Perceval House decision deferred! What happens now?

At last Wednesday's planning committee (17th Feb) to everyone's surprise, after two hours of heated debate, committee members asked for the application to be deferred. At that point the Chairman stopped any further discussion.

So what happens now?

Well, being deferred doesn't mean the plans have gone away - just they've been deferred to a future meeting. Nothing has yet been announced but we will notify you when we hear anything. We'd hate to think the Council would call a quick meeting and try and push this hugely controversial development through before the GLA elections stop this – we'd like to think they respect the views of all you who have objected and the need for transparency.

And what had been discussed before the decision was deferred?

The overriding concerns raised by many of the planning committee leading to the deferment, was the low percentage of genuinely affordable housing and that out of 477 flats, only SEVEN would have 3-bedrooms. The council planning officers insisted that a 2 bedroom dwelling was 'compliant' as an adequate family home, but this didn't sit well with some of the planning committee.

During the meeting both Rupa Huq MP and Cllr Seema Kumar gave impassioned speeches against the application making several important points, including the inappropriateness of the height and scale of the scheme, and echoing many of the other issues raised by many of the planning committee – including affordability, lack of play space /amenity (play space on the roof is not an acceptable option!), lack of family housing, fire safety, homes only meeting the minimum space standards plus significant harm to Longfield House and Apsley House re sunlight and daylight impacts.

They never got around to discussing the excessive height of the tower, the massive increase in population density and the pressure that would put onto local services, nor the adverse impact on the Town Hall and the surrounding conservation areas.

Covid19 was cited as a major concern by some of the planning committee, only to be told by the Chair (Cllr Shital Manro) that Covid is not a planning issue. *Isn't it about time to update this way of thinking? Planning laws were born out of health concerns so it is only right that health and well-being should be on the agenda for the future social well-being for all.*

What can we do to stop this scheme when it comes back to the planning committee?

You can still object to the scheme on the Council website - **click here.**

There are plenty of good reasons for objecting, which are listed in the table below or on the STT Ealing website - **click here**

To watch a video of the Planning Committee – **click here.**

Many residents associations have made a joint complaint to Ealing Council regarding the way the Perceval House application was handled by the Planning Committee. To read it, **click here.**

With the GLA elections scheduled in May, there will be lots of opportunities for local people to raise their concerns with any candidates wanting your vote, and to for vote for candidates who share our views that these tower block schemes are inappropriate in Ealing.

Thank you for supporting STT.

Stop The Towers

www.stopthetowers.org

STOP THE TOWERS

Perceval House Redevelopment

Weighing the Balance

Planning Officer's list of benefits	Top 12 disbenefits
477 new dwellings, new civic offices, customer services, relocated library	Permanent damage to Ealing's Heritage and transformation of the Town Centre's character
50% affordable housing (by habitable room)	Establishing a precedent for a cluster of overbearing and intrusive tall buildings
Mix of London Affordable Rent (LAR) and Discount Market Rent (DMR) held in perpetuity	Fails to meet the GLA's affordable housing requirements, only 14.7% are genuinely affordable LAR
Accessible and adaptable homes	Ealing needs more family homes rather than 1 and 2 bed flats
Replace civic offices -energy efficient	Release of embodied carbon through demolition of Perceval house is unnecessary and irresponsible
New business floorspace	Tall buildings are not carbon efficient
Commercial/retail units	Development will deprive hundreds of homes of natural light
New jobs in construction	Inadequate amenity and play space
Car-free so better air quality	Uxbridge Rd alignment harms the Local Plan's 'Boulevard concept'
New public spaces, high quality design, positively enhancing the landmark, heritage Town Hall	Increase in traffic drawn down residential streets
Improved public accessibility by bike or foot	Inadequate access for people with restricted mobility
Can see the Town Hall from the library windows	No demand for more commercial units. The library could make use of DY's empty space

Click here to download the comparison of benefits vs negatives

