in order to meet housing need, as supported by policy 3.3 of the London Plan. The proposed contribution to the supply of housing in the Borough is therefore supported in planning policy terms. Given the residential character of the surrounding area, there would be no conflict between the proposed development and existing land uses.
- 7.6. The mix of units proposed would broadly comply with the mix of units sought by policy SC3 (Meeting the need for a mix of housing size and type) of the emerging Local Plan.
- 7.7. D1 Use: The creation of a small unit within the development for use as a nursery and/or a homework club is appropriate as small scale community infrastructure supporting residential development. The unit would be positioned at ground floor level on the north side of block B, where any residential development would be

affected by the building's orientation, and so this is the most appropriate location within the site for such a facility.

- 7.8. It is acknowledged that the developer has sought to find a healthcare provider to occupy the unit, in response to requests from local people in pre-application consultations, but that no such occupier has been forthcoming. The D1 use class does not preclude the future conversion of the unit to provide a GP or dental clinic.

### **The alternative use of the site as a school**

- 7.9. The site is allocated in the emerging Local Plan as being suitable for a 'housing and education' use, though submissions have been made objecting to the education part of this designation, which will be considered at the Local Plan examination.
- 7.10. The supporting statement submitted with the current scheme application sets out a case for why a new school would not be appropriate on this site, making the following points:
- a. *The affordable rented units with nominations from existing Borough Residents will not generate 'additional' school demand and will not impact on local school capacity.*
  - b. *That the site is unsuited to mixed education use alongside residential use.*
  - c. *A mixed use site could create design issues and pressures, in particular in relation to density and access*
  - d. *Any site area for school use would need to be purchased at a price acceptable to the private landowner or the viability of providing 41% affordable housing on the site could be impacted. It is the applicant's opinion that a mixed scheme would detract from the viability of the remaining scheme.*
  - e. *That there is no adopted policy requirement for education floorspace.*
- 7.11. The site is deemed appropriate for educational use, either through the expansion of either of the adjoining schools or for a new secondary school of up to four forms of entry. The points raised regarding the difficulties of a mixed use scheme, including viability issues are however noted.
- 7.12. Notwithstanding the above, the site has been considered in relation to adopted development plan policies and the emerging Hounslow Local Plan policies, in particular Policy CI2 – Education and School Places and Policy IMP1 – Sustainable Development. Policies IMP1 and CI2 have been prepared to be used together to manage the process of selecting which of a range of potential school sites should be prioritised for school use and which may be released for another use in order to secure comprehensive development and prevent sterilisation of the development or regeneration potential of land.
- 7.13. Emerging Policy CI2 allocates potential sites for new school place provision and the Education Topic Paper (prepared to support the submitted Local Plan) quantifies the total projected need for additional primary and secondary school places and the potential supply of suitable sites for expansion or new schools to meet this need, including the application site. Potential sites have been sorted in a general sequential preference through an objective assessment process, but each is individually more or less suited to meeting a particular requirement within a particular

timeframe, for example, to meet the need for a primary school in a particular neighbourhood or the expansion of a nearby secondary school.

- 7.14. The Council works with school leaders to ensure school place provision which includes accounting for the requirements of a blend of single sex, co-ed and denominational schools. The Council has a duty to ensure provision of necessary school places and at this time, across the whole Borough, there is a projected need for 34 forms of entry of additional secondary places (by 2030) and potential supply of 51 forms of entry. A strategy for primary school expansion to 2020 has been agreed by Cabinet and on 9<sup>th</sup> September, Cabinet agreed a flexible strategy for 29 FE of new secondary school places to 2020 that aims to maximise provision through appropriate expansion of existing successful Academy Schools and new Academy and Free Schools on new sites. Four scenarios are identified. As an example, Scenario 2 requires 2 new secondary schools (total 12FE) and 17.5FE of expansion of existing successful Academies.
- 7.15. Policy IMP1 (f) and supporting text at paragraph 11.1E provides for a policy requirement on a site – such as the education requirement on the application site, to be reduced or removed on the basis that: i) The specification of the proposal and funding mean that the development would be unviable or is not required at the time of the planning application decision and; ii) The positive benefits to the community of the alternative scheme enabled by this waiver outweigh the negative impact of non-compliance with the full policy requirement.
- 7.16. In this case and at this time, the evidence leads officers to conclude that:
- 1) The site is not uniquely suited to providing new school places and alternative sites are available;
  - 2) There is no requirement in the approved school place expansion strategy or otherwise voiced by either of the neighbouring schools to expand onto the application site;
  - 3) The approved Free Schools actively searching for a site for a new school in the Brentford area currently have preferred alternative site options that they are pursuing;
  - 4) It is a compensatory benefit that the proposal offers market family housing with gardens - in an area that has mostly seen flatted development in recent times. Overall the scheme offers family housing units (in all tenures) in excess of the mix specified to meet housing need (LB Hounslow SHMA) and in the emerging Hounslow Local Plan Policy SC3.1. It is a compensatory benefit that the proposal provides 41% affordable housing units. The applicant is a Registered Provider with a strong local track record of delivery and has indicated a commitment to complete the development as soon as practical;
  - 5) The NPPF and emerging Policy IMP1 seek to avoid unnecessarily restricting development of an allocated site for another appropriate use. There is no overriding need to resist a housing development on the site on the basis of educational need at this time.
- 7.17. On the basis of the evidence listed above, the absence of additional school place provision within the current proposals is considered to be justified in accordance with the relevant policies in the emerging Local Plan and latest evidence and Council

strategy for school place expansion. However, it is recommended that if granted, the planning permission should include a clear informative that if the scheme is not implemented within three years, that the need for education provision on the site will be fully reappraised in the light of circumstances at that time.

- 7.18. A financial contribution of £618,621 towards the provision of educational facilities off-site would be provided, in accordance with the formula set out in Hounslow's Supplementary Planning Guidance for Planning Obligations.

### **Affordable housing**

- 7.19. The Council seeks the maximum proportion of affordable housing achievable on-site in accordance with the London Plan in order to contribute towards the Mayor's target of at least 13,200 more affordable homes per year in London over the term of the Plan. In Hounslow this equates to approximately 41% of all new housing provision.
- 7.20. 81 of the 195 units would have an affordable tenure, representing a proportion of 41.5% and in excess of the target requirement derived from the London Plan. The tenure mix would be 58.8% affordable rent to 41.2% shared ownership, broadly in line with the policy compliant split of 60%-40%.
- 7.21. The affordable housing offer of the current scheme is a marked improvement on the previously refused application, which despite its much higher density would have only provided 25.6% of the units as affordable. The quantum of affordable housing proposed is a significant factor weighing in favour of the scheme.

### **Visual impact**

- 7.22. Appeal decision: The starting point for considering a revised proposal for is the appeal decision on the previous scheme, the conclusion of which set out parameters that would need to be taken into account in accessing an alternative proposal. The appeal decision is a material consideration with significant weight in the determination of the current application.
- 7.23. The previous application was for 275 residential units, most of which would be in blocks of flats between 5.5 and 7.5 storeys high. The Planning Inspector's decision was particularly critical of the development's scale, height and density, p.359 stating "I can find nothing in the BAAP [Brentford Area Action Plan] to justify extending higher-rise development into residential areas away from the Great West Road. Nor, indeed is there an expression of a requirement for a mediation or transition between the high-rise development along it and the low-rise nature of the areas to either side."
- 7.24. P.361 further commented on the increase in height compared to the 4 storeys of the adjacent part of the Paragon development and noted that "this would not represent a transition or a continuation of the existing transition between the higher buildings along the Great West Road and the almost entirely two and three storey development surrounding the appeal site on the other three sides. It would extend higher-rise development into contrasting low-rise residential areas, imposing upon rather than respecting the characters of those areas as required by the BAAP."

- 7.25. In summary, the appeal decision can be interpreted as weighing against high density development on the site or buildings of a height greater than the existing townscape to the north and east.
- 7.26. Scale, massing, layout and density: The applicant has sought to address the Inspector's concerns by positioning two storey (and a handful of three storey) houses along the site's boundaries. The scale of development then rises towards the centre of the site, with the four storey blocks A and C and the central block B, which has four and five storey components. The layout of the scheme adopts a grid pattern, with its two main streets running parallel to Windmill Road, and consequently lacks a feature such as an area of open space that could act as a focal point for the development. Instead, the two small pocket parks are located in the southern and western corners of the site.
- 7.27. It is acknowledged that the reduction in the height of the development from 7.5 storeys to a maximum of 5 storeys and the number of units by almost a third from 275 to 195 represents a significant decrease in the scale of development proposed. Nevertheless, the bulk and height of the blocks and the street layout would result in a scheme with an appreciably urban, rather than suburban, character. It could be argued that this would be contrary to the findings of the appeal Inspector, as summarised above.
- 7.28. The applicant has produced a number of visualisations of how the development would be perceived from beyond the site. These indicate that the scale of existing buildings and the profile of the proposed scheme would result in there only being limited views of the development from the public realm, other than in positions immediately in front of the site accesses on Windmill Road. For instance, the development would not be visible from the main part of Manor Place to the west, whilst only partial views of the fifth floor of block B would be visible along roads to the east. Glimpses of the development would be available across the Gunnersbury School site to the north. This is in contrast to the appeal scheme, the largest blocks of which would be readily visible from the site's surroundings.
- 7.29. The limited visibility of the proposed buildings from beyond the site thus suggests that, despite parts of the proposed development being of a greater scale and height than some neighbouring development, it would not appear to be out of place or visually intrusive given the area is comprised of a mix of terraced housing and flats. Furthermore, the proposed outer terraces of housing would serve as an effective transition from the existing development to the larger buildings in the centre of the site. This must be weighed against the reservations of the appeal Inspector regarding the extension of higher rise development into lower rise areas.
- 7.30. With regard to the density of development, the London Plan indicates that development on the site should consist of between 45 -170 units per hectare or 200 – 450 habitable rooms per hectare. This was acknowledged in the Inspector's decision, which also noted that density should be at the lower end of the appropriate ranges on account of the low public transport accessibility of the site. The proposed density of 81.2 units per hectare and 304 habitable rooms per hectare would accord with the London Plan policy and the Inspector's direction on this matter.

- 7.31. Public realm: Creating pleasant and visually appealing public spaces is considered especially important in ensuring the success of developments of the proposed density. The challenge is particularly acute in this case as a high ratio of parking spaces to dwellings is proposed. Care must therefore be taken in ensuring that streets are not dominated by parked cars.
- 7.32. The developer has sought to address this through a 'Home Zone' treatment of the public realm, with the hard and soft landscaping design and layout intended to promote the flexible use of the streets and encourage slower vehicle speeds. Parking areas would be interspersed with trees at regular intervals and areas of denser planting with associated seating created to provide what are described as 'nodes'. More formal pavements would be retained to facilitate access by the blind or partially sighted, for whom shared surfaces can present difficulties.
- 7.33. On the principal road through the site, identified as 'The Avenue', there would be a considerable quantity of parking both on-street and in the forecourts of houses. The pockets of landscaping, although numerous would be small and only partially break up the expanse of hardstanding required for parking.. However, whilst this part of the site would be likely to benefit from additional on-street planting, this would necessarily require a reduction in the number of parking spaces and it is acknowledged that a balance needs to be struck between this and landscaping.
- 7.34. The approach to public realm would be most successful on the site's secondary roads, where the pair of nodes on 'The Walk and 'The Way' indicate a transition within the site. These nodes, as well as the two pocket parks designed into the street, would ensure that parking areas would appear less dominant in this part of the site.
- 7.35. The proposed treatment of the public realm and layout would also be successful along the two accesses. The orientation of a pair of terraces towards the access roads ensure that they would open out as a visitor enters the site, creating a sense of space to counter the narrow section where they pass between buildings on Windmill Road. Houses would also be placed facing the accesses, creating appropriate visual termini.



Figure 2: View within the site looking northwest along 'The Avenue'



Figure 3: View northwest along 'The Street'

- 7.36. Detailed design: The developer has sought to reflect the design and finishes of the existing townscape around the site. Consequently, both the blocks of flats and the houses would be finished in brick whilst interpretations of local details such as bay windows are evident. A small section on the southern side of the site would feature a mews, with a short terrace of smaller houses fronting onto a parking courtyard.
- 7.37. The blocks of flats are considered to be well articulated, with recessed stair cores and projecting balconies of solid coloured panels and metal balustrades (amended from the galvanised metal shown in the above images) modulating the elevations and breaking up the buildings' mass. Further design interest and variety would be by brick feature panels that would vary from section to section within the development.

Whilst the main brick type would be different varieties of red to reflect the local area, sections of yellow 'buff' brick would be used to break up the longer terraces. The attention to design detail is typified by the transfer of an attractive pediment depicting a fox from one of the building's to be demolished to be re-used on the side of block B, where it would be prominent at the entrance to the site.

- 7.38. The majority of the houses have projecting sections incorporated into the front roof slopes, described as dormers but in fact much more substantial than this would suggest and are in effect roof extensions designed into the scheme from the outset. Whilst such roof extensions are usually added to rear elevations, in this case the design has sought to avoid perceived overlooking to neighbours. The effect on the street scene from this design element is considered to be positive, as it would reflect the articulation of the blocks of flats opposite and provide a visual rhythm to the terraces.
- 7.39. The detailed design is well considered, and goes a considerable way to addressing concerns raised regarding the scale and bulk of parts of the site and the visual impact of large areas of car parking at street level. Conditions are recommended to secure samples of materials, boundary treatment and the approval of design details such as the feature panels (conditions 3, 7 and 22).

#### **Impact on residential amenity**

- 7.40. Impact on light/outlook: In order to assess the impact on neighbouring properties, the developer has provided a daylight/sunlight assessment to support the application. This compares overshadowing and loss of light from the proposed development with the existing situation using the recognised 'Vertical Sky Component' (VSC) and 'Annual Probable Sunlight Hours' (APSH) techniques developed by the British Research Establishment (BRE guidelines). Neighbouring residential properties at Boston Lodge, Windmill Road, Block B Thames Valley (Paragon), Manor Vale, Manor House and Davmor Court were assessed.
- 7.41. The report demonstrates that almost all of the windows assessed would not be subject to a noticeable reduction in daylight. Unusually, windows to a number of properties on Windmill Road would receive an increase in natural light as a result of the development. This can be ascribed to the demolition of large industrial buildings currently located close to the rear boundaries of these properties. A reduction in the VSC in excess of 20% to a window would be considered to be noticeable by its occupants under the BRE guidelines. A pair of windows would on Block B of the Paragon development would be subject to a reduction of 20.55% and 24.62%, very marginally in excess of the BRE guideline. Given that both windows would continue to enjoy excellent daylight levels despite this reduction, it is not considered that the amenities of the rooms' occupiers would be significantly harmed. No neighbouring property would suffer a significant loss of sunlight, according to the Sunlight Analysis in the report.
- 7.42. The demolition of the existing buildings, as well as improving daylight in some cases, would also improve outlook to properties bordering the site as existing industrial buildings and hardstandings are removed and replaced with an outlook over the domestic gardens that would primarily fringe the site following the development. It is

therefore considered that the impact on neighbours in terms of the impact on daylight or sunlight would be acceptable, whilst outlook would be improved.

- 7.43. Impact on privacy/overlooking: Appendix one of Hounslow's UDP recommends a minimum distance of 21m between facing windows of habitable rooms to ensure that privacy is maintained, though this figure has not been carried forward into the emerging Local Plan. The more recently adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan is more flexible, setting minimum distances of between 18-21m between habitable rooms, with these distances being useful yardsticks for privacy. However it also says that adhering rigidly to these measures can limit the variety of urban space and housing types, and sometimes unnecessarily restrict density.
- 7.44. Distances between habitable rooms on the north-eastern side of the development and the rear of properties on Windmill Road would be in excess of 21m, thereby satisfying Hounslow's UDP requirement. The proposed development would be oriented in such a way that there would be no facing windows towards the Paragon development, which are the closest residential buildings to the site, and thus privacy would not be compromised. Along the western boundary of the site, the nearest block of flats at 49-54 Manor Vale unusually presents a blank rear elevation towards the site, with no windows or openings. A pair of flats at Manor House and 82, 83 and 84 Manor Place have windows separated from the development by between 18m and 21m; i.e. in excess of the London Plan recommended separation distances but less than that recommended in the UDP. This is also the case with existing properties at Manor Vale. Given the site is classified as being within an 'urban' area in the context of the London Plan, as confirmed by the previous Inspector's decision, the level of privacy between existing and proposed dwellings is consistent with an urban development and there are also opportunities for landscaping at the end of the new gardens being provided for each house which may provide some screening. However it is recommended that further privacy measures be incorporated in the design of windows within 21m of opposing windows to maintain satisfactory levels of privacy. Such measures may include angled, high level or opaque glazing to parts of windows in combination with landscape and boundary treatments. A condition in this regard has been recommended (condition 24).
- 7.45. The occupants of the flats would not have access to the buildings' flat roof and so there is no prospect of overlooking from these raised levels. Given the constrained nature of parts of the site, it is considered appropriate to withdraw permitted development rights for the construction of extensions and outbuildings without the need for planning permission to ensure that the impact of these additional structures can be adequately assessed.
- 7.46. Noise and disturbance: The existing site is industrial in nature and has the potential to cause significant disturbance to neighbouring residents were all ten existing units to be occupied to their capacity. There are no planning restrictions on the existing buildings in terms of hours of operation or the range of activities that could take place there within the B1 and B8 use classes. The removal of these land uses and their replacement with residential development therefore reduces the potential for noise and disturbance to neighbours, particularly around the entrances to the site.

- 7.47. Overall the proposal would have acceptable impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residents with outlook improved and privacy and daylight/ sunlight satisfactorily maintained or enhanced.

### **Traffic and highways**

- 7.48. Access and permeability: One of the most significant constraints on the development of the site is its accessibility. There are only two access points, both relatively narrow and from the eastern side of the site. It would be preferable if the site were to have an additional pedestrian/cycle access from the western side of the site, allowing a greater range of destinations to be accessed by foot from the site, as well as allowing passage across it, avoiding detours via The Ride and Boston Park Road. A particular advantage would be the easy access this would allow from the site to Boston Manor Park and playing fields. It should be noted that this is one of the reservations the GLA have about the scheme in their Stage I response.
- 7.49. The applicant has produced an analysis of the potential for a pedestrian link in their Design and Access Statement. This shows that the existing urban form along the boundaries of the site and the enclosure of the site by land in private ownership renders a new pedestrian link impractical. The option of leaving a section of the site undeveloped to enable a pedestrian link to be created in the future following the redevelopment of a neighbouring site was considered. However, it is unclear when or if any neighbouring site would be brought forward for development and there are no obvious candidates. It is not therefore considered that part of site could reasonably be required to be set aside to allow for this possibility, whatever the benefits of an easy connection to Boston Manor Park would be.
- 7.50. Traffic and highway safety: The existing access points to the site would be retained, though the southern access would be entry only and the northern access only and an exit. This significantly reduces the potential for vehicle conflicts at these junctions. Tracking diagrams have been provided that demonstrate that servicing vehicles would be able to access and egress the site successfully. Kerb line build outs to both accesses would be secured through a S.278 agreement to further improve visibility at the junctions. Both the access and the egress would include cycle contraflow lanes. This would encourage and facilitate access to the site by cycle and is welcomed.
- 7.51. The applicant's Transport Assessment provides an analysis of the likely number of vehicles accessing the site following the development and compares it with the potential use of the existing site. It concludes that there would be an additional 14 departures in the morning peak and an additional 6 departures in the evening peak. This would be offset by an average reduction of 12 arrivals in the morning peak and a reduction of 9 in the evening peak. The impact on traffic is therefore deemed to be neutral. The Transport Assessment's assumptions about the number of people likely to drive, with only a third of trips expected to be by car, is accepted. Despite the site's relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Rating of 2/3, the proximity of Boston Manor tube and Brentford station to the site would be an incentive to travel by public transport. This is borne out by census data for the local area.

- 7.52. However, the existing site is unlikely to ever be used in the future to its theoretical capacity as set out in the Transport Assessment. Therefore there are grounds for seeking improvements to the local transport network to accommodate the additional demand. The most significant impact of additional traffic from the development would be to the junction between Windmill Road and the A4. The proposal by TfL for a financial contribution of £83,000 to make improvements to this junction is therefore supported. This would be secured through the S.106 agreement.
- 7.53. Given the scale of the development, a Delivery and Servicing Plan and a Construction Logistics Plan would be secured as part of the S.106 agreement. The latter would include measures for consulting local residents, given the proximity of the site to schools and the restricted access points. Refuse and recycling areas are satisfactorily provided for flats and houses with details to be secured by condition (condition 23).
- 7.54. Car and Cycle Parking: 200 parking spaces would be provided for the 195 residential units and D1 unit, a ratio slightly in excess of one per unit. The London Plan's residential parking standards specify a maximum of 247 spaces of a development of this nature, whilst Hounslow's parking standards specify a maximum of 294.
- 7.55. It is noted that many local residents, as well as the Windmill Road Action Group, are concerned about the prospect of overspill parking into neighbouring streets. Conversely, Transport for London considers that the level of parking proposed for the development should be reduced in order to discourage future residents from using cars. Whilst this would enable improvements to the public realm within the site to be made, given the availability of on-street parking in neighbouring streets its role in reducing car use would be less effective. Parking surveys reveal that the concerns of local residents regarding pressure on on-street parking are well founded. This was also a conclusion of the appeal decision, with the Inspector commenting that '[parking] provision at or near the maximum would be appropriate'.
- 7.56. It is considered that the proposed level of parking would strike the right balance and ensure that demand for parking from occupiers of the development would be absorbed within the site. Residents would be prevented from obtaining parking permits for the CPZs covering neighbouring streets through the S.106 agreement, whilst a financial contribution of £10,000 towards the cost of a consultation on amendments to the closest CPZ would ensure that any unforeseen impacts could be addressed. A Parking Management Plan, secured by condition (condition 8), would facilitate the most efficient management of the parking spaces within the site, whilst a further condition would prevent the conversion of garages (condition 6) to additional residential accommodation without planning permission.
- 7.57. 288 Cycle parking spaces would be provided across the site, which would be in accordance with the standards set out in the London Plan. The cycle stores for the flats have been designed into the buildings, and as such would be secure and undercover, as well as being positioned conveniently close to the cores they would serve. Each house would have an undercover cycle store to the front of the property, which would be a useful alternative to bringing bicycles into the houses themselves. The details and maintenance of the cycle parking would be secured by condition (condition 19).

- 7.58. Pedestrian and cycle access: As detailed above, the additional vehicular trips to the site that the development would generate could be successfully accommodated. However, the development would also generate additional movements by pedestrians and cyclists, and measures to facilitate this are therefore warranted. The applicant has agreed to fund the provision of a new zebra crossing immediately to the north of the site in Windmill Road in response to comments from local residents that this would be the most appropriate location. The crossing is featured on the application drawings, though its final design and position is subject to agreement with the London Borough of Ealing, where it would be located. The zebra crossing would be secured through a financial contribution.
- 7.59. In addition to the zebra crossing, the applicant would provide a financial contribution of £120,600 to public realm improvements in the wider area. This contribution could for example be towards the upgrading of the existing zebra crossing to the south of the site to a pelican crossing or to the creation of a dedicated cycle lane on Boston Park Road.
- 7.60. Travel Plan: Given the size of the development, a Travel Plan is considered necessary to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and to reduce the pressure on the public highway and on-street parking from the development. The Travel Plan would include £100 of sustainable travel vouchers for each household in the development and the creation of a car club, with one of the parking spaces in the scheme reserved for this use.

### **Standard of proposed accommodation**

- 7.61. Internal space standards: All of the proposed units, whether flats or houses, would either meet or exceed the minimum space standards set out in the London Plan, as set out in the table below:

	Size or range of sizes (square metres)	Minimum unit size (London Plan standard)
One bedroom flats	51.36 - 61.87	50
Two bedroom flats	65.82 - 95.50	61
Three bedroom flats	93.31 - 93.35	86
House type 1 (Three bed)	106	93
House type 2 (Three bed)	103.5	93
House type 3 (Three bed)	111.5	93
House type 4 (Four bed)	139	106
House type 5 (Three bed)	122	93

--	--	--

- 7.62. The large sizes of some of the two bedroom flats are accounted for by the requirements for units for disabled people.
- 7.63. Natural light and aspect: All of the houses would have a dual aspect, with a good outlook to the rear onto private gardens. All of the flats would have a dual aspect apart from four one-bedroom units on the ground floor of block B, where the position of the podium car park prevents a rear aspect. Although it would be ideal for all of the units to be dual aspect, and this is favoured by the Mayor's Housing SPG, given that none of the units would be north facing the arrangement is acceptable in this instance.
- 7.64. The availability of natural light to the proposed units was assessed as part of the daylight/sunlight study. This shows that, whilst almost all the units would receive levels of natural light that would comply with the BRE 'Average Daylight Factor' guidelines, for a number of rooms natural light would be compromised, usually by an overhanging balcony or walkway immediately above. The daylight/sunlight report suggests that this could be improved for some units through modifications to the position and size of some windows, and it is considered that this should be examined in the final design of the blocks.
- 7.65. In terms of privacy, as indicated on the plans the landscaping scheme and layout of the streets should be designed to provide some defensible space to the ground floor units. As recommended by the Housing SPG, flats on upper floors accessed via one of the walkways should be provided with an audio/visual intercom system to prevent unauthorised access to common areas and to maintain privacy, to be secured by condition (condition 21).
- 7.66. Private and communal amenity space: Hounslow's Supplementary Planning Guidance and policy SC5 (Ensuring suitable internal and external space) seeks a minimum of 60sqm of external amenity space for houses with four habitable rooms and 75sqm for those with five habitable rooms or over. The standards for flats are 25sqm for units with up to three habitable rooms, 30sqm for those with four habitable rooms and 40sqm for those with five habitable rooms or more.
- 7.67. Provision of amenity space to the houses would broadly comply with this policy, with an average garden size of 72sqm; though there would be significant variations in the sizes of individual gardens. Each block of flats would have access to shared amenity space, either to the rear of the blocks in the cases of blocks A and C or in the central courtyard in the case of block B. Some ground floor units would also have access to small areas of amenity space exclusive to their flat, whilst flats on the upper floors would each have a balcony. Nevertheless, the total amount of amenity space would fall short of the 3,155sqm sought for the flats under this policy, with approximately 1,500sqm to be provided for all three blocks
- 7.68. Additional public amenity provision would be likely to reduce the amount of affordable housing that could be provided. Given the reasonable quality of the proposed amenity space, the provision of new public open space, noting that the site is not within an area of identified public open space deficiency and the

acknowledged difficulties in achieving the level of amenity space sought in such relatively high density schemes, on balance it is considered that the proposed amenity space provision is acceptable.

- 7.69. Wheelchair units: 20 of the units would be provided as adaptable wheelchair homes designed in accordance with the GLA's Wheelchair accessible housing Best Practice Guidance (2007) and the Mayor's Housing SPG. This is secured by condition (condition 25).

### **Public open space**

- 7.70. Two areas of public open space would be provided; one in the western corner of the site measuring approximately 260sqm and a marginally smaller one in the southern corner 180sqm in size. The two spaces have been designed as pocket parks, to primarily provide doorstep play space for children under five.
- 7.71. Despite their limited size, the two pocket parks are well designed and integrated into the scheme. They would read as a natural continuum of the home zones they would adjoin and would be overlooked from neighbouring residential properties, providing security. Combined with the gardens to the houses, they would provide sufficient play space for all the children under five expected to be housed in the development in accordance with policy 3.6 of the London Plan. Details of the parks, play areas and equipment proposed would be secured by condition (condition 16)
- 7.72. Boston Manor Park is within 400m of the site, and provides additional play space for older children. Given the limited amount of public open space on site, the applicant has agreed to make a contribution of £32,630 to improving local open space beyond the site, in accordance with the formula set out in Hounslow's Supplementary Planning Document for planning obligations. This would be secured through the S.106 agreement.

### **Trees and ecology**

- 7.73. There are no trees of any significant amenity value within the site, which as described above is dominated by hardstandings and industrial buildings, nor would any trees or landscaping of importance on adjoining land be affected by the development. Overall the site is considered to have low ecological or biodiversity value at present.
- 7.74. The applicant has provided an Ecological Assessment for the site. This demonstrates that the existing buildings do not have significant potential for providing bat roosts. Precautionary measures are however recommended avoid harm to potential bat roosts and birds' nests during demolition works. The ecological assessment also provides some recommendations for improving ecological diversity in the completed development, such as bird boxes and 'swift bricks' and through the choice of planting in the open spaces. It should also be noted that the development would feature green and brown roofs to the flats, further enhancing biodiversity.
- 7.75. The measures contained in the ecological assessment are considered to be reasonable and a condition is recommended to secure their implementation

(condition 14). A further condition is recommended to secure details of the green and brown roofs (condition 20).

### **Energy and Sustainability**

- 7.76. London Plan policy 5.2 requires that developments achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide of 35% compared to a 2013 building regulations baseline, through a combination of reducing energy consumption, energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy.
- 7.77. The applicant has provided an Energy Strategy demonstrating how the targets would be met through improved thermal efficiency of the building fabric, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery, a district heat system for the flats and photovoltaic panels for both the flats and the houses. Excess electricity generated would be exported to the grid. The developer has also undertaken to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for the development.
- 7.78. The Energy Report has been assessed by the Council's energy consultant and found to be acceptable following revisions. It is noted that the report has also been assessed separately by the GLA, who also supported the approach. Conditions would ensure the implementation of the Energy Strategy, compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 and the potential for the district heating system to connect with a wider network (conditions 10 and 11).

### **Environmental Considerations**

- 7.79. Air quality: The NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan. It also requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing developments contributing or being put at unacceptable risk or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.
- 7.80. Whilst the site is in an Air Quality Management Area, along with the rest of the Borough, the site is in a backland location away from any main roads. The impact on residents through poor air quality is not considered to be a significant concern. An air quality report has been submitted setting out mitigation measures proposed during construction works. It should also be noted that the active ventilation systems proposed as part of the sustainability measures can be devised to minimise internal exposure to traffic exhausts. Details of air quality mitigation measures will be secured by condition (condition 12).
- 7.81. Flood risk and drainage: The site is not in an area identified as being at risk of flooding. However given its size, a Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA) was required to demonstrate that surface water run off from the site would not have an impact on other locations. The FCA has been assessed by the Environment Agency and found to be acceptable subject to a condition requiring details of a comprehensive drainage scheme for the site to be approved (condition 4).
- 7.82. Contaminated land: Given the site's history of industrial use, the Council's standard condition for possible contaminated land remediation is recommended (condition 5).

## **Conclusion**

7.83. The development would provide a welcome contribution to housing, and affordable housing in particular, in the Borough. The concerns raised by the Planning Inspector in their appeal decision have been largely addressed, or can be remedied through conditions or the S.106 agreement. Although it would be preferable if more open space were to be provided on the site, the design is considered to be well conceived and the standard of accommodation would overall be good. The site is not required for educational purposes at the present time, but may be in the future if this development does not come forward.

## **8.0 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

- 8.1 A planning obligation may be required to control the impact of a development particularly in circumstances where the desired restrictions go beyond the scope of planning conditions. In accordance with section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the local authority will enter into a legal agreement with the applicant (including anyone else who has a legal interest in the land) to secure planning obligations.
- 8.2 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF says local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. Whilst paragraph 204 says obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
  - directly related to the development; and
  - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 8.3 Planning obligations can include financial obligations requiring monetary contributions to the local authority to fund works or services as well as in-kind obligations requiring specific actions to be performed by specific parties.
- 8.4 Hounslow's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out in principle what kinds of planning applications will require planning obligations and in broad terms how monies will be spent on projects related to the proposed development.
- 8.5 The following sections discuss the need for planning obligations arising from the development and its impacts.
- 1) Affordable Housing: To secure the provision detailed above, constituting 41.5% of the units as affordable. This would include the securing of 100% of the nomination rights to the Council.
  - 2) Education: Contribution to local education provision of £618,621.

- 3) Junction improvement works: A contribution of £70,000 towards improvements to the Windmill Road/A4 junction.
- 4) Controlled Parking Zone: A financial contribution of £10,000 towards a consultation on amendments to the local CPZ.
- 5) Construction Training: Construction training opportunities would be provided by the development contractor for the duration of the works, to include a financial contribution of £77,500 if this is not forthcoming.
- 6) Local open space: A financial contribution of £32,630
- 7) Community facilities: A financial contribution to improving local community facilities of £10,000.
- 8) Public realm works: Contribution of £120,600 towards improving the street environment for pedestrians and cyclists and improving access to local facilities, plus securing the S.278 agreement to provide a new zebra crossing to the north of the site and to provide pavement build outs at the site's two access points.
- 9) Construction logistics plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan: A scheme to regulate construction works on the site, to include public consultation.
- 10) Travel Plan: The securing of a bespoke Green Travel Plan for the development, to include £100 worth of sustainable travel vouchers and the provision of a car club.
- 11) Considerate Contractors Scheme: Owing to the scale of the development the developer should register with the Considerate Contractors Scheme. This will ensure the site activity is monitored by an experienced industry professional to assess their performance against the eight point Code of Considerate Practice which includes the categories Considerate, Environment, Cleanliness, Good Neighbour, Respectful, Safe, Responsible and Accountability.
- 12) Restriction on parking permits: Residents of the development to be prevented from obtaining parking permits in the neighbouring Controlled Parking Zones.

## **9. EQUALITIES DUTIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1. The Council has to give due regard to its Equalities Duties and in particular with respect to its duties arising pursuant to the Equality Act 2010, section 149. Following a relevance test it is considered that there will be no specific implications with regard to the Council's duty in respect of its equalities duties and that if approving or refusing this proposal the Council will be acting in compliance with its duties.

## **10. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

- 10.1. Some new developments granted planning permission on or after 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 will be liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to the Mayor of London with respect to the funding of Crossrail. This is at the rate of £35 per m<sup>2</sup> of new floor space where the net floor area increase exceeds 100 m<sup>2</sup>, or where a new unit is created.

10.2. This proposal is liable to pay CIL. Based on the net increase in floor area this is estimated as being £648,445 (note this does not include any affordable housing relief that the applicant may claim).

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION:**

### **Approval**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and securing the abovementioned planning obligations by the prior completion of a satisfactory legal agreement or unilateral undertaking made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and or other appropriate legislation, the exact terms of which shall be negotiated by appropriate officers within the Department of Regeneration, Economic Development and Environment on the advice of the Assistant Director Corporate Governance.
2. The satisfactory legal agreement or unilateral undertaking outlined above shall be completed and planning permission issued by 30/1/15 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by appropriate officers within the Department of Regeneration, Economic Development and Environment or within Legal Services.
3. If the legal agreement or unilateral undertaking is not completed by the date specified above (or any agreed extended period), then the Assistant Director – Community Safety, Regulatory and Development Services or Head of Development Management is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason that the proposal should include planning obligations required to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, development plan policies and the Planning Obligations SPD, as described in this Report.
4. Following the grant of planning permission, where (a) requested to enter into a deed of variation or legal agreement in connection with the planning permission hereby approved and by the person(s) bound by the legal agreement authorised in paragraph 1 above, and (b) where the planning obligations are not materially affected, and (c) there is no monetary cost to the Council, the Assistant Director – Community Safety, Regulatory & Development Services or Head of Development Management is hereby authorised (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and upon the advice of the Assistant Director Corporate Governance) to enter into a legal agreement(s) (deed of variation) made under Sections 106 and/or 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and or other appropriate legislation.
5. If planning permission is refused, the Assistant Director Community Safety, Regulatory and Development Services or Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission validated within 12 months of the date of refusal of planning permission, provided that it (a) duplicates the planning application, and (b) that there has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and that a satisfactory legal agreement or

unilateral undertaking securing the obligations set out in the Report is completed within any specified period of time.

<b>Background Papers:</b>
---------------------------

The contents of planning file referenced on the front page of this report, save for exempt or confidential information as defined in the Local Government Act 1972, Sch. 12A Parts 1 and 2
--

Conditions:

1. Time limit: The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
2. Development in accordance with approved plans: The proposed development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and the plans submitted therewith
3. Approval of samples of materials: No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
4. Details of a sustainable drainage scheme: The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed flood risk assessment (FRA) Reynard Mills Trading Estate, Windmill Road, Brentford. Ref: 11291, dated April 2014 - has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
5. Details of contaminated land remediation to be submitted and approved.
6. Garages not to be converted into habitable rooms: The garage/car spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants of the dwelling of which it forms part and their visitors and for no other purpose and permanently retained as such thereafter.
7. Boundary treatment: Details of boundary treatment to be submitted and approved.
8. No unit shall be occupied until a Car Park Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
9. Restriction on permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings to houses, requiring planning permission to be sought first.
10. Within 3 months of first occupation, a Code for Sustainable Homes Final (Post-Construction) Certificate, issued by the BRE equivalent licensing organisation, must be submitted for each dwelling to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that Level 4 has been achieved.

11. The development shall be completed in accordance with the details set out in the approved Energy Statement prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.
12. Air quality mitigation: Details of air quality mitigation measures to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
13. The non-residential floor space shall be used for either a nursery, homework club or health facility and for no other purpose within use class D1.
14. Implementation of ecology measures: The recommended ecology measures set out in the ecology report shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development
15. Details of hard and soft landscaping: No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
16. Details of parks and play equipment: Details of the open space, including any play equipment, shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development.
17. Landscape and park management plan: A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all hard and soft landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
18. Details of electric vehicle parking spaces: Details of active and passive electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the spaces shown on the approved drawing shall be available for use before first occupation of the development and thereafter retained and maintained as such.
19. Details of cycle parking: Details of the proposed cycling storage within the development shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
20. Details of green and brown roofs, to include construction method, layout, species and maintenance regime, shall be approved prior to the occupation of the development.
21. Details of audio/visual entry system for the blocks of flats shall be approved before the occupation of the relevant part of the development.
22. Approval of design details: Detailed drawings of windows and balconies shall be approved prior to the completion of the development.
23. Details of refuse storage shall be approved prior to the occupation of the development.
24. Details of additional privacy treatments for houses with windows less than 21m away from opposing habitable rooms to be submitted for approval.

25. Details of wheelchair housing to be submitted for approval.

Informative:

If planning permission is granted and not subsequently implemented within 3 years, the policy allocation of the site shall be subject to review with consideration to be given to education status.