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Introduction

i. We act for UK European Investments Ltd who are the owners of Westworld (a landmark office building and adjoining land/car parks) on West Gate, adjacent to the Hanger Lane Gyratory system, in Ealing. They also own the adjoining Chelsea House (River Island warehouse/offices).

ii. Their Westworld site is situated approximately 1.5 miles to the north of Ealing Town Centre at the junction of the A40 Western Avenue with the A406 North Circular Road and A4005 Ealing Road. It is approximately 380 metres west of Hanger Lane Underground Station (Central Line) which provides direct access to the City and West End. Park Royal Underground station (Piccadilly Line) is also situated within easy reach of the site and provides access to north and west London. It is an under utilised site with land that is currently used for car parking, being prime for mixed use redevelopment purposes. The character of the surrounding area is mixed light industrial; commercial and residential.

iii. Following a meeting with Senior Planning Officers regarding this site held on 15th June 2011, we are extremely concerned that the emerging Core Strategy (CS) policies will be applied in a draconian way that will prevent a sustainable mixed use development from being delivered at this important major site and at other appropriate locations within the borough.

iv. For background purposes, a copy of our meeting notes and subsequent email correspondence with Officers is attached as Appendix NB1. Our site specific LDF representations are also attached as Appendix NB2 and Initial Proposals document as Appendix NB3.

v. These CS representations on the various ‘matters’ should be considered within this context.
Matter 1 - Overall Context

1.1 Under this matter, we would wish to comment on the following ‘Issues and questions’ raised by the Inspector using his/her numbering system:–

2. Whether the overall spatial strategy has a sound basis, having regard to the Borough’s context and needs, and the relationship with other strategies.

1.2 The strategy is inflexible and will lead to major mixed use development opportunities being missed. The fact that a site is located in the A40/Park Royal corridor should not prevent its consideration for housing, particularly where this is part of a mixed use proposition and where there is potential for tall buildings.

1.3 The CS document states:– ‘The vision is to harness opportunities for growth and development and promote improvement in appropriate locations.’ (Our emphasis in bold). The approach to split these locations into two categories; effectively one for commercial development and one for a residential development focus is fundamentally flawed in that it mitigates against sustainable mixed use development. In addition, by concentrating the major residential developments into the Uxbridge Road area undue stress will be placed upon the physical and social infrastructure of that Corridor. It will also mean that sustainable locations for mixed use developments (such as our client’s site) will be overlooked and appropriate opportunities for growth will therefore be missed.

4. Are the policies sufficiently distinct from the supporting text?

1.4 No, the policies tend to merge into the supporting text, as they do throughout the document. As a general comment, we consider that the policies are too long; not sufficiently precise and that the use capital letters would work better.

5. Is there adequate or too much reliance throughout the CS to the Development Sites and Development Management DPDs to provide an effective strategy for future development?

1.5 It is important that key sites should be identified through the CS and this is consistent with PPS12 (Local Spatial Planning). Our main concern is that the core strategy is inappropriately polarising the approach to site selection.
Matter 1 - Overall Context

9. Is the CS entirely consistent with The London Plan 2011 and is there any potential conflict with the Draft National Planning Policy Framework?

1.6 The CS ‘flies in the face’ of the emerging NPPF in that its application will result in a draconian approach to rejecting mixed use sites within the A40/Park Royal Corridor contrary to the new ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ and where the default position should be ‘yes’. Whilst this is still an emerging policy, the ministerial statement from The Rt Hon Greg Clark MP issued on 23rd March 2011 on ‘Planning for Growth’ is a material consideration.

1.7 It represents a call to action on growth and was issued as part of a set of Government proposals to help rebuild Britain’s economy. It states:-

‘The Government’s top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. Government’s clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be ‘yes’, except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy.’

1.8 The statement confirms the Government’s commitment to introduce a strong presumption in favour of sustainable development in the forthcoming National Planning Policy Framework, which inter-alia, will expect local planning authorities to plan positively for new development.

1.9 The statement encourages Local Planning Authorities to be proactive in driving and supporting the growth that the country needs, including meeting the housing needs of their area. It states:-

‘They should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that they can give clear reasons for their decisions.’

1.10 The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government will attach weight to this ministerial statement as a material planning consideration when determining any applications that come before him.
1.11 The CS is not consistent with this approach and as such there is a problem of ‘soundness’. PPS12 (Local Spatial Planning) at paragraph 4.52 states:- ‘To be ‘sound’ a core strategy should be justified; effective and consistent with national policy.’ The Council’s CS does not pass this test.

1.12 The Government’s ‘planning for growth’ agenda is also reflected in the new London Plan (July 2011), which seeks to manage such growth to ensure it takes place in the most sustainable way. The Council’s CS will not achieve this primary objective, if its application means that sustainable mixed use development opportunities are to be rejected.
Matter 2 - Vision and Objectives

2.1 Under this matter, we would wish to comment on the following ‘Issues and questions’ raised by the Inspector using his/her numbering system:-

1. Are the Vision and Strategic Objectives soundly based and appropriate for this Borough, consistent with national policies, reflecting community views and locally distinctive, and do they provide a sound basis for the overall spatial strategy and strategic policies in the Core Strategy?

2.2 As discussed above, the CS is not soundly based as it is not consistent with national policy. The policies that flow from the vision are not consistent with the vision itself that seeks to harness opportunities for growth in appropriate locations.

2.3 The strategic policy approach of having two corridors with very distinctive roles will result in perfectly suitable sites for mixed use development being rejected contrary to the emerging presumption in favour of sustainable development.

2.4 No. If mixed use/housing opportunities within other areas (outside of the Uxbridge Road Corridor) can not be delivered it will be extremely difficult to meet the housing target set. Clause c) to promote business and enterprise, with reference to responsiveness to market demands, is entirely appropriate. However, it is evident from our meeting with the Authority, that market realities will be disregarded in favour of a draconian application of strategic policy. In the case of our client's site, the existing value of the land for car parking would prevent a solely B2/B8 scheme from being viable.

2.5 There is also an extremely good existing supply of such premises already within the Park Royal area, as identified in the Ealing Employment Land Review prepared for the Council by Roger Tym & Partners in September 2010. Paragraph 4.59 of this document states:-

‘There is a constant turnover of units due to the large supply and demand within the Park. It consists of a mixture of old, high density,
low eaves 1930/40s units in the centre of Park Royal. Several modern industrial estates have been built over recent years providing new industrial units benefiting from good internal eaves height with larger yards offering better manoeuvrability for HGV’s.’

2.6 Due to market realities such a scheme would therefore simply not come forward at Westworld but, in the event that it did, a low rise warehouse/industrial unit would represent a wasted opportunity for growth and mixed use potential. On the other hand, the delivery of a mixed use proposal would involve no loss of employment floorspace but rather significant gains in terms of both commercial and residential accommodation. Such a proposal would in no way undermine the viability of any neighbouring employment uses but rather would result in a positive impact on the local economy and help to reinforce a sustainable mixed use pattern of development.

2.7 The Council’s policy approach will effectively stymie the site and only serve to preserve the ‘status quo’ which is not in the public interest. This is not consistent with adopted or emerging national policy to promote growth and the redevelopment of previously developed and sustainable sites. (PPS1; PPS3 and emerging NPPF)

3. Is a vision based on transport improvements proposed in the two corridors deliverable if the schemes do not materialise and are the proposed improvements to transport capacity and quality east-west and north-south deliverable?

2.8 The vision is ‘risky’ in this regard. It would be more appropriate to blur the roles within the Corridors and adopt a more balanced approach to dispersing development within the Borough, but with a focus on existing accessible and sustainable locations.

6. Does policy 1.2(b) accord with emerging National Policy, if not, is the policy justified?

2.9 No, it does not accord with the emerging NPPF which has a positive and flexible approach to the location of new office development. Furthermore, the Council’s approach to categorising employment land is rigid and will prevent mixed use opportunities from being delivered even in circumstances where there is no loss of existing employment floorspace.
Matter 2 - Vision and Objectives

2.10 The supporting text is noted which states:

‘Proactive management of Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs) will involve the limited transfer of 14 hectares to mixed use development over the plan period, co-ordinated through the Development Sites DPD.’

2.11 Whilst it is appreciated that this figure is supported by the London Plan, this is a relatively small transfer given the substantial existing supply of industrial sites/land in the borough representing only 3% of total industrial stock. The Council’s own Employment Land Review (by Roger Tym & Partners, dated September 2010) accepts that this is a conservative approach. At paragraph 6.45 of this document, it states:

‘The central scenario is fairly conservative and there may be a case for accelerating greater release in the future. But we propose this figure should be adopted for now and monitored to see if amendment is required in the future.’

2.12 In our opinion, this conservative approach is misplaced and not consistent with the emerging NPPF. This figure should be significantly increased. Moreover, there is no indication of the criteria that will be used to allocate the transfer of sites for mixed use. This is extremely important since there will be cases, such as our client’s land, where the ability to protect the Council’s position as one of London’s premier industrial locations will be unaffected. We therefore suggest the following sentence in the supporting text:

‘The transfer of such sites will be assessed and prioritised against the following main criteria: - sustainability/accessibility of location; potential to minimise amenity impacts; the ability to accommodate tall building(s) and potential to increase the existing level of employment floorspace.’
Matter 3 - Housing

3.1 Under this matter, we would wish to comment on the following ‘Issues and questions’ raised by the Inspector using his/her numbering system:

1. Does the Core Strategy make appropriate provision for the effective delivery of new housing, including affordable housing, in terms of the amount, distribution, location, phasing, size and tenure of new housing development, having regard to national policy, and is it fully justified and supported by an up-to-date, credible and robust evidence base?

3.2 No; the CS does not sufficiently reflect the borough’s significant need for housing (and particularly affordable provision) and its general approach to locating such developments in one specific Corridor will mean that significant housing opportunities will be lost. This is contrary to the Government’s objective of creating balanced; mixed and sustainable communities.

3.3 In particular, there is a pressing need for affordable housing in the borough. The preface to the CS states: ‘There is a shortage of affordable homes for young families to move into, a general problem of high house prices, and there are too many households that have difficulty in getting access to decent housing.’

3.4 This is also reflected in background paper 3: Housing to the Council’s Development Strategy Initial Proposals of September 2009 confirms that there is a significant shortfall of affordable housing in the borough, which outstrips targets and projections for all new housing. This establishes that increasing the provision of new affordable housing should be one of the Council’s priorities and the evidence should be treated as an important material consideration in shaping their CS.

3.5 The CS is therefore at odds with Government policy in PPS3 (Housing), the key goal of which is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. It notes specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver, including achieving housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. It also refers to a flexible, responsive supply of land, managed in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land, including re-use of previously developed land. Paragraph 15 of the guidance is of particular note;
Matter 3 - Housing

it states:-

‘Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should encourage applicants to bring forward sustainable and environmentally friendly new housing developments, including affordable housing developments, and in doing so should reflect the approach set out in the forthcoming PPS on climate change, including on the Code for Sustainable Homes.’

3.6 Unfortunately, it is clear from our meeting with Senior Planning Officers and their flat rejection of our client’s proposals, that the LPA are not providing such encouragement and rigid application of their CS is preventing the delivery of circa 180 new homes (both private and affordable proposed to be built at Code 4 level) as part of a mixed use scheme on under utilised (currently a car park); highly accessible; unconstrained and previously developed land.

3.7 PPS3 also deals with the issue of transferring employment land to housing. The advice generally encourages re-use of previously developed land for housing, and specifically states that LPAs should consider ‘whether sites that are currently allocated for industrial or commercial use could be more appropriately re-allocated for housing development.’

3.8 Our client’s land represents a model PPS3 site which is deliverable now (in that it is available; suitable and achievable) and its rejection by the LPA is therefore completely contrary to Government policy, As such, we would urge the Inspector to ensure that there should be no scope given to the LPA to enable them to justify such a rejection based on their emerging CS.

3.9 The CS is also contrary to the emerging NPPF which aims to significantly increase the delivery of new homes, including the requirement to identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. The NPPF stresses that the supply should include an additional allowance of at least 20% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. The CS was drafted prior to this emerging national policy and should therefore be amended to reflect a more positive and flexible approach to identifying sites, including those for mixed use.

3.10 Paragraph 110 of the emerging NPPF should be specifically noted; it states:-
Matter 3 - Housing

‘The presumption in favour of sustainable development means that Local Plans should be prepared on the basis that objectively assessed development needs should be met, unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.’

3.11 We are not convinced that the CS is supported by an up to date, credible and robust evidence base. If it was, the CS would respond more positively to the pressing need for new housing in the borough and be more flexible with its approach to managing the release of existing employment sites for mixed use development.

2. Are there sufficient identified sites to demonstrate that there is an identified 5 year supply plus an additional 20%. Large and small sites need to be identified; if they are to come from windfall sites the provisions of PPS3 would not be met. Is there any reliance on garden land to meet the housing provision.

3.12 We look forward to the Council’s response on this question. We are aware that historically the borough, with its predominantly suburban character, has relied heavily on residential garden land which PPS3 now no longer classifies as ‘previously developed land.’ In addition, as stated, with reference to advice in PPS3, windfalls can also no longer be relied upon. We do not therefore consider that the Council is likely to be in a position on their housing requirements (8,900 minimum 10 year target identified in the London Plan) where they can afford to adopt a CS that prevents appropriate and available sustainable sites from being delivered for residential led mixed use schemes.

3. Key policy 1.2(a) sets a 50% affordable housing target in accordance with the London Plan and while the supporting text sets out that is the level required, is this viable on all sites.

3.13 This is an appropriate target reflecting the London Plan and the pressing need for affordable housing in the borough. There should however be an appropriate acknowledgement of viability issues which in some cases will result in a lower percentage provision to secure delivery of the site.
Matter 4 - Climate Change and Sustainable Development

4.1 Under this matter, we would wish to comment on the following ‘Issues and questions’ raised by the Inspector using his/her numbering system:-

1. Does the CS provide an appropriate, effective and soundly based framework for providing access to jobs and services, including the provision of an efficient, safe and sustainable transport system to meet the needs of all transport users, which is fully justified and supported by robust, up-to-date and credible evidence and consistent with national policy?

4.2 The CS’s polarised approach to corridor zones with different land use roles is not conducive to encouraging sustainable mixed use development where housing and jobs can be located side by side in accessible locations on previously developed land. The Council’s approach to our client’s land at Westworld highlights this failure and is contrary to both adopted and emerging Government policy.
7.1 Under this matter, we would wish to comment on the following ‘Issues and questions’ raised by the Inspector using his/her numbering system:-

1. Is it realistic to place reliance on HS2 when it is identified in the London Plan for anticipated completion post 2020 and is as yet unfunded?

7.2 In our opinion, the CS places too much reliance on this uncertain project and this puts its deliverability (and therefore effectiveness) into serious doubt.

7.3 A more pragmatic; flexible and realistic focus should be taken based on encouraging sustainable developments at existing accessible locations. This would be consistent with Objective 7 of Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework document prepared by the GLA which states:-

‘Deliver housing where it can enable other benefits including affordable housing to meet the highest access, design and environmental standards. Secure social infrastructure to support new and existing residents.’

7.5 In this regard, it is noted that the Planning framework document identifies a housing capacity/target for Park Royal to provide 3,500 new homes (over the plan period) which allows for residential development being acceptable as part of mixed use developments in appropriate gateway locations (such as our client’s land). This compares to the Council’s CS which by 2026 seeks the development of over 3,000 additional homes within the A40 Corridor and Park Royal Area. The pressure for residential development in the Park Royal area is therefore fully acknowledged and the view expressed in the Park Royal Partnership’s ‘Regeneration Strategy’ is that ‘where there is strong local housing demand, this should be met by concentrating on mixed-use development schemes around station nodes, which will be highly accessible to public transport and amenities.’

7.6 The document also stresses that it is essential that any new housing does not interfere with or prejudice the operational effectiveness of industries and business. The development of our client’s land for mixed use development would achieve these objectives.
Matter 7 - A40 Corridor and Park Royal

3. **Policy 3.3 supporting text indicates that traffic movement through Park Royal is a key challenge and it is vital that public transport serving the area is improved.**

7.7 In relation to our client’s site, the main traffic issue is likely to be the nature of the traffic generated rather than increased traffic flow itself. A B2/B8 development would result in additional significant heavy goods vehicle movements onto the local network to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenities. It should also be noted that other industrial sites in central Park Royal locations have the benefit of large servicing yards which enable good servicing and maneuvrability for HGVs. Our client’s land would not enjoy such an advantage for industrial development.

7.8 A residential led mixed use development on the other hand would benefit from this highly sustainable location very close to Hangar Lane tube station and local bus routes, consistent with Government policy in PPG13 (Transport) which seeks to reduce reliance on the private car and encourage use of other forms of public transport.
Matter 10 - Maps

5. Whether the Proposals Map and Inset Maps are correct and effective in implementing the CS development proposals and policies.

10.1 Important and strategic opportunities for mixed use development have been missed on the Key Diagram. This is contrary to the vision of the CS which seeks to harness opportunities for growth and development, and to promote improvement in appropriate locations.

10.2 Our client’s land represents such an appropriate location within the A40/Park Royal corridor and it should therefore be shown on the CS Key Diagram/Maps as a potential housing /mixed use site.
Dear Mr Cuthbert & Mr Bleakley

Please find attached a note of our recent meeting. This is intended to represent an accurate record of the discussion so please let me know if you feel there is anything that I have misrepresented or omitted.

Yours Sincerely

Nigel Bennett
WESTWORLD, WEST GATE, EALING W5 1DT

NOTE OF A MEETING AT LONDON BOROUGH OF EALING PLANNING DEPARTMENT ON 15th JUNE 2011

Present:- Mr Neil Bleakley; Borough Major Projects Officer, LB of Ealing

Mr Sam Cuthbert – Policy Officer; LB of Ealing

Mr Toby McCulloch – Metropolis Architectural Studio

Mr Nigel Bennett – Metropolis Planning & Design

1.0 Purpose of Meeting

1.1 The meeting had been requested by Metropolis (representing the landowners) in order to gain feedback on their Local Development Framework (LDF) representations (dated November 2010) which recommend a mixed use development allocation for the site.

2.0 Officer Feedback

2.1 TM presented the Metropolis masterplan for the site. Neil Bleakley stated that he did not support the principle of a mixed use scheme and considered that the Council wished to see the site developed for B2 (general industry) and/or B8 (Storage & Distribution) only; any residential content would jeopardise the potential for such uses due to amenity considerations. He added that the height of any development scheme was not an issue in this location.

2.2 Given the employment benefits associated with a hotel, NB queried whether this element of the scheme (positioned fronting West Gate) could be supported as a 'stand alone' application, particularly since there was another nearby emerging hotel allocation (Site 47 – South of Westgate/north of railway). SC stated that the Site 47 allocation was not confirmed as being accepted by the Council and considered that a hotel proposal was unlikely to be supported. Neil Bleakley also queried whether the subject site occupied a sustainable location for a hotel. TM/NB pointed out that the site is within 380 metres of Hanger Lane Underground Station.

3.0 Procedural Position on LDF/Way Forward

3.1 SC stated that the Council’s next consultation was due in Spring 2012 with an ‘Examination in Public’ due to follow in September
2012. The LDF was due to be adopted in mid 2013. He stressed that all of the dates were subject to change.

3.2 NB/TM agreed that they would report the feedback received to their client and would be in touch again in due course.

Nigel Bennett – 27th June 2011
Dear Lisa

My colleague has also pointed out to me that we should clarify the fact that the reference to Site 47 is to the UDP development sites schedule not the emerging Development Sites DPD. The listing for Site 47 states the preferred use as 'Employment'.

Best wishes

Sam

Sam Cuthbert
Policy Planner
Planning Policy, Ealing Council, 4th floor Perceval House, 14-16 Uxbridge Road, Ealing, London W5 2HL
T: 0208 825 7488

>>> "Lisa Lindsley" <lisal@metropolispd.com> 30/06/2011 11:26 >>>

Dear Sam,

Thank you for your email. I confirm that this is fine and we will amend the record accordingly.

Kind regards
Lisa Lindsley

-----Original Message-----
From: Samuel Cuthbert [mailto:CuthbertS@ealing.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 June 2011 11:08
To: Lisa Lindsley; Nigel Bennett
Cc: Neil Bleakley; Karen Montgomerye
Subject: Re: FW: Westworld, Westgate

Dear Lisa

Thanks for this version, I had no problems opening it.

I would suggest one amendment; at point 2.2 it would be more accurate to state that the Sites DPD is only at the Initial Options stage and so the proposals which it contains do not yet represent the stated policy of the Council, and are liable to further revision.

Many thanks

Sam

Sam Cuthbert
Policy Planner
Planning Policy, Ealing Council, 4th floor Perceval House, 14-16 Uxbridge Road, Ealing, London W5 2HL
T: 0208 825 7488
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Site Location Plan
1.0 Introduction

1.1 These representations are made in respect of the site at Westworld West Gate, Ealing in response to the Council’s formal consultation on the emerging LDF Strategy, and LDF Development Sites (Initial Proposals) documents.

1.2 The representations seek to modify the existing Major Employment Location designation in favour of a general mixed use allocation.

1.3 The specific details of the proposed allocations are described later in this report.
2.0 Site Context

2.1 The site is located on West Gate just north of the A40 West Avenue, and extends to approximately 2.065 hectares.

2.2 The site is occupied by our client’s premises at Westworld, a 10 storey office building originally constructed in the 1990s. The remainder of the site is used by our client, its tenants, licensees and visitors for the purposes of parking private motor cars.

2.3 Immediately to the west of the site and also within our client’s ownership is Chelsea House, an office and warehouse complex. The surrounding area is commercial, with offices, warehouse and a budget hotel. These range in scale from single storey to ten storeys in height.

2.4 The majority of the wider area is residential, predominantly 2-storey semi-detached houses with private rear gardens.

2.5 The site has two access points; West Gate to the south, and Quill Street to the north. The site is well placed in terms of access to public transport. The closest underground station is Hanger Lane which is 380m away on Western Avenue.

2.6 The site is not within a Conservation area and is currently designated for employment use within the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan.
3.0 Background and Planning History

3.1 Outline planning permission was granted in 2000 for the provision of up to 12,077 sqm of B1 office floorspace together with car parking and a link road from Quill Street to West Gate (forming phase II of the West World development).

3.2 A recent Certificate of Lawfulness was granted in August 2010 for the Use of land to north-east of West World as a car park in connection with the existing office building (reference P/2010/2351).

4.0 Objection to Existing Allocation

4.1 Within the adopted Ealing Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2004, the subject site is part of a wider designated Major Employment Location as shown on the extract on the opposite page.

4.2 Consistent with the requirements of UDP policy 6.1, the Council will encourage the retention, location, and expansion of industry in these areas.

4.3 The Council’s Employment Land Review published in September 2010 identifies the site as No: 33 West Gate, Park Royal and concludes that the wider site should be retained as a Major Employment Location within the emerging Local Development Framework context.

4.4 We object to the site’s continued Major Employment Location designation and the Council’s failure to identify this particular area for a managed release of employment land in favour of a mixed use allocation.
Proposed Zoning Plan
5.0 Proposed Allocation

5.1 These representations seek to modify the existing Major Employment Location designation in favour of a mixed use allocation.

5.2 The proposed mix of uses, as depicted on the Zoning Plan opposite include the following:-

- Hotel (Class C1) with frontage to West Gate
- Mixed Use including Residential (Class C3)
- Car Parking and Residential (Class C3)
- Retention of existing employment use associated with Westworld.
Planning Policy Support

6.1 Specific policy support for these representations is contained within National Planning Guidance.

6.2 In particular, Planning Policy Statement (PPS)1, Delivering Sustainable Development, states at paragraph 27 that Development Plans, among other things, should seek to:

- Bring forward sufficient land for housing and industrial development, which is of suitable quality and in appropriate locations, to meet the expected needs;
- Allocate sites on the basis of their accessibility and sustainable transport needs, and the provision of essential infrastructure, amongst other criteria;
- Provide improved access to jobs by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car;
- Focus developments that attract a large number of people, including offices, in existing centres, in order to promote the vitality and viability of these centres, social inclusion and more sustainable patterns of development;
- Reduce the need to travel and encourage accessible public transport provision by actively managing urban growth to make full use of opportunities for increasing public transport patronage; and
- Promote more efficient use of land through higher-density, mixed use development and the reuse of suitably located previously developed land and buildings.

6.3 Employment land is also mentioned in Planning Policy Statement (PPS)3, Housing. This statement generally encourages re-use of previously developed land for housing, and specifically states that local planning authorities should consider: ‘whether sites that are currently allocated for industrial or commercial use could be more appropriately reallocated for housing development’.

6.4 This type of brown field site is even more important than it was previously due to the recent amendments to PPS 3 which excluded private gardens from the definition of previously developed land. This is particularly relevant in a typically suburban borough such as Ealing.
7.0 Sustainable Location

7.1 The adoption of a mixed use allocation in this location would be a highly sustainable proposition in terms of its proximity to facilities, local amenities and surrounding infrastructure.

7.2 The site is approximately 1.5 miles to the north of Ealing Town Centre, and situated in very close proximity to the Hanger Lane gyratory system at the junction of the A40 and the North Circular.

7.3 The site is located within 380 metres of Hanger Lane Underground Station (Central Line) which provides direct access to the City and the West End. Park Royal underground station (Piccadilly Line) is also situated within easy reach and provides access to north and west London.

7.4 The disposition of mixed uses on the site and different operational hours involved would also allow for multi use car parking to be expanded. Furthermore, significant infrastructure improvements are facilitated by the incorporation of the former link road proposals from Quill Road to West Gate.
8.0 Continued Employment Contribution

8.1 The long term and strategic employment function of the wider area will not be compromised through the introduction of a mixed use designation in this location.

8.2 The proposed schedule of uses includes a variety of activities which will contribute to the area’s employment offer. The proposed hotel use and additional commercial floorspace which would be part of any future proposal will significantly add to the existing level of employment floorspace.

8.3 This will in turn complement the existing employment contribution associated with Westworld and Chelsea House, both within our client’s ownership and which currently provide 295 and 475 numbers of employees respectively.
9.0 Lack of Market Demand

9.1 It is considered that the site is currently under-utilised for employment purposes and that there is limited market demand for major new commercial development at the site.

9.2 This situation has only been worsened in the last few years owing to the global economic downturn.
10.0 Housing Contribution

10.1 The Council’s Strategic Housing Market & Needs Assessment 2009 identified that the scale of demand and need within the Borough is significant.

10.2 It is noted in the assessment that compared to the proposed annual provision of 915 units p.a. as outlined in the London Plan, there is an identified shortfall of 2,560 units in the affordable sector.

10.3 The introduction of a residential component within mixed use redevelopment proposals would make a significant contribution to the Council’s overall housing targets, and in particular assist in the future delivery of much needed affordable accommodation.
11.0 Consistency with Wider Regeneration Proposals

11.1 We note that the land south Westgate and to the north of the railway shares the same Major Employment Site designation, however in the 2004 UDP it is also designated as a Development Site.

11.2 Identified as Site 47 Land at Hanger Lane Westgate W5, the Council's Development Sites SPG provides that the development aims for this location seek high quality, high density office development and also include the possibility of a hotel. We also note that this recommendation is being carried forth in the emerging LDF documentation.

11.3 It is considered that the flexibility of uses associated with this location and principles of redevelopment defined by the Council are also applicable to our client's site.

11.4 Our client's are also in discussion with the Park Royal Partnership in terms of how the proposals will compliment their wider regeneration agenda.
12.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

12.1 The subject site provides an excellent opportunity for regeneration and a model of good practice for achieving mixed use and sustainable development.

12.2 The benefits for inclusion in the LDF would not only assist meeting local housing and employment demands asserted by planning guidance, but would also provide an improved quality of environment on the site in terms of visual amenities and regeneration of the area generally.

12.3 It would also make efficient use of a previously developed brownfield site consistent with the policy guidance contained in PPS 3.

12.4 It is therefore recommended that the emerging LDF Development Sites (Initial Proposals) document include our client's site as a mixed use allocation consistent with the zoning plan described in this report.
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1.0 Introduction

This document has been prepared for UK & European Investments Ltd as an initial appraisal of the site neighbouring the Westworld Office building, London, W51DT.

This report contains our preliminary design strategy together with drawings to scale. Metropolis Planning advice will be provided separately to this report.

Note all areas are approximate and subject to the level of information available.
The site is located on West Gate just north of the A40 West Avenue. From the OS-map the site area has been calculated as approximately 1.1 hectares.

The existing site is vacant and is used as car parking.

The immediate surrounding area is commercial, with offices, warehouse and a budget hotel. These range in scale from single storey to ten storeys in height.

The majority of the wider area is residential, predominantly 2-storey semi-detached houses with private rear gardens.

The site has two access points; West Gate to the south, and Quill Street to the north.

The north and northeast areas of the site are fronted by warehousing. The southeast, and southwest by office buildings. The west boundary opens to a carpark whilst the south of the site is bounded by West Gate.

The site is not within a Conservation area and is currently designated for employment use.

Closest underground station is Hanger Lane which is 380m away on Western Avenue.
The site is located in a pocket of industrial land within a suburban area. The majority of the wider context is allocated for residential use, with semi-detached residential properties together with a limited number of smaller unit types.

The site will benefit from views of the new Wembley Stadium at higher levels.
Local amenities and facilities are within reach from the site, with a Sainsbury's walking distance north of the site on Ealing Road.

The site is conveniently located to local public transport, both bus routes and London Underground which allows easy access to Central London.

Hanger Lane Tube station is 380m away together with Alperton, and Park Royal Tube stations around 1,000 metres away.
5.0 Design Principles

**Opportunities**
- Create new "street" to link West Gate and Quilt Street.
- Extend green corridor link from canal into the site.
- New multi-storey carpark releases land for high quality development.
- Create private and communal amenity space.
- Provide commercial and community uses at ground floor level.
- New housing provision (private and affordable) with mix of tenures.
- On-site renewable energy generation with low/zero carbon emissions.

**Form and massing**
- Create new street with active frontage.
- New buildings to create markers at new link with West Gate and Quilt Street.
- Cluster of buildings to avoid monolithic development.
- Varied building heights and massing to create visual interest and townscape.
**Organisation**

- Taller buildings to act as marker for wider context.
- Ground floor commercial / community provide active frontage.
- Car parking and hotel serviced off new street.
- Hotel entrance from West Gate.
- Residential cores from new park area act as local markers.
- Amenity space to benefit from natural surveillance.

**Urban Texture**

- Cluster of new buildings to delineate new street.
- Building forms offering views of new park from street.
- Balconies to model form and provide legibility for new residential.
- Proposed landscaping to create hierarchy of spaces between public and private areas.
- New green spaces to link to "green corridor" along river and canal.
- Development to provide new aspect and improved visual amenity.
5.1 Design Principles Summary

- Extend green corridor link into site
- New link to Quilt Street
- Hotel as marker for new street link to West Gate
- Hotel addresses West Gate
- Taller buildings as markers for wider context
- Varied building heights and massing to create visual interest
- Improved aspect and visual amenity
- New car park to release land for development
- Ground floor commercial oriates active frontage to new street
6.0 Scheme Proposals

**Residential**
- 22 x 3-Bed 86sq.m+
- 78 x 2-Bed 70sq.m+
- 73 x 1-Bed 50sq.m+

**Overall Total 177 Flats**
- Residential Sales area (NIA) = 11,371sq.m
- Residential GIA (inc Plant) = 14,089sq.m
- Commercial GIA = 1,357sq.m
- 140 room hotel GIA = 4,549
- Car Parking = 272 spaces total

**Density**
- 425 Hab Rooms/Ha
- 157 units /Ha
6.0 Scheme Proposals
The new development will enhance the site setting with the proposed buildings set within a new landscaped park.

The scheme proposes two types of amenity for residents. A high quality communal park to the west of the site, together with private balconies or terrace space.

Overall the proposal provides amenity of 5,484sq.m with an average provision of 32sq.m per unit

The scheme provides:
- 3,157sq.m Ground floor communal park
- 804sq.m Communal roof garden terrace
- 1,523sq.m Private balconies and terraces

5,484sq.m Total Amenity
The proposed development has been designed to be fully accessible for people with mobility, sight and hearing difficulties.

The scheme design has referred to the following standards:

- Approved Document M, 2004
- British Standard BS 8300: 2001
- Designing for Lifetime Homes

Although the London Housing Design Guild is still only guidance the main principles are likely to be incorporated into the Local Authority Planning UDP.

As such the scheme has been designed with the main principles in mind and with flats a minimum size of 50.70, and 86sq.m for 1, 2 and 3-Bed flats respectively.

Generally the circulation within the site has been designed to be level. Where changes in levels or falls in surface to facilitate drainage occur they will be no more than 1:20.

Clear landing areas of 1.5 x 1.5 have been created at the building entrances. Thresholds will be no more than 15mm high.

The building entrances will be provided with canopies where they are not recessed.

Reception and lobby areas will provide clear and unobstructed access to allow for wheelchair and ambulant.

Parking for 18No spaces will be located within the site and will include 2No disabled bays.

Internal circulation. Common parts and flat circulation are designed to meet the requirements of the above standards.

Lighting: The lighting strategy will be designed to support the hierarchy of spaces. This will assist partially sighted users to distinguish between circulation and points of arrival. Generally uplighting will be used and the design will seek to prevent glare and shadows.

The development has been designed to be fully accessible to all users:

- Generally external areas will provide level access with changes in levels being mitigated by ramps or slopes of no more than 1:20.
- Entrance thresholds will be no more than 15mm.
- Lighting design and signage will support ease of circulation by partially sighted.
9.0 Drawings to scale

D3100rev00  Ground floor plan
D3101rev00  First floor plan
D3102rev00  Second floor plan
D3103rev00  Third floor plan
D3104rev00  Fourth floor plan
D3105rev00  Fifth floor plan
D3106rev00  Sixth floor plan
D3107rev00  Seventh floor plan
D3108rev00  Eighth floor plan
D3109rev00  Ninth floor plan
D3110rev00  Tenth floor plan
D3111rev00  Eleventh floor plan
D3112rev00  Twelfth floor plan
D3900rv00  Schedule of areas
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Key:
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