

1 Pitshanger Lane

The PCA's view in a nutshell is that we are not opposed to new housing in the area, but we strongly consider that:

- the designs are contrary to both London's and Ealing's planning policy, both in terms of size and design;
- the development would lead to a vast overdevelopment of the site; and
- result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area and the amenities available both to the wider community and to residents in neighbouring properties

When making comments on the planning portal, you must give your name and address (if you live with others, all in the residence/house can object). (The entry gives a deadline but you can comment on the proposals past that – planning policy documents advise that LBE will take comments on the planning application past the deadline and will take all comments into account as far it can).

Emails for our MP and ward councillors are at the end of this note.

Make sure you use the “tick boxes” as these are used by planning officers to identify the major concerns people have with a proposal. We recommend you tick the following:

- close to adjoining properties
- conflict with local plan
- development too high
- general dislike
- inadequate parking provision
- inadequate public transport provisions
- information missing from plans (eg some of the documents are unloadable and others are missing)
- out of keeping with the area:
- over-development
- strain on existing community facilities

There is then a box for you to type up to 5000 words. Note that you should not copy others' comments or the advice below but you are free to adapt both. We suggest you focus on these, in particular the first three:

- Design/Layout: we think the design is contrary to the London Plan – para 3.3.8 that says: “buildings should be of high quality and enhance, activate and appropriately frame the public realm. Their massing, scale and layout should help make public spaces coherent and should complement the existing streetscape and surrounding area. The information in the community engagement document and comments on social media shows that people feel the proposals for 1 Pitshanger Lane would not make public spaces coherent and not complement the existing streetscape.
- Tall Buildings: This is classified as a tall building. The London Plan and Ealing's Development Plan¹ enables tall buildings to be developed in identified development sites and where such sites in Ealing are in areas of good public transport. Pitshanger is not defined as a town centre hub by Ealing Council because it has no tube or overground stations nearby. Nor is it designated as a development area by the Council. Therefore it is outside planning policy.
- Densities, small number of family homes and affordable housing:

¹ Policy D of the London Plan says: “Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans.” Ealing's policy is support higher densities in areas of *good public transport* and that “the council will take into account primarily the quality of the design, the location of the site and the need to provide a suitable housing mix.... Tall buildings may be suitable in specified sites within Acton, Ealing and Southall town centres, gateways to Park Royal and identified development sites only.

- proposed are given as 647 hr/ha and 238 u/ha with the site's PTAL (public transport accessibility measure) currently 2 and stated to be going to 3 later (PTAL of 1 is defined as poor so 2 is pretty poor). Also the housing densities are significantly in excess of guidelines for an urban area let alone a suburban one like Pitshanger, compounding overcrowding; of sixty apartments (already too many on that site see above), affordable housing provision in the scheme is 35%, (by habitable room) with a 60/40 split between London Affordable Rent and Intermediate tenure, (by habitable room). The absolute numbers are 11 (LAR) and 9 (IT). The 1 Pitshanger Lane website says this "The proposals are for 60 much needed new homes on a brownfield site with 35% affordable housing, contributing to solving Ealing's housing crisis where too many of our neighbours can't afford a place to live or are living in unsuitable or over-crowded conditions." If the developers were truly committed to this, surely that they would have suggested a far greater level of affordable housing, rather than do the bare minimum and certainly have done more to support key workers who work here but can't afford to live near their place of work.
- Concern about the reduction of the services that used to be provided by Kent Lodge: Ealing's target is to provide 1000 additional specialised older persons units (the 5th highest target of the 33 London Boroughs) – how can it therefore contemplate the closure of Kent Lodge at this stage?
- Daylight/sunlight: "A building of this size would undoubtedly cast shadow on its immediate neighbours and also have implications for privacy. The sunlight/daylight report provided for planning says the surrounding area is predominately residential in nature and that the sunlight/daylight aspects are noticeable but not unacceptable. But it quotes precedents for this, using examples from inner London urban areas, not a suburb in Ealing.
- Implications for local services in particular the local primary school:
 - Parking: in line with LBE's policy, no car parking spaces are being provided (other than three disabled parking spaces) and many bike racks. As always, there is the statement that this will deter people accordingly. The concern is that traffic gets pushed onto Pitshanger Lane, Woodbury Park Road and Bellevue and the north side of Scotch Common. This may have implications for the staff of North Ealing Primary School. There is CPZ (reference TT) but residents of 1 Pitshanger Lane will not be able to park in it. We recommend that there must be a better parking management plan, given the patchwork of parking provision in the immediate area.
 - Intake: the apartment block is so close to the school that it is bound to have implications for school admissions. This has not been given any consideration at all.
 - Utilities: Thames Water have been attending burst drains in the Pitshanger area on and off for the past 15 years (of which many have been at the junction of Castlebar Park and Pitshanger Lane – close to the proposed development).

Please ask for this project to be considered by the Community Review Panel. It's being established to play an independent, advisory role in Ealing's planning work, discussing issues including housing, transport, public and green spaces, and the local environment. Pitshanger supports new housing wherever possible but only when it won't be detrimental to those who live and work in the area.

When you have completed your comments, we suggest you let our MP and local ward councillors now. If you want, make a note of the boxes you ticked and send those and a copy of your specific and include them in the email. Emails are:

james.murray.mp@parliament.uk; burkeL@ealing.gov.uk; AnjumS@ealing.gov.uk; LusuardiC@ealing.gov.uk;

The PCA will be keeping a close eye on the portal entry – Kenmure Mansions generated over 1400 objections thanks to those who live and work here – let's see if we can get more on this one.

