

Examiners' Issues and questions:

Matter 1: Procedural and Legal Requirements

Issue: Whether the Council has complied with the relevant procedural and legal requirements.

Plan Preparation and Scope. Questions 1 to 6

EM response

As set out in EM Representations 1 and 15, Ealing Matters does not think that the Council has complied with the required procedural and legal requirements in the preparation of the plan. The LDS is not systematically updated nor is its progress reported on, the provisions of the unduly wordy SCI have not been observed, the Regulation 18 consultation which is supposed to consult on the scope of the plan was only undertaken after the plan was, to all intents and purposes written. Key documents which ought to feed into the Plan including reviews of the 2012 plan, AMRs, S106 reports, brownfield land registers remain unavailable despite frequent requests for them by the Ealing community.

The scope of the Plan and how it relates to other made plans (including neighbourhood plans) is unacceptably unclear. The Plan's structure is not at all logical or easy to follow and there is considerable and unnecessary duplication of the Council's higher level aspirations. The Plan period is unclear and seemingly inconsistent.

EM recommends that the Plan's format and presentation should more closely resemble LB Wandsworth's recently adopted plan which is very much easier to use.

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA). Questions 7-14

EM response

While they appear on the Regulation 18 website, the IIA scoping study and first draft of the IIA were not widely publicised and no questions regarding them appeared in the online response page. It seems hard to imagine these studies can have formed or fed into new Plan which differs little in scope from the Reg 18 Plan published alongside the IIA.

The final IIA report dated February 2024 and published along with the rest of the Regulation 19 documents was also unpublicised. People simply were unaware of it amongst all the other consultation documents. This makes it unlikely that many substantial comments from the Ealing community – including from Ealing Matters - would have been made on it.

Examination of the February 2024 IIA shows that it pays insufficient attention to the Allies and Morrison's evidence at EB42 and EB43 and its assessments undervalue the borough's historic environment and established character and townscape. It fails too to respond adequately to the requirements to mitigate against and adapt to the challenges of climate change.

Other Matters. Question 26.

EM response

As set out in EM Representation 2, EM does not believe the Plan adequately responds to the challenges of climate change. The Plan ignores the clear evidence as to the priority that should be paid to repurposing existing buildings over against redevelopment, especially when the new developments are tall buildings with their far greater embodied carbon implications.