West Ealing Centre Neighbourhood Forum

WECNF Management Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Tuesday, 12 April 2016 at 7.00pm
Venue: Welshore Community Hub, 99 Broadway, West Ealing, W13 9BP

Present:

Eric Leach (Chair)
Arthur Breens
John Cowing
Efie Drivyla
Will Howe
Geoff Langston
Ian Potts
Nigel Presky
Dave Randles
Tony Burton (LBE Supporting Role).
Brendan O'Neill (rCOH Ltd)
Max Taylor (rCOH Ltd)

Apologies:
No Apologies Received

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Minutes for the previous committee meeting held on 4th February 2016 were agreed. These minutes are available for view on WECNF's website

General Matters

- Subject to available funding, the committee voted to retain the services of rCHOH Ltd until the end of the project
- The chairman stated that WECNF would be applying for additional 'Locality' funding for the financial year 2016/17
- The committee agreed to a provisional date for the next AGM on Monday, 27th June 2016. The meeting will be held at the Welshore Community Hub
- The Chairman reported that members of the committee and representatives from planning consultants rCOH Ltd met with LBE Planning & Regeneration on 6 April 2016 to discuss feedback on WECNF's draft neighbourhood plan

Draft Neighbourhood Plan Feedback

The chairman reported that, following the public launch of the draft Neighbourhood Plan on 2nd March 2016, a significant amount of feedback has been received and recorded his

thanks to all those who contributed. A list of contributors is shown below and brief details of each of the 90 comments received can be found on the attached pdf spreadsheet.

WECNF Draft Feedback Contributors

1) Cttee member Dave Randles
2) Historic England
3) Dron & Wright (Fire Station Property Consultants)
4) West Ealing Neighbours (WEN Residents Association)
5) London Borough of Ealing (LBE Regeneration & Planning Services)
6) Member Richard Mutton
7) West Ealing Business Improvement District (WEBID)

The committee discussed each of the feedback comments in detail as shown below. (reference numbers shown below correlate with line numbers on the attached spreadsheet)

Ref 1:
The chairman has written to affected landowners on several occasions but engagement has so far been very poor. This matter was also discussed at the recent meeting with LBE's Strategic Planning Manager on 6th April who has also tried to set up meetings with Sainsbury's and landowners for Chignell Place without success. The committee agreed to renew their efforts once the final pre-submission plan has been prepared and to include a summary of relevant landowners in the plan where appropriate.

Ref 2:
The committee agreed to include more detailed 'red-line' plans in order to supplement the general Plan D overview shown on page 38 of the draft. The chairman thanked LBE for their offer of cartography help.

Ref 3:
The committee agreed to improve the cross referencing of LBE Development Sites with policies shown in the neighbourhood plan. It may be possible to include an overview map showing all development sites although this is already available in WECNF's supporting data evidence.

Ref 4:
The committee thanked member Richard Mutton for his suggested amendment to include management of estate agent boards as a new policy. The committee felt that this matter was adequately covered in current legislation and decided against the proposal.

Ref 5:
The committee agreed to include additional wording to the draft plan in order to clarify differences in designated areas between WECNF & WEBID. The committee also agreed to include additional wording in order to define use of the term 'trader'

Ref 6:
The committee agreed to WEBID's proposal to include a new Policy 13 in respect of trader parking and to renumber existing policies as necessary. The committee felt however that the proposed new Policy 13 wording suggested by WEBID fell outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan and could not be delivered.

The committee agreed that site specific parking references already included within the draft policies should remain in the pre-submission plan. (Chairman's Note: Following the meeting committee member Will Howe agreed to draft a new clause).

Ref 7-8:
The chairman advised members of the committee that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SAE) as referenced in Clause 1.9 of the draft plan will not be required as the neighbourhood plan is not expected to have a significant impact on the environment. This was discussed at the recent meeting held on 6th April at which LBE agreed to confirm the matter in writing. Clause 1.9 of the draft plan will be redrafted accordingly.

Ref 9:
LBE have withdrawn their proposal to amend the designated area boundary to include parts of Argyle Road/The Avenue. This was agreed at the meeting held on 6th April 2016.

Ref 10:
The committee agreed to redraft the wording of Clause 2.14 in accordance with LBE's view. rCOH Ltd to action

Ref 11:
The committee agreed to amend the wording 'significant residential tower blocks' in Clause 2.8 to read 'large residential blocks'

Ref 12:
The committee agreed to amend the wording 'pressures on' with 'potential of' in Clause 2.12 of the draft

Ref 13:
The committee agreed to correct the typing error in Clause 2.13 by removing the final 's' in 'Conservation Areas'

Ref 14:
The committee disagreed with LBE's comments on Para 5.1(i) of the draft. This clause forms part of WECNF's Vision Statement and no supporting evidence is required

Ref 15-16:
The committee agreed to WEBID's proposed amendments in respect of additional wording in Vision Statement Clause 5.1(i) and to separate reference to parking in an additional bullet point

Ref 17:
Clause 5.1 (vi) - the committee identified significant gaps in public transport particularly in respect of routes between the new station and the southern part of the designated area. This matter is highlighted within WECNF's community feedback

Ref 18:
The committee disagreed with comments in respect of Clause 5.1(ii) feeling that WEBID has misunderstood this aspiration within WECNF's Vision Statement

Ref 19:
The committee disagreed with WEBID's proposal in respect of Clause 5.1(vi) to replace the word 'rectified' with 'recognised'. WECNF's aspiration is to encourage significant change to gaps in public transport and not simply to acknowledge existing deficiencies

Ref 20:
The committee agreed with WEBID's proposed wording change in Clause 5.1(ix) from 'that is fit for purpose' to ' that are fit for purpose'

Ref 21:
The committee agreed with LBE's view that the replacement of Jacob's Ladder is a key aspiration and should be better highlighted in Plan D on page 38

Ref 22:
An extensive discussion was held about Clause 6.4 and the committee agreed that this clause should be redrafted in totality in order to make the CIL list of projects more specific. The new wording will include LBE's proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling routes particularly in respect of the new station. It was felt that this clause should also include 'Improvements to Dean Gardens' and that the reference to 'Community Arts' needs expansion. The committee recognised the need to ask local residents and businesses to rank possible uses of CIL money in order of priority. They should also be invited to add and rank other potential CIL funded projects.

The typing error in the final line of Clause 6.5 should be amended to read 'investments listed in **6.4** of this Neighbourhood Plan'

Ref 23-24:
The committee agreed to the proposals made by Heritage England in respect of Policy 1 (Royal Mail Building). The description included in the heritage section of the plan will be expanded

Ref 25,26 & 28:
The committee agreed to amend the wording of Policy 1(iii) to allow a mix of residential and commercial if deemed appropriate. A discussion was held about the practicality of this decision given that the Royal Mail building is predominately a single storey building with a large central sorting area making it difficult to adapt as a significant residential site without destroying the unique character of the building. The structure of the large central area might lend itself better to community use or even as an attractive indoor market.

Ref 27:
The committee disagreed with LBE's proposal to replace the word 'setting' contained within Policy 1(ii) – it was felt that this was a widely accepted term and that it was therefore unnecessary to change the wording of bullet point (ii)

Ref 29-31 & 33:
Policy 2 deals with a site opposite the new Crossrail Station which includes a parade of shops with residential flats above. The committee noted the level of confusion over this policy where both LBE and WEBID had mistakenly thought that this was a different site, adjacent to the new station, located on the corner of Manor Road and Drayton Green Road. Ref 30 was withdrawn by LBE at the meeting held on 6th April 2016.

The committee agreed to strengthen the wording for existing Policy 2 in order to explain the importance of the site opposite the station and to clear up any confusion. The committee agreed to amend the wording of Clause 2(ii) to read 'Comprises a mix of retail & commercial use at ground floor level with residential accommodation above'.

The committee also acknowledged that it may be necessary to introduce a new policy in respect of the corner site at the junction of Manor Road and Drayton Green Road. This site is already covered in Ealing Development Site EAL12 and it may not be necessary to supplement the existing plans. rCOH Ltd agreed to revisit the issue to see whether it would be appropriate to add anything to EAL12 in order to protect the existing building line and pedestrian access to the new station. It was felt that the height of any new development must be appropriate to the size of the surrounding buildings.

Ref 32:
Policy 2: The committee agreed to reword Clause 2(i) in order to replace the 4 storey height restriction with more suitable phraseology.

Ref 34:
Policy 3: The committee agreed with WEN's comments on congestion at the Drayton Green Road bus stop and the need to protect the building line on the west side of the road so as to avoid further problems like those currently experienced by residents of Thornberry House

Ref 35-36:
Policy 3: The committee acknowledged that there is an existing planning application in respect of the site at Drayton Green/Lancing Road; this proposal is the subject of a recent consultation process. The committee felt that LBE should take into account the views expressed in WECNF's draft neighbourhood plan before reaching a decision. The committee agreed with LBE's view that the ground floor level facing Lancing & Kirchen Roads should not be exclusively developed for retail & commercial use

Ref 37:
The committee disagreed with the WEBID's proposal to amend the word 'active' in Policy 3 (ii). Use of the word is considered to be a widely accepted term.

Ref 38-39:
Policy 3 (iii): The committee disagreed with proposed changes to the wording in this clause believing that the current wording adequately reflects the necessary and desirable transition between Thornberry House and the adjacent terrace to the north.

Ref 40:
The committee believes that use of the term 'public realm' in Policy 3 Para 5.12 is standard terminology which is widely understood

Ref 41-43:
The committee acknowledged LBE's comments regarding the new development currently under construction at 160 Uxbridge Road and the requirement for rear access from Drayton Green Road. After discussion it was agreed that the wording in draft Policy 4 should remain despite the fact that the available land at the rear of the NatWest bank is reduced in size. The committee believes that, although this area is very small, it may still be possible to repurpose the land in such a way that would significantly enhance Drayton Green Road and the access corridor up to the station. The committee will contact the landowners for the NatWest bank site once the pre-submission plan has been completed.

Ref 44-46:
Following extensive discussion, the committee agreed to retain Policy 5 relating to the whole of the corner site on the western side of the Lido junction lying between Kirchen Road and Drayton Green Road. This site extends north along Drayton Green Road to include the block currently occupied by Cherry Pye. The committee acknowledged the views of Heritage England relating to this site but felt that the current building is of poor quality with poor quality shop fronts. The building has been extensively modified over the years and bears little evidence of former grandeur or distinctive style particularly when viewed from the rear. The committee agreed with WEN that this is a landmark site located at a key junction in the high street and felt that this was a once in a lifetime opportunity to introduce a high quality development that would enhance the area. The design of any new development on this site would need to be in keeping with, and not detract from, the NatWest Bank on the opposite corner.

Ref 47-50:
The committee acknowledged the considerable concern over Policy 6 relating to Dean Gardens. This site is a matter of concern to many although surprisingly no feedback has yet been received from Pathways who manage the sheltered housing to the south of Dean Gardens. The issue of crime and antisocial behaviour within the park is of paramount importance in the development of WECNF's designated area and the thinking behind Policy 6 is that matters would be significantly improved through the introduction of active frontages. Such active frontages, which could also include community space, would enhance the poor reputation of West Ealing and encourage greater use of the park. Although the space is small and the policy would require the loss of a small amount of green space, it was considered that the benefits far outweighed the disadvantages.

The chairman advised that the problems within the park are currently under discussion by a new Dean Gardens Working Group of which he is a member – this group has yet to make

any recommendations despite the publication of a recent MPS Crime Prevention Environmental Visual Audit report which has already been circulated to all WECNF committee members. The committee agreed that Policy 6 should remain in the pre-submission plan so that the issue can be further debated and tested. The committee felt that the inclusion of a visual sketch within the plan would be of considerable value in demonstrating what might be possible and that the reasoning behind the policy could be strengthened within the text. The committee further agreed with WEN's view that the height restrictions shown in Policy 6 (iii) should be reworded to include reference to the massing and scale of any new development which should be appropriate to the area.

Ref 51-52:
The committee acknowledged LBE's view that the changes recommended in Policy 7 were largely covered within LBE Development Site EAL14 proposals. Policy 7 attempts to strengthen and elaborate on this view. It was agreed that the policy could be reworded to include use of 'The Lodge' cottage as a community facility as recommended by WEN.

Ref 53-57:
Policy 8: The committee supports LBE's view on increasing N-S permeability through LBE Development Site EAL15 and is cognisant of the potential impact on Hugh Clark House to the rear. The committee agreed to add the word 'retail' to Policy 8(i) after the word 'active' in accordance with LBE's recommendation.

The committee also agreed to reword the 3 storey height restriction contained in the draft as this conflicts with the policy in EAL15 recommending 5 storeys. The committee disagreed with WEBID's suggestion regarding flexible floor space on grounds that the amendment was unnecessary and already covered by existing wording.

Ref 58:
The committee agreed to reword Policy 9 to include reference to performance space that would offer cultural benefit – use of the expression 'white space' is not commonly known and should not be included.

Ref 59-60:
The committee disagrees with LBE's view on resisting a net loss of car parking within Policy 9. The issue of shopper parking is key to the success of the high street and is a major concern to business traders and WEBID. The committee will however include a specific new policy on car parking as mentioned in Ref 6 above.

Ref 61:
Although the committee agreed with WEBID's proposal regarding pedestrian access in Policy 9 Para 5.22 it was felt that this was a matter that could be aired at a later stage of the planning process.

Ref 62:
The committee does not agree with the views expressed by LBE regarding Policy 10 and fails to grasp the relevance of the Corridor 1c amendments. The committee expressed surprise that there was no feedback from WEBID regarding the possible redevelopment of Chignell Place – this may be because the current traders have a rateable value below £10K.

Ref 63-66 & 75:
The committee acknowledged WEN's view that a café might be inappropriate for inclusion in Policy 11 although they felt that there was no reason to exclude such a possibility at this stage.

The committee acknowledged LBE's support for the replacement of Jacob's Ladder and receipt of recent plans showing the extent of the approved Green Man Estate redevelopment on the southern side of Felix Road. rCOH Ltd agreed to amend the red line on the map to reflect the footprint of the new Green Man development. It was felt that the Green Man plans would not preclude the small piece of land on the corner of Romsey Road from being included in Policy 11 designed to enhance and improve pedestrian access and public realm towards the entrance to Jacob's Ladder. The committee felt that current Green Man proposals to use this small piece of land for car parking were unsatisfactory.

The committee agreed to reword Policy 11(iii) to remove reference to a height restriction of 5 storeys – any new building should be sympathetic to the surroundings. The committee also agreed to include WEBID's recommendation on the provision of adequate and sufficient lighting and signage.

Ref 67:
The committee disagreed with WEN's proposals to amend the wording of Policy 12 to be more explicit on the support for a night time economy on grounds that the current wording was adequate.

Ref 68:
The committee disagrees with LBE's views on the net loss of car parking. This matter is referred to above and will be the subject of a new Policy 13

Ref 69:
The committee disagreed with WEBID's proposals regarding the use of 'active frontages'. Use of the word is considered to be a widely accepted term.

Ref 70:
Although sympathetic, the committee felt that the WEBID recommendations regarding traffic calming and speed limits within the town centre were not a planning issue and should not be included in the neighbourhood plan.

Ref 71-74:
The committee acknowledged the concerns of LBE and WEBID regarding Policy 12(i) and Policy 12(ii) relating to shop frontages and agreed that this policy should be better justified and include evidence. Nevertheless, the committee was reluctant to depart from its stated policy and challenged the council's objections on grounds that WECNF's draft plan does not conform with LBE's development plan; current practice frequently departs from the development plan as evidenced within WECNF's high street analysis. The committee felt that the policy should seek to retain a reasonable balance in accordance with current practice and that such a flexible approach would offer significant advantages to the high street.

Ref 76-79:
The committee acknowledged the error concerning planning categories and the removal of betting shops and payday loan shops from Class A2 to Sui Generis as advised by WEBID following an amendment to planning law in 2015. Policy 12(ii) and Para 5.27 will be reworded accordingly and the necessary amendments will be made to WECNF's High Street analysis and panorama.

Ref 80:
The committee disagree with LBE's view on high street parking and will include additional evidence and justification within the new Policy 13

Ref 81:
The committee agreed with the feedback submitted by Heritage England regarding the need to include additional wording in the Heritage Policy (Old Policy 13 - Revised Policy 14) about the nature and character of West Ealing. The chairman agreed to draft additional wording which will include references to the historical nature of the area and reflect on the distinctive architectural styles that have appeared over the years.

Ref 82-84:
The committee accepted the views of Heritage England in recommending removal of Grade II listed St.John's Church (Asset 16) from the published list of heritage assets in order not to cause confusion. It was agreed that Asset No.16 should be replaced with the NatWest Bank; a new page will be added and the index will be updated.

Ref 85:
The committee acknowledged the views expressed by Mssrs. Dron & Wright regarding heritage protection of the Fire Station. rCOH ltd undertook to investigate further although the general view of the committee is that the wording proposed by Dron & Wright may result in unacceptable harm to West Ealing's local heritage.

Ref 86:
Although the committee acknowledges and supports the existence of LBE's local heritage list, WECNF disagrees with LBE's view that these heritage assets should not be included in the neighbourhood plan. WECNF's position as supported by Heritage England and the WECNF membership is not negotiable.

Ref 87-88:
The committee agreed with the feedback submitted by WEBID regarding Policy 13, Item 18 and will amend the text to include numbers 25-41The Broadway. The committee confirms that Policy 13, Item 10 includes the whole building and not just the chimneys and agrees to amend the list of heritage assets accordingly.

Ref 89:
The committee does not agree that the wording of Policy 14 conflicts with Development Management DPD Policy 4B. Neighbourhood Plans need only to conform with LBE's strategic policies contained within its Development Strategy.

Ref 90:
The committee welcomes the support provided by WEN regarding the potential use of empty shops for arts/crafts and for business start up usage.

A.O.B

Cttee member Dave Randles agreed to send a selection of local photographs to rCOH Ltd for possible inclusion in the pre-submission plan.

****

The chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and the meeting closed at 2150 hrs.