

**ED4 Matter 3
Representor 40
Ealing Civic Society**

**ED4. MATTER 3 – SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES
DPD**

**3.1 ACT1, ACT3, ACT5, ACT6, EAL2, EAL3, SOU1, SOU5, SOU6, SOU8,
and OIS1 – will the sites be deliverable in the light of concerns from
Thames Water about water supply and waste water services? What is the effect
on the development sites of safeguarding land for HS2.**

No comments

3.2 No comment

Area 1 - Acton

**3.3 An overarching issue for Acton is whether the development sites
contribute to revitalising Acton Town Centre and the regeneration of
Acton Main line Station, as envisaged by the CS.**

3-3a Difficulties of shopping in Acton relate to traffic congestion, limited public parking and lack of large units. The CS requires expansion of 550 residential units and 10,000-12,000 sqm of retail space. Office space is not mentioned but improvements to the public realm especially the Market Square are proposed, despite at least two recent makeovers. More housing will increase the number of residents in Acton Town Centre, a highly polluted environment, deficient in open space where high rise flats would harm the CA, listed buildings and the local character. It is also unsound to do this in the most polluted parts of the centre or the Acton Main line station. Morrisons is a successful larger retail units with parking that supports nearby small shops and its loss even if only temporary would reduce retail trade already experienced since the opening of Westfield Shopping Centre. New retail space at the Former Tram depot stands empty due to lack of current demand.

3.4 Additional site specific matters include:

• ACT4, ACT5 – Are the allocated uses justified/too restrictive/viable?

3.4a ACT 4 -Beechworth House (DS40 18-21)has retail use at ground floor level. Vacant upper floors should be promoted for any town centre use because mixed uses might inhibit early reuse. which would help vitalize the town centre. A no or low car development could increase pressure for street parking. With a PTAL of only 4 and alternative off street parking some distance, this would not be sound.

3.4b ACT 5 Acton Central Station Yard(DS40-22) The Allocation of all the site is residential or employment. Part is designated Green Corridor which should remain undeveloped and included in the proposed Allocation. Residential development would expose residents to rail noise. Trees on the site should be protected by TPOs and the amenity of the road frontage improved by removal of the advert hoarding. An attractive frontage would enhance the business on the site and contribute to the viability of the centre. It is unjustifiable to cut down trees to build houses adjacent to the railway

**• ACT2 ACT3, ACT4 - Are the design principles clear, justified and
flexible enough to be effective?**

3.4c ACT2 (DS40 6-12) Morrisons site is misnamed Acton Gateway. This term should be used for Teevan at the junction of Steyne Rd and Horn Lane and we do not consider that naming as a gateway justifies peripheral high rise development. The design principles require substantial residential blocks around the perimeter with rear servicing. The main justification is that there are high blocks to the NW of Steyne Rd. These are in a landscape setting and adding some more blocks would increase the dominance of flats without the additional landscape. High rise flats would obscure the west frontage of Morrisons which was designed to be in keeping with the Victorian mock tudor of the High Street and to replace the genuine older buildings occupied by Poores. The Council is proposing that more peripheral buildings are needed to “reflect the character of the adjacent conservation area and listed church”. Morrisons’ west façade may not be the current fashion with some visible equipment on the roof but we disagree that the supermarket façade needs alteration due to its weak architectural quality.

3.4d A green wall would be damaged by traffic fumes, salt spray and pollution but more trees in the car park would improved the high pollution levels and the amenity of this corner and complement the planting on the west side of Steyne Rd. If Acton is to be revitalised adequate town centre parking is essential and insertion of a peripheral building line would require extensive underground parking. We agree with English Heritage that tall buildings would impact on the Conservation Area and listed buildings and therefore reference to ‘opportunities for additional height’ should be deleted and heights should reflect those in the opposite side of the High Street. It is unsound to raise false expectations.

ACT 3 Oaks Shopping Centre (3.4e DS 40 13-17)

ECS objected strongly to P/2012/3154 and 3155 see Appendix 3.1 because of the unattractive design of the tower block and its impact on the conservation area and historic cemetery and listed Town Hall. Communal Amenity space is not satisfactory in courtyards or terraces because it is noisy for flat dwellers especially from children’s play. The site is unsuitable for tall buildings because of the impact on the Conservation Area and listed buildings, a view supported by English Heritage.(DS60 (4) The requirement excluding piecemeal development should be limited to the rear of the site as renovation could be a satisfactory approach to the High Street frontage. Some of these buildings are in character with the Centre and increasing the heights of the frontage with flats would harm the CA.

3.4f• ACT2 - Is the development site boundary appropriate. Should it include other buildings? See DS40(11)

3.4g ACT6 Acton Main Line/Crossrail Station (formerly Act 7) How will the allocation reduce the environment impact of the industrial activities on the surrounding residential areas? Is it compatible with Ealing’s Sustainable Communities Strategy?

DS 40 (24) The Development Management policies have been inadequate to control the noisy, dusty railway depot without harming local amenity for adjoining housing, while access to the A40 for the lorries distributing stone past residential uses adds to the problem. Crossrail will introduce further interchange traffic and there will be a need for bus access, cycle parking, disabled parking and vehicle drop off.

3.4h No residential accommodation should be allowed within the site because of the poor environment, lack of public open space and the needs for access to Crossrail. Council response to DS 57.1 implies that the stone depot is protected by regional policy but moving the stone depot to an alternative location would eliminate the harm. It would depend on the life of the existing quarries in the west of England and the availability of sites in London with good rail and road access. A more realistic approach is to require landscaped mounding on some of the open space to the north to reduce noise and visual intrusion in the adjoining residential area.

Area 2 - Ealing

3.5 An overarching issue for Ealing is whether the development sites would revitalise Ealing Metropolitan Centre, including defining and reinforcing its character, as envisaged by the CS.

3.5a Minor changes to existing sites are helping to revitalize shopping. This includes **DS 40 (37-43)Ealing Broadway Shopping Centre EAL 4** is very pleasant and attractively designed which provides a short cut from the station south to Ealing Green. With covered sections giving rain protection and an open square for sitting in the sun it provides for a range of customers in the varied London Climate. As a locally listed building that was designed with major input from local people it should not suffer major redevelopment destroying its very individual character. Units may be small in depth compared with shop frontage so that rents tend to be high per square foot but size adjustments of units can take place without major reconstruction. The site should be removed from the schedule or presented as a site for renovation rather than major development which would destroy its award winning environment.

3.5 b Dicken's Yard, which is under construction totally dominated by flats and progressing slowly, is leaving revitalization in limbo. Most of the other sites proposed for retail in the metropolitan centre seem similarly burdened with residential proposals that detract from the retail space at a time when shopping patterns are changing and there is competition from large centres such as Brent Cross, Westfield and the West End. Cross rail will limit the attraction of retail businesses to the centre to all that is needed for a dormitory suburb.

3.5 c DS40 (33)Ealing Broadway Crossrail Station EAL2 needs adequate access. The POS of Haven Green has been used to build a cycle hub and despite its common land status no compensatory land has been offered. Disabled access is needed with drop off for people with luggage. The Council and TfL are trying to fit a bus depot into the road outside the station. On the main N-S route in this part of the borough. buses and taxis are a major cause of congestion and groups of passengers block the pavement and access to the station. We welcome the proposal to demolish Villiers House but are concerned that DS46(1) on behalf of the owners of Villiers House wish to include the option of recladding or extending it. This has already been done unsuccessfully. An imaginative scheme is needed that provides space for buses and adequate drop off that protects Haven Green and the buildings that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. We are concerned about the adaptation of the forecourt prior to the Crossrail station development because minimal proposals so far presented do not appear to make enough space for access. The Crossrail station designs and adjoining land need to be progressed now rather than rushed through at the planning application stage when the GLA can direct permission. A recent lecture

to Ealing Civic Society attended by over 80 people generated great concern over the limited investment likely to be made by Crossrail

3.5d Arcadia EAL 3 DS 40(34-43) A current planning application for part of the site is to replace small units with access from a covered shopping mall with two large units. It does not solve the problem of back access to the remainder of the site but it is already designed so that such access can be provided. The quality of design is inadequate to justify demolition of this part of the Conservation area. We support SEC representations on this site.

3.5e Lamertons EAL5 DS40 (44-45) is unlikely to contribute through redevelopment even in the medium term. Because the capacity for increasing floorspace is limited by surrounding property development seems over optimistic. In its current mixed use the site contributes to the prosperity of the centre with shops rarely vacant. The interior parking area abuts the rear of the Bond Street property with rights of light limiting its development and it provides a useful central area car park.

3.6 An overarching issue for West Ealing is whether the sites form part of a wider strategy for West Ealing? Should there be a more holistic approach? Can the infrastructure cope with the new development?

3.6 a DS40(131) The opening of West Ealing Crossrail and the potential for redevelopment of 8 sites within the West Ealing part of the Metropolitan Centre will make major changes that the DS DPD does not seem designed to cope with. The CS identifies West Ealing as a retail centre for Value and Convenience Goods but does not specify the capacity of the sites identified. In the absence of a Characterisation Study (LP policy 7.4) capacity is difficult to estimate and local people undertook a study of buildings they thought should be locally listed. These are identified as local gems on ECS web site with the assistance of the Council and Mapping for Change London University. Agreement on local listing has not yet been published by the Council. We support EH proposals that 7C should set out a framework for identifying and appropriately protecting Locally Listed Buildings.

3.6b The West Ealing Centre Neighbourhood Forum is bringing together interested parties to produce a consistent and holistic approach for a Neighbourhood Plan to help future planning decisions. One important issue identified by local traders is the need to provide better short term parking for shoppers in order to sustain retail growth. Initiatives, such as shop front improvements are underway and the formation of a BID will assist in identifying and implementing business needs.

3.6c Redevelopment for retail at the ground floor with housing over it presupposes there will be demand for increased shopping. Internet shopping, competition from Ealing Broadway, Westfield at Shepherds Bush, Kew Retail Park and Kingston absorb the local demand for comparison shopping and there are already empty shops. It is not redevelopment that will make West Ealing more attractive to customers but:

- 1) more parking for shoppers;
- 2) improvement of access for servicing;
- 3) improvement to shop fronts using an agreed shop front guidance, and
- 4) ensuring access to upper floors and improving their state of repair.
- 5) the importance of conservation of heritage assets as a basis in which to inform future change (EH-4.7) Issues identified by the Neighbourhood Planning Forum

should be reflected in the DS doc. Management policies protect heritage buildings but they should be identified in this brief. It is unsound to promote retail redevelopment for which there is no demand and which will damage the local character

3.6d The amount of residential proposed exceeds the capacity of schools, POS and other community facilities. St Johns school is full and has to accommodate children from the Greenman Lane Estate when it is complete. Infrastructure Schedule identifies St Johns PS for ½ FE but the site is too small. At present the Council is trying to finance a 3 storey replacement with 2 floors of flats above. Extra playground is needed and in a closely developed area problems of overlooking arise. Designation of land for POS is needed adjacent to the undersized Dean Gardens. Drayton Green POS and School are accessible across the railway but only for able-bodied people without prams because Jacobs Ladder needs rebuilding. Essential infrastructure needed to accommodate both existing and proposed population.

3.7 Additional site specific matters i:

• **EAL7, EAL13, EAL18 - Are the design principles clear, justified and flexible enough to be effective? Will there be sufficient parking provision for the town centre?**

3.7a EAL7 Longfield Ave DS40(50-51) Redevelopment of the Perceval House car park should be considered in the context of parking for a metropolitan centre. The council is promoting cycle use but this is less popular in winter or for elderly and disabled people. Parking for Council staff is very restricted and it is even difficult for Blue badge visitors to Perceval House to obtain parking spaces The new Dickens Yard centre opposite will provide some parking but mainly for customers to the new retail units and residents of the flats..

3.7b Most of the design principles are clear and justified but because of the need to replace the parking, avoid cables to the substation and apply management policies the scheme does not seem viable. Redevelopment of the car park for residential use would lack any usable private amenity space because of overlooking from Perceval House windows. The site is elongated along the railway maximizing the impact of rail noise. Residential use is unsound on amenity grounds. Leisure and more car parking would provide alternative flexible uses with officers parking spaces available for leisure uses at the weekend.

3.7c Perceval House car parking needs increasing. At present staff and town centre workers park beyond the CPZs occupying the North side of Castlebar Hill, Queens Walk Castlebar Park and Kent Gardens causing congestion for buses to Greenford and access to Pitshanger Lane shops.

3.7d EAL 13 (former BT centre) DS40 (142-144) The design principles accept problems of conversion too easily. Height is limited by the local character and this controls viability of redevelopment for residential use. We supported 3-4 storeys in our representations but most of the surrounding development is 3 so that a 4th storey should be set back or placed in a mansard roof. Demolition is supported by DS47(1) but conversion to office or residential use is the most sustainable option for this site.

3.7e EAL18 DS40 (159) Parking provision is totally inadequate in West Ealing.

North of the Uxbridge Rd is a CPZ with a Council car park. A recent consultation ‘Traders Parking Request ‘ in response to” LBE/TfL 1c Plans-West Ealing High Street Road Changes” has identified approximately 40-60 potential places in 8 different street kerb locations south of the Uxbridge Rd. Off street parking is confined to a Council car park built on the west part of Dean Gardens, Maitland Yard and Sainsbury Multistorey. Retention of the car parking use at Maitland Yard could enable Dean Gardens to be increased in size from the Council Car Park

• **EAL1, EAL3, EAL4, EAL11, EAL14, EAL15 and EAL17 - Do the design principles take sufficient account of non designated heritage assets?**

Is it necessary to specify demolition /refurbishment /modification?

3.7f EAL1, EAL3, EAL4, DS 40 (32,34,40) Locally listed buildings should be recorded in the briefs and refurbishment encouraged. Where modification is appropriate this should be indicated. Making best use of heritage assets and existing buildings in a Conservation Area provides sustainable development required by NPPF and heritage led regeneration in London Plan policy 7.9 and respecting local character in policy 7.4. We do not agree with the Council’s balance on harming conservation areas and locally listed buildings to encourage economic development. This should only happen in exceptional circumstances where heritage led regeneration is not possible.

3.7g EAL11, EAL14, EAL15 and EAL17 DS 40(134,149, 151, 157) do not have recorded heritage assets but would benefit from refurbishment or modification rather than substantial redevelopment; EAL 11- because of difficulties of access and the small retail units with an interesting character that provide services for the locality, E14 because of the local listed buildings that the site adjoins and the need for car parking EAL15- because increasing the height would take light from the rear property. EAL17 has some scope for redevelopment.

• **EAL8, EAL10 - Are the allocated uses justified/too restrictive/viable?**

3.7h EAL8 DS40 (52) There is still concern about loss of the Police Station in Central Ealing because there is no suitable alternative agreed yet. The CS refers to development in conjunction with the Questors Theatre but this is not mentioned in the site brief. The Office quarter needs a quantum of office space to provide a pool of local office workers with contacts that help sustain the office market (Outer London Commission) which should improve with completion of Crossrail. Heathrow Connect has encouraged hotel development so that the Town Centre now has 3 hotels and 1 under construction in the office quarter so that further loss of offices might make the remainder less viable. A high rise residential development quarter replacing it would reduce the size of the town centre and separate West Ealing into a neighbourhood centre. Any further flexibility should relate to other Town Centre uses associated with the Questors to the rear of this site with the renown Ealing Film studios attracting related office uses.

.EAL10 93-113 Uxbridge Rd (by Culmington Rd) DS 40 (54-55)

3.7i Development has already started on part of this site. The allocations seem justified and viable. It will contribute to the quantum of office space that the Outer London Commission regarded as necessary to attract office users in Outer London. The impact of office uses on Mattock Lane CA houses and rear gardens are less onerous than the noise and light intrusion which can be 24 hour from residential

blocks. Reflection from materials adds to the problem of light intrusion. There is no justification for bringing the building line forward to reduce the depth of the Landscaped Corridor and reference to “roof terraces” should be deleted as the protection of residential amenity would be overridden by this strong recommendation. Otherwise you are raising false expectations.

• **EAL12 – Is residential use unsuitable because of the railway? DS40 (138-139)**

3.7j Crossrail will introduce further interchange traffic and there will be a need for bus access, cycle parking, disabled parking and vehicle drop off. None of these are available at present and land is needed to provide for them. Allowing residential use on the Waitrose corner has introduced a large number of flats with very poor amenity on a space that if available for a larger retail unit would have drawn more customers to the Metropolitan Centre. We are concerned there is no evidence about the quality of noise and amenity in Luminosity or one of the high blocks on the North side of the railway. Any space on this site that is not needed for access could replace existing retail.

• **EAL17 – Would low rental accommodation of value to the community be lost? DS40 (155-158)**

3.7k Yes but this applies to other sites in West Ealing that have been identified for redevelopment. The planning application for a new Mosque centre is an overdevelopment of the northern part of the site. Perhaps its site area could be increased if Chignell Place were redeveloped.

Area 3 – Greenford

3.8 An overarching issue for Greenford is whether the development sites will enhance and consolidate Greenford Town Centre.

3.8a Dependence on buses with no adequate bus stands limits customers to the town centre but it is a pleasant place to shop and has available car parking. Except for the recent monolithic housing over a large retail unit, the 1930s character has been fostered especially in the refurbishment of Greenford Hall which won an Ealing Civic Society award last year. The library, police station and voluntary museum add to the community facilities. The Red Lion PH should have been included as an additional site as a large corner development is proposed. If permitted there will be a loss of local character. An important leisure facility has already been demolished.

GRE 2 DS 40. We have concerns about the height on the “remainder of the site”. Variation should not be the 3-5storey proposed on the cleared Red Lion site opposite but relate well to the 2-3 storey buildings of the centre. Reference to the Brent Valley Park should be the Brent River Park.

3.9 Additional site specific matters include:

• **GRE1 DS 40(5) is there a conflict with the existing uses? Will the character be harmed by the allocation?**

Development of the existing use as a community facility for Greenford would benefit the town centre and avoid the impact that housing would have on the amenity of the park and housing along the frontage of Oldfield Lane South. With a requirement for a barrier zone next to the Park it is the equivalent of a backland site. A Multi Function Service centre would destroy the important amenity of the adjoining houses and park frontage and introduce an industrial type use near the children’s play space. A service

road for either this use or housing would impact on the Museum site which should be extended as a leisure facility, crèche or children's centre and car parking for visitors.

Area 4 - Hanwell

3.10 An overarching issue for Hanwell is whether the development sites would enhance and consolidate Hanwell Town Centre as envisaged by the CS. What happens to the existing uses that are occupying the development sites?

3.10a The CS proposes 3300-5600 gross retail and 109 mixed tenure flats. The consultation process identified a number of priorities for the town centre regeneration programme. These included the need to improve the retail offer in Hanwell, improvements to local green spaces, improved car parking provision, maintaining the distinct character of the town centre, improvements to the street scene and to develop a vision for Hanwell. The policies will be complemented by improved public transport with the arrival of Crossrail. The identified sites do nothing to achieve these priorities. Short term renovation would improve the street scene and maintain the character which would help to improve the retail offer. Redevelopment is not necessary to do this.

3.10b HAN3 DS40 69-71 is proposed for development in the short term. Wickes is an edge of town facility and use of the car park for ground floor retail with housing would introduce conflict between residential and the building supply warehouse on what is an employment site on the UDP proposals map. Wickes is vital to the local building industry which delivers and collects materials in a wide range of vehicles. Consultation identified the need for more parking in Hanwell not less. Cambridge Yard adjoining has been redeveloped for housing and local workshops are lost. Hanwell does need employment sites. Any further development should either extend this type of use or if redevelopment of all the site is envisaged, peripheral housing should follow the landscaped building line. Extending retail shops in this edge of town location is unsound because it is likely to increase the numbers of empty shops in Hanwell.

3.10c HAN1 DS40 61-65 We do not agree that heights are too low and out of scale with the surrounding context because the entrance to Hanwell is marked by the two churches. A medium term site in different ownerships is more likely to achieve enhancement of this part of the town centre with incremental improvements than allowing property to deteriorate awaiting long term redevelopment.

3.10d The Council thinks incremental improvements will happen anyway but investment in enhancement such as restoring the Rolls Royce wall painting is unlikely to take place without a reasonable life expectancy and trees need time to grow to maturity. It is unsound to promote redevelopment which is unlikely to occur when renovation and tree planting will achieve the requirements identified through consultation. Any redevelopment should increase the public area of the Lidl square not increase the height of buildings that overshadow it. Public WCs should be provided.

3.10e HAN2 DS40(67-68) is a long term site that redevelopment would improve. The Council does not seem to consider what happens to the existing businesses on the

sites but there is scope here for two separate redevelopments. Design Principles should include methods of making best use of the essential amenity space ensuring the privacy and amenity of adjoining local residents. Section 106 funding to provide to improve some distant park or the clock tower square should not be required in return for higher densities. 158-160 High St are worthy of renovation setting a precedent for the height, grain and scale of redevelopment and account should also need to be taken of Maudesville Cottages.

Area 5 – Southall

3.11 Overarching issues for Southall are whether the development sites will revitalise Southall Town Centre and whether sufficient land been identified for additional community buildings to meet local need, as envisaged by the CS. Should there be a greater provision of open space?

3.11 a The former gas works site (SOU5) when it is eventually redeveloped (2011-2031) will provide an alternative revitalized town centre with some community facilities, and large retail units. The planning application showed some open space, and a limited area for a school and health centre. The dominance of residential with high rise blocks will increase the demand for facilities on site and most open space will be in Hillingdon. Major works have not even started yet so that the long time lag means that for some time revitalization will depend on completion of Crossrail.

3.11b SOU3 Beaconsfield Rd/South Rd DS 40 (80-83) The restoration and viable use of Kings Hall should be supported by the increase in population that will result from SOU5 development. It is not just a frontage but an interesting group of buildings that need restoration, Community facilities will link both parts of the Town Centre if this group is renovated/redeveloped successfully. Provision of open space for education should not be reduced by residential proposals. Despite improvement in wording we are still concerned that a tall building may be justified when it would conflict with the landmark listed-building Kings Hall.

3.12 Additional site specific matters include:

**• SOU5 - How will the development be integrated into the town?
What will the effect of the proposed retail be on the town centre?
Are the design principles clear, justified and flexible enough to be effective
What measures have been considered to ensure that traffic can be accommodated in the area?
Has the funding for the additional infrastructure been taken into account and how does this affect the viability of the site?
Should reference be made to the character of the Grand Union Canal?
What is the position with Hillingdon Council about cross boundary issues?**

3.12a DS40 (90)The two parts of the Town Centre are quite separate and the access road, (detailed application) does not provide a satisfactory connection with South Rd and the existing town centre. GLA permitted it in Sept 2010. The report to Ealing Planning Committee supported the decision that the Council is minded to refuse subject to direction by the GLA and the GLA permission form P/2008/3981S with first 7 paras.& P29-34 (Reasons for permission) of report form **Appendix 3.2.**

3.12b We do not agree that outline planning application P/2008 /3981 provides an acceptable quantum of uses. The Justification in SOU5 says it provides the principle

of mixed uses but this does not mean that the detailed floorspaces are appropriate because the proposed layout is unacceptable. Some points are summarized below

3.12c Employment uses seem inadequate. With a PTAL of 0-3 a mix of employment uses is needed. Southall Crossrail station will link it to Heathrow and new road access to the Hayes bypass will provide for car journeys to work. Employment of future residents should not depend on Heathrow expansion when the future of the third runway is in doubt.

3.12d The large residential component of the site means that there will be many new customers. Young people in past consultations have said they want chain stores and supermarkets rather than the traditional shops of the existing town centre. Since 2008 financial problems have changed retail demand and the growth of on-line shopping may reduce this demand further so that community and leisure uses should be maximized to provide an attractive centre.

3.12e The Paddington branch of the Grand Union Canal is inadequately respected. It is a site of metropolitan importance for nature conservation and the bank should be landscaped to enhance this role not treated as amenity space for high rise flats where children's doorstep play will cause safety hazards.

3.12f Restoration levels control the areas that can be used for housing. Open space for residents depends on bridging the river and canal to the Minet Country Park. Over much of the site gas holders and the railway/aircraft noise create a poor external amenity. This could be improved by landscaping of more public open space to create buffer zones. The disadvantages of the site and how these could be overcome should be included in the brief. Public open space is preferable to private gardens because it is easier to monitor residual pollution.

• SOU6 – Are the allocated uses justified/too restrictive/viable? Are the design principles clear, justified and flexible enough to be effective? What is the status of the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework? How has it/will it influence the design principles?

3.12g DS40 (90) Southall East is divided into 3 components with no clue as to how a comprehensive and phased mixed use development can be achieved over the site as a whole. Heritage assets are not identified and we object strongly to the demolition of The Arches or Charles House. Delivering a substantial new neighbourhood implies there will be high rise flats. It is unsound to require the blocks at the focal point on the corner of South Rd and Merrick Rd. and adjacent to The Arches and Charles House. They would be out of keeping with the local character set by heritage assets important to Southall's architecture and history. Any high buildings should be set back from Merrick Rd.

3.12h Middlesex Business Centre mixes employment and residential uses raising amenity issues that are not dealt with in either Proposed Allocations or Design Principles. This seems too flexible. The improvement of the pedestrian bridge to take cycles, prams and wheelchairs should be part of any scheme of change improving

access to the town centre. Better bus services needed If this is recorded here it might be achieved by the time Crossrail is complete and planning applications are received. In the Atlas of proposed changes **PM 20/17** Middlesex Business Centre should be a locally significant industrial site so that local employment has priority. Other important sites are dealt with under Matter 4.2

Appendix 3.1 which covers planning Applications P/2012/3154 and 3155.

5426 deduct 667 for Inspectors questions



10
MARKET
PLACE

Shams
Fish Bar

AL SOLICITORS

9
MARKET
PLACE

PP/2012/3154

10/08/2012

**THE OAKS SHOPPING CENTRE AND ADJOINING CAR PARK IN
CHURCHFIELD ROAD HIGH STREET ACTON W3 6RE LONDON**

Partial refurbishment, demolition and redevelopment of shopping centre to provide 2 storey residential accommodation fronting Hooper?s Mews, 5 storey accommodation fronting Churchfield Road (retail on ground floor with residential above), 11 storey tower to the corner of Churchfield Road former burial ground and part 5, part 7 and part 8 storey residential accommodation with a basement level across the remainder of the site. New foodstore to basement level (4,606 sq m) together with 2 new retail units (91 sq m and 14 sq m), 7 refurbished units (2,425 sq m), 146 residential units (55 x 1 bed, 59 x 2 bed and 32 x 3 bed) and ancillary service yard, storage, plant, circulation space, amenity space and play space, provision of 227 car parking spaces, including 22 disabled spaces (193 retail and 34 residential), 262 cycle parking spaces (82 retail and 180 residential), with vehicular access from Churchfield Road and access to the residential units off Churchfield Road, Hooper?s Mews and former burial ground. Provision of two pedestrian links between High Street and former burial ground (previous applications for The Oaks site have been withdrawn) Conservation Area Consent Application also received (Ref PP/2012/3155) - Demolition of western wall to St Mary's Burial Ground
PENDING