

Rectory Park Estate (Phases 3-4)

in the London Borough of Ealing

planning application no. P/2015/5051

Strategic planning application stage II referral

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

The proposal

Redevelopment of the estate to provide 289 residential units, a replacement community centre and open space, together with access, parking, and landscaping.

The applicant

The applicant is **Network Stadium Housing Association** and the agent is **JLL**. The architect is **BTPW Partnership**.

Strategic issues

The principle of the redevelopment of the existing estate is strongly supported. Outstanding strategic planning issues relating to **housing, urban design, climate change** and **transport** have been satisfactorily addressed, and the application is now acceptable.

The Council's decision

In this instance Ealing Council has resolved to grant permission.

Recommendation

That Ealing Council be advised that the Mayor is content for it to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct that he is to be the local planning authority.

Context

1 On 8 October 2015, the Mayor of London received documents from Ealing Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. This was referred to the Mayor under Category 1A of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

"Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats".

On 18 November 2015, the Mayor considered planning report D&P/2878d/01, and subsequently advised Ealing Council that whilst the principle of the redevelopment of the estate

was strongly supported, the application did not yet comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 68 of that report but that the resolution of the issues could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

2 A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report. On 9 December 2015, Ealing Council followed the Council officers' recommendations to approve the scheme and resolved to grant planning permission for the application. On 10 December 2015, the Council advised the Mayor of this decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application, and any connected application. The Mayor has until 23 December 2015 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

3 The Mayor's decision on this case, and the reasons, will be made available on the GLA's website www.london.gov.uk.

Update

4 At consultation stage Ealing Council was advised that the principle of the redevelopment of Rectory Park Estate was strongly supported, but that further information should be provided to address the outstanding planning issues set out below:

Housing and affordable housing

5 At consultation stage, it was not possible to determine whether the proposal provided the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12.

6 The applicant's financial viability report has been subject to independent assessment on behalf of the Council. The applicant's financial viability appraisal and the Council's viability advisors have confirmed that the proposal is considered to represent the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that can be provided.

7 The Council's S106 Agreement secures the provision of affordable housing, comprising 31 units (with 134 habitable rooms) in social rent tenure, 66 units (with 225 habitable rooms) in affordable rent tenure, and 68 units (with 229 habitable rooms) in shared ownership tenure. This equates to 165 units or 57% of affordable units. This will be provided through a Registered Provider in accordance with London Plan policy. Ealing Council's housing regeneration manager has confirmed that the proposed mix of housing meets the needs on the estate in terms of the re-provision of housing for existing residents. The planning committee report also confirms that Ealing officers consider that, overall, the proposed development offers a good range of non-family and family sized accommodation, in accordance with the objectives of Policy 3.8 of the London Plan. The applicant's affordable housing offer and proposed housing mix is therefore acceptable.

8 With regard to children's play space, the planning committee report advises that the Council's parks service has not raised any concerns about the applicant's play space strategy and has not identified any further requirement for additional contributions for improvements to the local play and outdoor recreational facilities. This is accepted.

Urban design

9 The applicant was advised at stage 1 to explore means of bringing forward the building line of terrace housing to the south-east of the “Garden Square” to improve enclosure to the street, avoid areas of under-utilised open space and enable car parking zones to be set back to the rear of the blocks.

10 In response to these comments, the applicant has advised that it had explored other configurations under the original outline and full permission that were submitted in 2011, had discussed the proposal at length with Ealing officers and that there were a number of positive reasons why the proposed approach had been agreed to be the most appropriate solution for the site. The proposal is also supported by Ealing officers in their planning committee report which advises that the proposed layout of the houses, rear gardens and front parking courtyards continues the layout of the development already constructed as part of Phase 1 of the regeneration masterplan.

11 GLA officers accept the above and are content that the open space area along the Avenue secures a high quality pedestrian environment. It is also noted that the applicant has included terraced housing either side of ‘The Gardens’ which is a positive aspect of the scheme.

12 GLA officers note and support the fact that no single-aspect north-facing flats are proposed. This addresses the issue raised in the stage 1 report.

13 The detailing of the proposed buildings and material used has been secured by condition by the Council, which is welcomed.

Climate change mitigation

14 At the consultation stage, the applicant was asked to provide quantified evidence to support the cooling measures proposed. An overheating assessment has been provided by the applicant as requested. SAP outputs which verify the energy efficiency savings claimed from energy efficiency measures alone have also been provided. The applicant has also quantified the total size of the PV panels and has confirmed that 220kWp of PV panels is required. As requested at stage 1, a roof layout drawing detailing the PV locations demonstrates that there is sufficient roof space to accommodate the proposed PV arrays, which is welcomed.

15 All of the energy issues are resolved. As such the proposal complies with London Plan policies on climate change.

Climate change adaptation

16 In response to the stage 1 comments, conditions with regard to climate change adaptation, which include conditions on surface water drainage scheme, sustainable water use, biodiversity roofs, and tree retention and monitoring have been secured by the Council.

Transport for London’s comments

17 With the exception of substandard analysis of cycling conditions, TfL was overall satisfied with the proposals at stage 1, subject to satisfactory conditions and Section 106 mitigations. In view of the limited increase in dwellings for this specific application, Ealing Council has considered it appropriate to secure by condition the requirement for further details of cycle parking to be submitted. TfL’s preference would however be, within the finalised legal agreement, to refer to ‘prior to commencement on site’ rather than ‘within 3 months of the commencement of superstructure works’ to potentially avoid poor design and ensure a more practicable solution in the event changes to the plans are required.

18 TfL has accepted the proposed car parking provision but highlighted the requirement for sufficient blue badge parking and electric vehicle charging points; these have been secured by condition. Additionally, a car parking management strategy and a car club space on-site have both been secured through the Section 106 agreement.

19 The travel plan, which was considered of an acceptable standard and secured as part of the Section 106 agreement, will be submitted prior to the first occupation of the residential units and £3,000 is secured, also through the s106, for its monitoring. This is welcomed by TfL.

20 Although a condition requiring a construction method statement to be submitted has additionally been secured as part of this consent, Ealing Council has however considered the additional frequency of delivery vehicles servicing the site too low to merit a delivery servicing plan, despite TfL's recommendation. It is noted however that the travel plan incorporates measures to manage deliveries to the site.

21 TfL accepted at stage 1 that this specific redevelopment would not result in an unacceptable impact on either the TLRN or the public transport network, and no direct mitigation was required.

22 In summary, TfL is satisfied this proposal is London Plan compliant.

Response to the consultation

Local neighbourhood consultation

23 Ealing Council advertised the proposals by site and press notices and letters. The Council received one objection to the development proposal in response to the consultation. The letter objects to the proposed demolition of existing buildings and states that the existing accommodation is fit for purpose and should be retained.

Statutory consultees

24 Thames Water responded to the consultation and advised that they would not object to the proposal in relation to sewerage infrastructure capacity but requested a condition for a piling method statement to be submitted for approval prior to the commencement of the development.

25 GLA officers are satisfied that issues raised by the respondents have been considered in this report, the stage 1 report and the Council's planning committee report.

Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority

26 Under Article 7 of the Order the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance the Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at stage one, therefore there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

Legal considerations

27 Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have

regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

Financial considerations

28 Should the Mayor direct refusal, he would be the principal party at any subsequent appeal hearing or public inquiry. Government guidance emphasises that parties usually pay their own expenses arising from an appeal.

29 Following an inquiry caused by a direction to refuse, costs may be awarded against the Mayor if he has either directed refusal unreasonably; handled a referral from a planning authority unreasonably; or behaved unreasonably during the appeal. A major factor in deciding whether the Mayor has acted unreasonably will be the extent to which he has taken account of established planning policy.

30 Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any reserved matters applications (unless he directs the council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

31 The principle of the redevelopment of the existing estate is supported in accordance with strategic policy. The issues raised at consultation stage regarding housing, urban design, climate change and transport, have all been addressed, and the application is now acceptable in strategic planning terms.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects team):

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects

020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

020 7983 4895 email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Hermine Sanson, Senior Strategic Planner, case officer

020 7983 4290 email Hermine.sanson@london.gov.uk

Rectory Park Estate (Phases 3-4)

in the London Borough of Ealing

planning application no. P/2015/5051

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

The proposal

Redevelopment of the estate to provide 289 residential units, a replacement community centre and open space, together with access, parking, and landscaping.

The applicant

The applicant is **Network Stadium Housing Association** and the agent is **JLL**. The architect is **BTPW Partnership**.

Strategic issues

The principle of the redevelopment of the existing estate is strongly supported. However, there are some outstanding strategic planning issues relating to **housing, urban design, climate change** and **transport** that should be addressed before the application can be considered acceptable in strategic planning terms.

Recommendation

That Ealing Council be advised that, whilst the principle of the redevelopment of the estate is strongly supported, the application does not yet comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 68 of this report. However, the resolution of those issues could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

Context

1 On 8 October 2015 the Mayor of London received documents from Ealing Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 18 November 2015 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor's use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under Category 1A of the Schedule to the Order 2008: *"Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats"*.

3 Once Ealing Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The Mayor of London's statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

5 The 4.43 hectare application site is located in Northolt and comprises the Rectory Park housing estate. The site is situated immediately north of Ruislip Road and south of Gifford Primary School. To the west of the site is an area of low-density housing and to the east is Rectory Park playing fields which are designated as Green Belt land. The wider area is suburban in character and comprises largely of low density housing and green open space.

6 The site was established as a housing estate immediately after World War Two when a number of pre-fabricated houses were built. In the 1970's the original housing was replaced with 270 homes arranged in four to six storey linear blocks running parallel to Rectory Park Avenue, a centrally located north-south spine road. The original estate comprised 151 tenanted residents, 99 leaseholders and 20 vacant properties. It also included a single-storey community centre north of the site.

7 In 2012 outline permission was granted for the redevelopment of the whole estate in tandem with full permission for the demolition and reconstruction of part of the estate (Phases 1 and 2) (GLA reference PDU/2878 & 2878a/02). The outline permission approved the development of a total of 425 homes on the estate with 160 homes in phases 1 and 2 covered by the full application, and the remaining 265 homes under the phase 3 – 5 element of the outline permission. Phases 1 and 2 have now been built out and are now close to being fully occupied.

8 In terms of transport, the nearest part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) are the A312 / A4180 White Hart Roundabout junction, 850 metres west of the site, which links with the A40 (also TLRN) about 700 metres north east of the site boundary. Five bus routes are accessible from Ruislip Road immediately to the south of the site. The closest rail link, Northolt London Underground station on the Central line, is considered to be above the maximum acceptable walking distance as located approximately at a 2.5 kilometre walk to the north of the site. As such, the site's public transport access level (PTAL) varies from 2 to 3, on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 is least accessible.

Details of the proposal

9 Network Stadium Housing Association seeks full planning permission to complete the final phases (Phase 3 and Phase 4) of the regeneration of the Rectory Park Estate. Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing and the redevelopment of the site to deliver 289 homes and a permanent community centre of 2,500 sq.m. with associated landscaping, amenity space and parking.

10 The revised application seeks to increase the number of homes across the whole estate from 425 as approved by the 2011 outline permission to 449. This represents an increase of 24 units across the scheme. It is also proposed that the final phases of the development be delivered in two phases instead of three to achieve quicker delivery. The last two phases of the development would therefore deliver a total of 289 homes rather than 265 homes in three phases as approved under the outline permission.

11 The proposed overall number of dwellings in the final phases is presented in table 1 below:

Phase	Number of bedrooms	Affordable (rent) units	Affordable (shared ownership) units	Private units	Total
1 to 2 (completed)	1	18	22	0	40
	2	60	29	0	89
	3	20	11	0	31
3 to 4	1	34	13	33	80
	2	18	36	59	113
	3	33	19	32	84
	4	12	0	0	12
Total (Phases 3 -4)		97 (33%)	68 (24%)	124 (43%)	289
Total (all phases)		195 (43%)	130 (29%)	124 (28%)	449 (100%)

Table 1: Proposed accommodation schedule

12 The proposal comprises a series of two and three-storey houses, together with apartment block elements which rise to seven storeys at the centre of the estate where, the 'Gardens', the main communal amenity space and the proposed permanent community centre are located.

Case history

13 In 2011 Network Housing Group submitted a part outline and part full planning application for the phased redevelopment of the estate to demolish the 270 existing flats and redevelop the estate to provide 425 new homes together with associated landscaping, a new community centre and up to 297 car parking spaces. As mentioned in paragraph 7 above, outline planning permission for a total of 425 homes (phases 1 to 5) was granted with full planning permission for 160 homes (phases 1 and 2) and outline permission for the remaining 265 homes (phases 3 to 5) in 2012 (GLA reference PDU/2878 & 2878a/02).

14 The regeneration of the estate was originally based on the delivery of a high percentage of private homes in the first phases with the funds being used to help the viability of subsequent phases. However, following the allocation of additional grant funding and to respond to the

immediate need for more affordable housing, a non-material amendment (LPA ref: PP/2014/2336) was approved to vary the unit mix and tenure of the homes provided in the first phases to deliver affordable homes. The first phases are therefore 100% affordable.

15 The application for phases 3 and 4 considered here was subject to formal pre-planning application discussions with GLA officers with a meeting held on 15 December 2014. GLA officers welcomed the opportunity to proactively engage with the applicant at an early stage in the development process, and strongly supported the principle of the estate redevelopment. However, a number of issues were raised regarding housing, urban design, climate change and transport.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

16 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Housing *London Plan; Housing SPG; Draft Interim Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG*
- Affordable housing *London Plan; Housing SPG; Draft Interim Housing SPG; Housing Strategy;*
- Density *London Plan; Housing SP; Draft Interim Housing SPG;*
- Urban design *London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG; Housing SPG; London Housing Design Guide; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG*
- Access *London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG*
- Sustainable development *London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor's Water Strategy*
- Transport *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy*
- Parking *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy*

17 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is Ealing Council's Core Strategy (2012), Development Sites Development Plan Document (2013) and Development Management Document (2013), and the 2015 London Plan (with alterations since 2011).

18 The following are also relevant material considerations:

- The National Planning Policy Framework and Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework;
- Minor Alterations to the London Plan – draft Housing standards and Parking standards (May 2015);
- The Mayor's draft Interim Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (May 2015).

Principle of development

19 London Plan Policy 3.3 provides explicit strategic support for the provision of housing within London. With specific regard to existing stock, Policy 3.14, in addition to the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, makes clear that whilst existing housing should be retained where possible, renewal of stock can be necessary where it is required to deliver improvements to housing quality and to better address housing need.

20 The extant outline permission establishes the principle of development in this location. The principle of the redevelopment of the site for housing in this location is therefore supported in strategic terms. The reprovion of the existing temporary community centre is also supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.16.

Housing

Reprovision of existing affordable housing

21 London Plan Policy 3.14 resists the loss of housing, including affordable housing, without its planned replacement at existing or higher densities, with at least equivalent floorspace. The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance provides further advice in support of Policy 3.14, and clarifies that an assessment of the quantum of reprovion in estate renewals can be made on a habitable room basis, or number of units, as well as floorspace, where improvements are delivered.

22 Table 2 below sets out the reprovion of social accommodation in terms of units that would be delivered on-site.

	Existing estate (units)	Outline permission (units, all phases)	Revised proposal (units, all phases)
Affordable tenure			
Social /affordable rented	151	170	195
Difference with existing	-	+19	+44

Table 2: Comparison schedule of social/affordable rented accommodation in unit terms

23 Based on table 2 above, the revised proposal would represent a gain of 44 social units on-site compare to the existing provision and an increase of 25 affordable units compare to the outline permission, with all the social units under the revised scheme being affordable rented units. In addition to the replacement of the social units, the proposal also includes 130 shared ownership units across the scheme (68 units under phases 3-4). This significant increase in affordable housing overall is strongly supported. The total amount of affordable housing in the revised proposals would therefore equate to 325 units or 72% of affordable housing overall.

24 The above conclusions therefore confirm that there would be no loss of affordable housing on-site but, on the contrary, a gain of affordable housing units in line with Policy 3.14. The proposal would also exceed Ealing Council's minimum policy requirement of 50% affordable housing. The applicant has submitted a financial viability appraisal in support of its proposal, which is being independently assessed by the Council. It is therefore not possible at this stage to determine whether the application provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12. GLA officers will review the Council's appraisal of the applicant's viability statement before the scheme is referred back at stage 2 to determine whether the proposed affordable offer is the optimum that can be achieved on-site. The Council should also confirm that any affordable offer, tenures and rent levels meet local housing needs.

25 The proposal will deliver better quality accommodation in line with London Plan Policy 3.14. This aspect is covered in details in the housing quality and urban design sections of this report.

Tenure split

26 London Plan Policy 3.11 seeks to ensure at the strategic level that 60% of affordable housing provision is social housing, and 40% is intermediate. As shown in table 1 above, across the whole scheme, it is proposed that 60% of the units are affordable rent and 40% are shared ownership. This is in accordance with the London Plan's strategic tenure split and is therefore supported.

Housing choice

27 London Plan Policies 3.8, 3.9 and 3.11 and the Mayor's Housing SPG promote housing choice and seek a balanced mix of unit sizes and tenures in new residential developments with priority given to affordable family housing (those of 3 bedrooms or more). This is to promote mixed and balanced communities.

28 The applicant proposes to deliver a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 beds as shown in table 1 above. 21% of the units across the scheme will be affordable family accommodation. Subject to the Council being satisfied with the proposed mix, the mix and provision of affordable family accommodation proposed by the applicant would be acceptable. The introduction of houses to the estate (where previously there had only been flats) is also a positive addition to the scheme.

Density

29 The density of the proposed development (phases 3 to 4) is 114 units per hectare and 390 habitable rooms per hectare, which is above the density guidance within the London Plan for suburban sites with a public transport accessibility level of two.

30 As noted in paragraph 5.1.14 of the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, *"To achieve no net loss, development at significantly increased densities may be necessary to generate sufficient value from market development to support replacement of affordable housing provision, or to achieve a mixed and balanced community"*.

31 Whilst there is not an in principle objection to the development of high-density schemes, specifically in the context of estate renewal, in order to be acceptable, as set out in paragraph 1.3.41 of the Mayor's Housing SPG, development needs to provide high-quality residential accommodation that is well designed and delivers an appropriate mix of units, sufficient play and amenity space, and be in context with its surroundings. As detailed in the relevant sections of this report, the proposal introduces houses to the estate, includes a considerable increase in the proportion of family accommodation, and does not result in a net loss of affordable units. Provision for door-step play has been included within the development, the residential quality is high, and the overall design of the development is supported. In this context, the proposed density is acceptable.

Housing quality

32 London Plan Policy 3.5 promotes quality in new housing provision, with further guidance provided by the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. All units meet, or exceed, London Plan space standards and have generous balconies, which is welcomed. The ground floor mansion block units and proposed maisonettes have individual entrances, which is also welcomed. A generous number of cores and internal corridors also have natural light and ventilation. The proposal includes a significant proportion of dual aspect units which benefit from large windows. There are a number of north facing single aspect units. This point is covered in the urban design section of this report. Including both private and communal amenity spaces, phases 3-4 will provide 31.75 sq.m. of amenity space per dwelling, which is welcomed.

33 The residential quality of the proposal is therefore high overall, and responds positively to London Plan policies. Further comments on the residential quality is provided in the urban design section below.

Children's play space

34 Policy 3.6 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals include suitable provision for play and recreation. Further detail is provided in the Mayor's Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation Supplementary Planning Guidance. Using the methodology within the Mayor's SPG, the development will be home to approximately 287 children, of these 124 will be under five years of age. Based on the GLA requirement of 10 sq.m. per child, the area required is 2,870 sq.m.

35 The applicant has acknowledged that this amount of play space would be challenging to deliver given the pressures on amenity and parking requirement and proposes to assume that the 12+ teenagers/young adults can safely make use of the off-site surrounding facilities, which include informal and formal sports pitches, a skatepark, a basketball court and youth shelters at Rectory Park and Northolt and Greenford Country Park, all within 800 metres of the application site. The applicant is also proposing to deliver outdoor gym areas as part of the development which could be used by teenagers. Given the proximity of the neighbouring parks, the applicant's proposed approach is accepted in principle, however, the quality and popularity of these facilities should be assessed, and contributions should be offered to the Council to expand or improve these spaces if necessary.

36 The applicant advised that it was currently achieving 1,210 sq.m. of play area within the development. Whilst this falls short of the Mayor's requirement for play, it is acknowledged that the proposed play space would considerably improve existing provision, that Rectory Park is on the edge of the application site, and that generous private amenity space for flats and houses, including private gardens will also be provided. The proposed amount of play space is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Community facility

37 A replacement community centre of 250 sq.m. is proposed as part of phases 3-4. The community space will be designed to allow for a flexibility of uses, including a nursery, office, a secondary hall and evening use.

38 The replacement community centre within the site is supported and in line with London Plan Policies 3.1 and 3.16, which encourage the re-provision of social infrastructure to meet the need of the community and the multiple use of the facilities.

Urban design

39 As commented on at pre-application stage, the proposals for the detailed design of the final phases of the masterplan are generally well thought out and structured around the approved outline masterplan for the estate. The principle of organising residential blocks either side of a central north-south thoroughfare is supported as this provides the opportunity for a street-based focus to the scheme with a simple and legible means of accessing the site, culminating in the 'The Gardens' public square at the centre of the masterplan area.

40 Residential blocks are generally arranged to align with the earlier phases of development, providing visual consistency, enclosure to the street and clear definition between private and public realm. In response to pre-application discussion, the applicant has provided further information on the treatment of the Rectory Park edge which is welcomed. This demonstrates a

clear spatial hierarchy between the public pathway along the edge of the park, connecting routes into the site and defensible space zones/thresholds to residential entrances which in turn provide high levels of passive surveillance. This is welcomed.

41 At pre-application stage, the applicant was advised to explore means of bringing forward the building line of terrace housing immediately to the south-east of the 'Garden Square' to meet the back of pavement. This would provide improved enclosure to the street, avoid areas of under-utilised open space and enable car parking zones to be set back to the rear of blocks so as not to detract from the quality of streetscape and pedestrian amenity. It would also provide a more varied and active streetscape and avoid a continuous run of car parking spaces of approximately 200 metres along the eastern edge of the north-south thoroughfare. The applicant was advised that should this prove difficult to implement, a detailed landscaping strategy should be provided that demonstrates how car parking/open space zones along the frontages of terrace housing can be fully utilised to include opportunities for shared residential amenity and thereby optimise the quality of streetscape. Officers remain unconvinced that the proposed arrangement of car parking and terrace housing immediately to the south of the 'Garden Square' will result in a sufficiently high quality of public realm and as such, the applicant should explore the feasibility of bringing forward this particular section of terrace housing, demonstrating how a car parking zone could be located to the rear. Officers would welcome further discussion on this point before the scheme is referred back to the Mayor at Stage 2.

42 Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that the applicant has introduced further terrace housing to flank the 'Garden Square' at the centre of the scheme in addition to the distribution of terrace housing along the central thoroughfare and park edges and this will help to enhance activity and levels of passive surveillance, which is welcomed. As discussed at pre-application stage, the applicant has provided further information which demonstrates how individual entrances will also be included to the mansion blocks. This is welcomed and will assist in optimising street based activity across the masterplan area while also providing future residents with a sense of ownership.

43 The indicative residential layouts demonstrate that a high quality of residential accommodation can be achieved across the scheme, with 75% of units designed to achieve dual aspect which is welcomed. The inclusion of through units within perimeter blocks is strongly supported and helps to achieve efficient core to unit ratios and avoid north facing single aspect units. The applicant has provided details of typical unit layouts which indicate that all units are designed to meet minimum space standards with efficient footprint depths to provide sufficient daylight/sunlight penetration. It is however noted that there are a number of north facing single aspect units within mansion blocks. The applicant should confirm that these units in particular are designed to meet acceptable ADF levels and all units should be designed to achieve a minimum of 2,500mm floor to ceiling heights.

44 The form and massing strategy is broadly supported and responds successfully to the scale of the wider masterplan. The varying housing typologies, ranging in height from two to seven storeys help to define contrasting character areas, with taller elements located to give visual prominence to corners and a civic scale to the 'Gardens'.

45 The refined architectural response is supported with the implementation of simple building forms providing a human scale to the development. Simple articulation is achieved through the use of subtle brick detailing, varying brick tones and contrasting balcony treatments, which is welcomed. The use of restrained uses of brick tones to give prominence to corner buildings and the edges of communal spaces is supported as this will assist in defining character areas within the site.

Inclusive design

46 In accordance with London Plan Policy 3.8, the applicant has confirmed that 29 wheelchair adaptable units would be provided. This comprises 10% of the 289 units proposed for phases 3 – 4. The wheelchair adaptable units have been identified on plan and will be delivered across the different tenures, which is welcomed. Adaptable wheelchair parking spaces have also been identified on plan. The wheelchair adaptable units and wheelchair parking spaces should be secured by the Council through condition.

47 The shared surface environment has been designed to be inclusive with visual contrast to distinguish the road from the pavements. The applicant proposes to deliver a range of seating areas, some of them incorporating seats with back rests and arm rests. This is welcomed and will ensure that as many people as possible can use these areas.

Climate change adaptation

48 The proposals include a number of measures to respond to climate change adaptation, these include high performance passive materials, low energy use fittings, appliances and systems which are further dealt with in the section below. In addition, sustainable drainage systems have been incorporated within the proposals, these include permeable paving and planted swales/soakaways in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.13. There are also 152 trees proposed in phases 3 and 4. The above measures should be secured by condition by the Council.

Climate change mitigation

Energy efficiency

49 A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations. Other features include low energy lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery.

50 The demand for cooling will be minimised through shading from balconies and openable windows. The applicant should however provide quantified evidence of how Policy 5.9 has been addressed to avoid overheating and minimise cooling demand.

51 The development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 46 tonnes per annum (12%) in regulated CO₂ emissions compared to a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development. The savings appear high for the measures proposed. The applicant should provide the sample SAP full calculation worksheets (both DER and TER sheets) for the development including efficiency measures alone to support the savings claimed.

District heating and renewables

52 The applicant has carried out an investigation and there are no existing or planned district heating networks within the vicinity of the proposed development. The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a communal heat network, however due to the low potential for district heating development and the low heat density of the site an individual boiler approach is proposed. It is accepted in this instance that a communal heat network is not proposed.

Combined Heat and Power

53 The applicant has investigated the feasibility of CHP. However, due the intermittent nature of the heat load, CHP is not proposed. This is accepted in this instance.

Renewable energy technologies

54 The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and is proposing to install roof mounted Photovoltaic (PV) panels. The applicant should quantify the total size of the PV panels required in kWp and sq.m. The applicant should also provide a roof layout drawing detailing the PV locations to demonstrate that there is sufficient roof space to accommodate the proposed PV arrays.

Summary

55 A reduction of 85 tonnes of CO₂ per year in regulated emissions compared to a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development is expected, equivalent to an overall saving of 35%. The carbon dioxide savings meet the target set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. However, the comments above should be addressed before compliance with London Plan energy policy can be verified.

Transport

Car parking

56 The proposed parking for the additional 24 units will comprise 15 car parking spaces plus two disabled spaces. Given the existing parking demand, the location of the development and existing parking controls in place in the area, this provision is considered appropriate. In accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13, 10% of these spaces will be wheelchair accessible and 20% should be provided with electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs), with a further 20% passive provision. The applicant is committed to provide and fund by condition/s106 an on-site car club space for 2 years as well as a car park management strategy, ensuring appropriate control of parking. This is supported.

Trip generation & transport impact

57 Trip generation has been based on existing traffic surveys used to determine the number of vehicles entering and exiting the site. The applicant's transport statement (TS) updates the original transport assessment (TA) produced in support of the original consent with 2011 Census data. As a result, the analysis is considered robust and the resultant person trip rates appear reasonable.

58 A number of localised junctions have been modelled to test development impact, including the White Hart Roundabout. Based on the above, the conclusion that the redevelopment of the site will not result in an unacceptable impact on either the TLRN or the public transport network is accepted.

Walking, cycling and accessibility

59 It is understood that £6,000 towards pedestrian and cycling facilities was secured through the s106 for Phases 1-2 and that this modest sum has been used for some limited connectivity improvements, including lighting a non-vehicular link to Parkfield Road.

60 No pedestrian environment review system (PERS) or cycling environment review system (CERS) audit (review surveys) of the environment for pedestrians and cyclists respectively has been supplied or justification given for its lack in the TS. The supplied plan goes some way to presenting a generalised current cycle routing and nothing about the local environment conditions. It is understood that the Council would like to improve cycling attractiveness and quality of specific routes that lead west and east from this site by for example removing unnecessary barriers. TfL supports further interventions by the Council in pursuing funding from

this specific phase towards further improvements as per their latest Ealing Council Cycling Strategy in order to encourage safe and attractive non-car trips. This is in line with London Plan Policies 6.1 and 6.9 and would support the likely increase in cycling demand from this scheme. Notwithstanding the above, the improved pedestrian permeability of the site through to the adjacent Rectory Park is welcomed.

61 In terms of cycle parking, the applicant has satisfactorily clarified that the proposal will provide a total of 406 secure cycle storage spaces for the 289 units proposed. This provides the requested 2 spaces for all the family 3-bed units plus the 1 space per 40 units short stay spaces, in line with London Plan Policy 6.9.

Travel plan, servicing and construction

62 The travel plan is generally of a reasonable quality and sufficient phasing information related to targets at intervals of occupation is given. Adequate framework plans for delivery and servicing and construction logistics are supplied separate to the TA.

CIL

63 The Mayor of London introduced his Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 1 April 2012. Most development that receives planning permission after this date will be liable to pay this CIL. The proposed development is in the London Borough of Ealing, where the charging rate is £35 per square metre of floorspace. Further details can be found at <http://www.london.gov.uk/publication/mayoral-community-infrastructure-levy>.

Summary

64 Following further detail and clarification received in response to the initial comments provided to the Council, TfL is satisfied that this phase can proceed in compliance with the latest transport policies with the exception of cycling environment analysis which appears to be sub-standards. Therefore, and in view of the increased levels and prominence of cycling since the 2012 outline application was consented, further mitigation should be sought in the form of funding towards the implementation of Ealing Council's Cycling Strategy.

Local planning authority's position

65 Ealing Council's officers are supportive of the proposals.

Legal considerations

66 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor's statement and comments.

Financial considerations

67 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

68 London Plan policies on housing, urban design, inclusive design, climate change and transport are relevant to this application. Whilst the principle of the redevelopment of Rectory Park Estate is strongly supported, further information should be provided to address the following outstanding planning issues:

- **Housing:** the principle of the redevelopment of this estate is acceptable in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.14. The increase in affordable housing provision is particularly welcomed. However, it is not possible at this stage to determine whether the proposal provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12. The proposed quantum of children's play space is considered to be acceptable.
- **Urban design:** The proposed phases 3 and 4 are generally well thought out. The applicant should explore the feasibility of bringing forward the terrace housing immediately to the south east of the 'Garden Square' to meet the back of pavement and demonstrate how a car parking zone could be located to the rear. The applicant should confirm that the north facing single aspect units are designed to meet acceptable ADF levels and that all units are designed to achieve a minimum of 2,500mm floor to ceiling heights.
- **Inclusive design:** The wheelchair adaptable units and wheelchair parking spaces identified on plan should be secured by the Council through condition
- **Climate change adaptation:** Measures that contribute to climate change adaptation should be secured by condition.
- **Climate change mitigation:** The carbon dioxide savings meet the London Plan target. However, further information should be provided on the proposed PV panels and to verify the energy efficiency savings claimed.
- **Transport:** TfL is satisfied that phases 3-4 can proceed in compliance with the latest standards and advice with the exception of cycling environment. TfL supports the funding sought by the Council to support the cycling vision.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects team):

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects

020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

020 7983 4895 email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Hermine Sanson, Senior Strategic Planner, case officer

020 7983 4290 email Hermine.sanson@london.gov.uk
