



Quod

---

# **Matter 5: Economic Development**

Affordable Workspace

Ealing Local Plan

Hearing Statement  
prepared by Quod

---

MAY 2025

# Matter 5: Economic Development

---

Issue [Focus – Policies SP4, E3, E4, E6] – Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to economic development.

*Draft Policy E3: Affordable Workspace London Plan (local variation)*

**Q6.e Is the policy consistent with Paragraph 85 of the NPPF in terms of helping to create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt and allowing the area to build on its strengths, counter weaknesses, and address future challenges?**

and

**Q6.l are any other modifications needed to Policy E3 for soundness?**

- 1.1 Stantec / Quod previously submitted representations in response to the Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation (provided at Appendix A). These representations highlighted concerns that the policy is not considered to be 'justified' or 'effective' – and therefore is not sound – as required by NPPF paragraph 36(b) and (c) (i.e. it is not 'consistent with national policy'), and is also not conducive to a business environment that encourages investment, expansion and adaption (i.e. it is not 'positively prepared'). As such, it fails all four tests of soundness.
- 1.2 Furthermore, it is inconsistent with the emerging position on the new London Plan which seeks to exclude B2/B8 from affordable workspace requirements altogether, and as such would be premature to bring forward in its current guise.
- 1.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:
  - There is no justification for the 80% discount over 15 years;
  - It does not identify the intended beneficiaries or their space / location requirements, nor does it identify a strategy (without which such a large discount would present an unfair advantage to others);
  - Industrial sites are not well suited to deliver affordable workspace due to difficulties in subdividing large warehouse and external spaces, whereas office / shared workspaces are better suited (more conducive to small units and are typically better-located);
  - Economic benefits of industrial / logistics development (job creation, training opportunities, economic growth) outweigh the feasibility of providing affordable workspace;
  - Viability concerns, primarily in relation to: approach to land value; understated build costs; and a failure to reflect costs associated with intensification, concluding that the combination of additional policy requirements will have the unintended consequence of reducing development, significantly disincentivising intensification/modernisation/decarbonisation which the plan seeks to encourage, and

therefore put at risk the Council's good growth objectives and the benefits that new development will bring.

- 1.4 It was therefore recommended that the policy was revised in a way that excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8 from the affordable workspace obligation (as per the emerging London Plan position).

- 1.5 LBE responded as follows:

*"The discount rate is addressed in evidence as necessary to provide space that meets affordable needs, and has been subject to whole plan viability assessment."*

And:

*"There is identified need for affordable industrial space, which is why the benchmark for industrial uses is set in the policy. Where there are site specific viability or suitability considerations these should be considered on their merits through the development management process."*

- 1.6 The issues submitted in the Reg 19 Representations still stand (provided at Appendix 1); the BNPP viability study is dated December 2023 and necessarily draws on evidence prior to this date. Development viability is challenging, and has continued to worsen, meaning the 2023 study is now out of date. The primary concern, therefore, is that viability is not appropriately addressed at plan making stage, ensuring policies are realistic and that the total cumulative cost of these will not undermine deliverability of the plan. This will cause viability to be required at decision taking stage.
- 1.7 Stantec / Quod previously submitted representations in response to the Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation (provided at Appendix A). These representations highlighted concerns that the policy is not considered to be 'justified' or 'effective' – and therefore is not sound – as required by NPPF paragraph 36(b) and (c) (i.e. it is not 'consistent with national policy'), and is also not conducive to a business environment that encourages investment, expansion and adaption (i.e. it is not 'positively prepared'). As such, it fails all four tests of soundness.
- 1.8 Furthermore, it is inconsistent with the emerging position on the new London Plan which seeks to exclude B2/B8 from affordable workspace requirements altogether, and as such would be premature to bring forward in its current guise.
- 1.9 **We propose the policy excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8 from the affordable workspace obligation.**



## Appendix A

### Reg 19 Representations

---



## **Ealing Local Plan Regulation 19 (Submission Draft)**

Representation made on behalf of **SEGRO plc**



Project Ref: 33313383800/A5/AV/AL/LG | Rev: AA | Date: April 2024

---

Registered Office: Buckingham Court Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 1JU  
Office Address: 50/60 Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2JH T: +44 (0)1223 882 000 E: [cambridge.uk@stantec.com](mailto:cambridge.uk@stantec.com)

## Document Control Sheet

**Project Name:**

**Project Ref:** 33313383800 / A5 / AV / AL / LG

**Report Title:** Local Plan Regulation 19 Representation

**Doc Ref:** 01/02

**Date:** April 2024

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Anett Vild	Planner		Mar 24
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Alex Lloyd	Associate Planner		Mar 24
<b>Approved by:</b>	Lyndon Gill	Planning Director		Apr 24
<b>For and on behalf of Stantec UK Limited</b>				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved

This report has been prepared by Stantec UK Limited ('Stantec') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which Stantec was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). Stantec accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>National Planning Policy Framework (2023).....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Strategic Policies.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	General Comments .....	4
3.2	Draft Policy SP1 A Vision for Ealing.....	4
3.3	Draft Policy SP2.2 Climate Action .....	4
3.4	Draft Policy SP4: Creating good jobs and growth .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Town Plans.....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	General Comments .....	9
4.2	Acton Town Centre.....	9
4.3	Greenford Town Centre.....	9
4.4	Perivale Town Centre .....	11
	Draft Policy P1 Perivale Spatial Strategy .....	11
	Draft Policy P4 Perivale Station and Environs .....	12
	Draft Policy P5 Perivale Industrial Estate .....	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Development Management Policies .....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	General Comments on the Development Management Policies .....	13
5.2	Draft Policy DAA: Design and Amenity (local policy) .....	13
5.3	Draft Policy D9: Tall Buildings London Plan (local variation) .....	13
5.4	Draft Policy E3: Affordable Workspace London Plan (local variation) .....	14
5.5	Draft Policy E4: Land for Industry, Logistics and Services to Support London's Economic Function (local variation) .....	15
5.6	Draft Policy E6: Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) (local variation) .....	15
5.7	Draft Policy G5: Urban Greening (local variation) .....	16
5.8	Draft Policy G6: Biodiversity and Access to Nature London Plan (local variation) .....	17
5.9	Draft Policy S5: Sports and Recreation Facilities (local variation) .....	17
5.10	Draft Policy OEP: Operational Energy Performance (local policy) .....	18
5.11	Draft Policy ECP: Embodied Carbon (local policy) .....	18
5.12	Draft Policy WLC: Whole Life Cycle Carbon Approach (local policy) .....	19
5.13	Carbon Emission of Data Centre.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.14	Draft Policy FLP: Funding – The Local Plan (local policy) .....	20
<b>6</b>	<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>21</b>

## Figures

No table of figures entries found.

## Tables

No table of figures entries found.

## Appendices

No table of contents entries found.

DRAFT



DRAFT  
This page is intentionally blank

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Stantec is instructed by SEGRO plc ('SEGRO' hereafter) to prepare a representation to the Ealing Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation ('the Local Plan'), including relevant documents within the evidence base.
- 1.1.2 This representation follows the structure and order of the Local Plan and comments on relevant policies.
- 1.1.3 Stantec previously submitted representations on behalf of SEGRO in response to the Regulation 18 consultation. These representations build on our initial response and should be read alongside the Regulation 18 representations.
- 1.1.4 SEGRO has also submitted representations in response to the local CIL Charging Schedule. Again, we ask that these Regulation 19 representations are considered alongside SEGRO's comments on local CIL, particular in relation to draft Policy FLP Funding.
- 1.1.5 The major estates that SEGRO has assets in that are covered by the Ealing Local Plan are:
- SEGRO Park Perivale
  - SEGRO Park Greenford Central
  - SEGRO Park Greenford
  - SEGRO Centre Greenford North
  - SEGRO Park Fairway Drive (Greenford)
  - SEGRO Park Acton
- 1.1.6 All of SEGRO's sites are identified within the adopted Development Plan as Strategic Industrial Locations ('SILs'), with the exception of Acton Park (The Vale), which is instead designated as a Locally Significant Industrial Site ('LSIS'). These designations highlight the importance of these sites in meeting employment needs within Ealing. SEGRO supports the continued recognition of these designations through the new Local Plan.
- 1.1.7 SEGRO is a UK Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT), listed on the London Stock Exchange and Euronext Paris, and is a leading owner, manager and developer of modern warehouses and industrial property. It owns or manages 9.7 million square metres of space (104 million square feet) serving customers from a wide range of industry sectors. Its properties are located in and around major cities and at key transportation hubs in the UK and in seven other European countries.
- 1.1.8 For over 100 years SEGRO has been creating the space that enables extraordinary things to happen. From modern big box warehouses, used primarily for regional, national and international distribution hubs, to urban warehousing located close to major population centres and business districts, it provides high-quality assets that allow its customers to thrive. A commitment to be a force for societal and environmental good is integral to SEGRO's purpose and strategy. Its 'Responsible SEGRO' framework focuses on three long-term priorities where the company believes it can make the greatest impact: Championing Low-Carbon Growth, Investing in Local Communities and Environments and Nurturing Talent.

- 1.1.9 Within Ealing, SEGRO estates accommodates approximately 200 different businesses across 30 sectors.
- 1.1.10 SEGRO is seeking to continue to maximise employment opportunities on their sites in order to improve site efficiency, improve sustainability, retain existing customers and attract additional businesses to the area, thereby supporting the local economy and job generation.
- 1.1.11 SEGRO welcomes the opportunity to provide a response to the Local Plan consultation and looks forward to engaging with the Council further in respect of employment matters within Ealing.

DRAFT

## 2 National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

2.1.1 Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') sets out the tests which Local Plans are assessed against at examination.

2.1.2 Plans are 'sound' if they are:

*'35(a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs 19 ; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;*

*35(b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*

*35(c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*

*35(d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.'*

2.1.3 As set out in paragraph 36 of the NPPF, the tests of soundness are now applied to non-strategic policies in a proportionate way, taking into account the extent to which they are consistent with relevant strategic policies for the area.

2.1.4 Throughout these representations, we set out whether we consider each policy complies with the tests of soundness as set out above.

## 3 Strategic Policies

### 3.1 General Comments

- 3.1.1 As per the Regulation 18 consultation response, this section comments on key spatial strategies relevant to SEGRO.

### 3.2 Draft Policy SP1 A Vision for Ealing

- 3.2.1 SEGRO supports the Council's vision for Ealing which, amongst other things, seeks to support growth to create jobs for all. In particular, SEGRO supports Policy SP1 which states '*Ealing will grow and diversify its business space, and further strengthen the role of its industrial areas.*'
- 3.2.2 Investing in modern, operationally flexible, high-capacity facilities provides a strong foundation for business to improve efficiency and productivity on the same amount of land. Investing in infrastructure like fibre, power and transport also drives investment in buildings and productivity.
- 3.2.3 The starting point for Local Plan making should therefore be to encourage investment in industrial buildings and infrastructure, to grow and diversify the Borough's business space. Without the focus on need for investment within Draft Policy SP1, we consider this policy contrary to NPPF paragraphs 86(c) and 35(d). We therefore propose that Draft Policy SP1 is amended to include this additional sentence:

'SP1(b):

*Ealing will become the engine of West London's new economy managed to provide equitable access to jobs that provide decent living incomes that can support genuinely affordable homes for all. We want growth in Ealing to be inclusive so that people can both contribute to and benefit from growth. Ealing will grow and diversify its business space, and further strengthen the role of its industrial areas. Such growth will be supported by further investment within the Borough.*

### 3.3 Draft Policy SP2.2 Climate Action

- 3.3.1 SEGRO support points A-E of Sub-Policy SP 2.2 ('Climate Action'), which presents five priorities in tackling climate change, including Point B which supports '*making the best use of land*'.
- 3.3.2 Redeveloping existing employment sites would serve to support other aspects of draft Policy SP2.2, such as Point (d) '*supporting the delivery of Net Zero Carbon buildings*' and Point (f) '*building resilience and adapting to a changing environments*', through the provision of modernised developments which are more energy efficient.
- 3.3.3 However, clarification is required on what '*making the best use of land*' means in practice. In relation to industrial provision, '*making the best use of land*' generally translates to '*intensification*'. However, the current definition of industrial intensification is too narrow. It is leading to a misunderstanding of the drivers of productivity which fails to make more effective use of industrial land. From a commercial industrial perspective, making the most efficient use of land involves modernising, investing, creating resilience, sustainability and improving quality. When referencing '*making the best use of land*' the Local Plan should not solely rely on quantum of floorspace or development footprint. Reference needs to be made to modernised floorspace, increased building heights, infrastructure investment, resilience, sustainability, quality and operational flexibility (24/7 use). All of these serve to maximise productivity of Industrial land, which in turn creates jobs and attracts investment.

3.3.4 Recognition also needs to be given to the importance of car parking and service yards, the latter of which is a core ingredient of efficient industrial design. By better referencing the elements we set out above throughout the Local Plan, the draft policies would support employment opportunities and create the confidence for investment within the Borough to enhance the existing industrial offer, create high quality employment floorspace and attract productive modern businesses.

3.3.5 To ensure this policy is effective, as per NPPF paragraph 35(c), Policy SP2.2(b) should be updated to state:

*'Making the best use of land, including modernised floorspace, increased building heights, infrastructure investment, resilience, sustainability, quality and operational flexibility (24/7 use), and investing in sustainable connectivity by:...'*

3.3.6 In relation to SP2.2(g)(iii), whilst supportive of urban greening, SEGRO requests that the policy is developed in accordance with London Plan standards (London Plan Policy G5), which recommends a target score of 0.4 for developments that are predominately residential, and a target score of 0.3 for predominately commercial development (excluding B2 and B8 uses). The London Plan is an integral part of the statutory development plan for the borough of Ealing. The Local Plan must be in general conformity, any basis for departure from this would be contrary to the NPPF, unless it is very clearly justified and demonstrated to be viable.

3.3.7 Part (g)(iii) also makes reference to maximising opportunities for a net gain biodiversity. Recent changes to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) emphasise that Local Plans should not stipulate BNG levels exceed the minimum 10% unless adequately justified.

3.3.8 Accordingly, to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 35(d), Part (g) (iii) should be updated to state:

*'Maximising opportunities for urban greening, in accordance with the London Plan targets and a net gain in biodiversity, in accordance with national requirements.'*

3.3.9 In relation to Part (h), we request that the draft Air Quality policy wording is drafted in full accordance with London Plan Policy SI 1 'Improving Air Quality', which requires the following:

***"Part 2***

- a. Proposals must be at least Air Quality Neutral
- b. Development proposals should use design solutions to prevent or minimise increased exposure to existing air pollution and make provision to address local problems of air quality in preference to post-design or retro-fitted mitigation measures
- c. Major development proposals must be submitted with an Air Quality Assessment. Air quality assessments should show how the development will meet the requirements of B1
- d. Development proposals in Air Quality Focus Areas or that are likely to be used by large numbers of people particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, such as children or older people should demonstrate that design measures have been used to minimise exposure...."

3.3.10 To ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 35(d) 'consistent with national policy', Part (h) should be updated to state:

*'Ensuring new developments do not lead to a further deterioration of existing air quality, contributing to improved air quality where possible, and avoiding exposure to unacceptable*

*levels of poor air quality, or incorporating design solutions to minimise increased exposure, in accordance with the London Plan targets.'*

### 3.4 Draft Policy SP4: Creating good jobs and growth

- 3.4.1 SEGRO supports Part (c) of Policy SP 4.1 which refers to making 'the most efficient use of land on development sites ... which will contribute to more sustainable patterns of development and land uses'.
- 3.4.2 Part (g) (iii) of SP 4.1 refers to '*Creating a clear framework for future negotiations on planning obligations, including developer contributions that will include a new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)*'. While SEGRO supports the provision of clarity in respect of developer contributions, the Council must ensure its priorities and vision for the Borough are deliverable. While the Local Plan relies on the re-development and intensification of existing industrial floorspace, the Viability Study demonstrates that industrial and warehouse uses cannot afford to pay the proposed CIL rate when reasonable assumptions are made about existing use value. Additional policy obligations proposed in the Draft Local Plan worsen this position. The proposed rate is also significantly above rates set by neighbouring authorities. Please find set out below examples of other authority charge rates for industrial uses:
- a. Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation - £35 per sqm
  - b. London Borough of Brent - £0 per sqm
  - c. London Borough of Hounslow - £20 per sqm
  - d. London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham - £0 per sqm
  - e. London Borough of Harrow - £0 per sqm
- 3.4.3 This sets Ealing's Industrial locations at a competitive disadvantage, that would directly contradict other policies that seek investment and intensification. It is therefore not appropriate to charge a CIL rate for industrial and warehouse development, including Use Classes B2 and B8, and relevant parts of E Class, (E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes and E(g)(iii) Industrial processes). These Use Classes should be removed from the '*all other uses*' category and be set at a zero rate. This would ensure the emerging Local Plan was in accordance with PPG Paragraph 010 Reference ID: 25-010-20190901 which states: '*When deciding the levy rates, an authority must strike an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments*'. Removing these Use Classes from the '*all other uses*' category within the CIL Charging Schedule, would ensure policy is 'effective' and 'justified', in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 35(b) and 35(c). Please refer to SEGRO's representations contained at **Appendix 1** for further information.
- 3.4.4 Policy SP4.2 (a) refers to '*maintaining the existing supply of industrial land on designated and undesignated sites and adding to this where possible*'. The Council must adopt a pragmatic approach to redevelopment of existing industrial sites, that is not simply focused on a quantitative approach of increasing floorspace. It needs to also account for qualitative improvements to operations, and support planning applications that make solely qualitative improvements, if these would improve productivity of the Estate. The Council's policies should instead strive to achieve modernised floorspace, where appropriate, support and recognise the contribution that additional building height can create for businesses, support infrastructure investment, resilience, enhance building and operational sustainability, and improve the quality of buildings and estates and support operational flexibility (24/7 use). For example, additional height may not 'create floorspace' but it can create additional volume, essential for a business whose principal operation is storage and distribution. Further, the function of a service yard is



fundamental to minimising vehicle movements in lower/reverse gear and enabling faster turnaround of vehicles – which in turn increase productivity. This must equally be recognised, as protecting and enabling existing businesses to grow is just as important as creating new space for new businesses. To ensure this policy is ‘effective’, as per NPPF paragraph 35(c), Policy SP4.2(a) should be updated to state:

*‘Maintaining the existing supply of industrial land on designated and undesignated sites adding to this where possible, without compromising business operations and adaptability of buildings for future use. Making these areas more resilient through investment in modernised buildings, infrastructure, sustainability and operational flexibility (24/7 use).’*

3.4.5 Policy SP4.2 Parts (b) seeks to manage SILs exclusively for ‘conforming uses’. SEGRO agrees with this approach.

3.4.6 Policy SP4.2 Part (b) also makes reference to necessary consolidation of SIL sites through the plan making process only. London Plan Policy E5 ‘Strategic Industrial Locations’ states that SILS should be managed proactively through a plan led process to sustain them as London’s largest concentration of industrial, logistics and related capacity for uses that support the functioning of London’s economy. The ‘West London Employment Land Review’ (2022), states that the industrial market in Ealing is undersupplied due to both strong demand and declining levels of supply. The resulting planning policy response to improve the market performance should be to seek to prevent future losses of stock and/or increase supply (para 4.26). SEGRO objects to the principle of consolidating SILS, particularly given the evidence demonstrates the Borough cannot afford to lose any further industrial space. Currently, this draft policy is unjustified and contrary to the Local Plan evidence base. Reference to consolidation should be deleted from Policy SP4.2(b), to ensure a ‘justified’ policy in compliance with NPPF paragraph 35(b).

3.4.7 Part (c) of SP4.2 states LSIS sites will be brought forward through plan-led comprehensive masterplans (mixed intensification), in accordance with the London Plan. Whilst SEGRO has no objection to the ‘mixed use’ reference in principle, this cannot be to the detriment of industrial uses and businesses within the LSIS itself or on surrounding sites. As set out in part (d) of London Plan Policy E7 ‘Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution’, co-locating industrial and residential uses in proximity to one another on SILs or LSISs cannot compromise the efficient function, access, service arrangements and days/hours of operation that many industrial businesses rely upon on a 24/7 basis. To ensure compliance with the London Plan and NPPF paragraph 35(d), this policy should be updated as follows:

*‘Setting out a specific strategy for Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) in line with the London Plan and actively by means of plan-led comprehensive masterplans undertaking mixed intensification, where operational functionality of surrounding industrial units is not comprised’.*

3.4.8 Policy SP4.2 Part (g) refers to the need for ‘affordable workspace’. Draft Policy E3 expands on this and is commented on later in these representations. However, in summary, SEGRO has raised a number of concerns relating to the lack of justification for the unprecedented discount rate and duration (80% over 15 years), the unsuitability of industrial sites to provide affordable workspace due to their scale and internal configuration, viability and other economic benefits industrial and logistic sites can deliver. We ask that policy excludes industrial (E (g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8) from the affordable workspace obligation, to ensure compliance with NPPF 35(b). This should be reflected throughout the draft Local Plan. Please refer to our comments on draft Policy E3 for further justification.

3.4.9 SP4.2 Part(g) also refers to the need to enable more small and medium sized businesses to start up. Business requirements can only be market driven and based on need. With industrial space at such a premium in Ealing (as referenced by the West London Employment Land Review) it is essential that land is able to deliver for expanding and larger businesses. If not,



they will re-locate outside of London having the opposite effect on goals to enhance sustainability and create/support jobs. specific requirement for small/ medium sized units should not be stipulated in local policy. Individual smaller sites will be appropriate for smaller and medium sized businesses, and each site should be assessed on its own merits and consideration given to modern business needs, given that only a small number of sites within London can actually meet the requirements of growing and larger employers. To ensure an 'effective' policy as per NPPF 35(c), SP4.2(g) should be amended as follows:

*'Delivering affordable workspace on appropriate sites, where this also serves a broader social or economic purpose and to enable more small and medium sized businesses to start up.'*

- 3.4.10 SEGRO continues to support the identification of Northolt, Greenford and Perivale as areas for growth in the size and range of employment typologies, as set out in SP4.2 Part (e).
- 3.4.11 Whilst Part 8 of 'Strategic Place Interventions' (page 90) supports maintaining and intensifying SILs and LSIS, this principle should be enshrined in policy, as per our comments on SP4.1 Whilst supportive of '*maintaining and intensification*', again we must express the need to apply this principle pragmatically, where applicants can demonstrate efficiencies within planning applications that are both quantitative and qualitative, on a site by site basis. The emphasis should not purely be on intensification. Redevelopment should focus on modernised floorspace, operational efficiency of the entire sites (including service yards); building height, infrastructure investment, resilience, sustainability, quality and operational flexibility (24/7 use). This should be appropriately reflected in Part (c) of Policy SP 4.1. To ensure 'effectiveness', paragraph 3.69 should be updated as per comments below to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 35(c):

*'The spatial strategy will reinforce and intensify, where feasible, existing Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) within the borough and explore options to improve industrial land and intensify employment, where appropriate.'*

## 4 Town Plans

### 4.1 General Comments

- 4.1.1 As per the Regulation 18 consultation response, this section comments on the key town centre chapters, relevant to SEGRO's landholdings within the London Borough of Ealing.

### 4.2 Acton Town Centre

#### Policy A1 Acton Spatial Strategy

- 4.2.1 SEGRO supports the proposed spatial strategy for Acton set out within Policy A.1. including the recognition that '*growth will be concentrated around existing transport interchanges*', including Acton Central (A1.(c)).
- 4.2.2 SEGRO welcomes Policy A.1 (m)(i), which supports development and intensification of industrial and commercial uses at Local Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) at The Vale and South Acton on the basis of an agreed masterplan with Ealing Council. However, the term '*intensification*' should be clearly defined as explained in our response to strategic policies in Chapter 2. It must allow planning applications to be determined positively where they can demonstrate qualitative improvements to an estate's efficiency, sustainability and adaptability, rather than a blunt focus on achieving a net increase in floorspace which may not result in usable/ attractive space for modern business. As previously set out, policy should reference modernised floorspace, enhanced state efficiency, increased building heights, infrastructure investment, enhancing resilience, improving sustainability, quality and operational flexibility (on a 24/7 basis) as important factors in '*intensification*'.
- 4.2.3 Recognising the importance of yards as a core ingredient of efficient industrial design is also essential (in accordance with London Plan Policy E7 'Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution' Part A(4)). Policy should reflect a pragmatic approach where intensification is proposed, reflecting its complexity and risk.
- 4.2.4 To ensure an 'effective' policy in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(c), we therefore propose the following amendments to A.1(m)(i):
- 'Development and intensification, where feasible and desirable, of industrial and commercial uses at Local Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) at The Vale and South Acton on the basis of an agreed masterplan with Ealing Council'*
- 4.2.5 Existing sites may be most appropriately redeveloped to provide modern and sustainable facilities but retain a similar level of floorspace to that which is existing. Any policies relevant to intensification should acknowledge that the Council will need to work proactively with developers to ensure that schemes are viable, suitable for modern business and therefore deliverable.

### 4.3 Greenford Town Centre

#### Draft Policy G.1 Greenford Spatial Strategy

- 4.3.1 Whilst SEGRO supports the principles set out in Policy G1(d), including references to '*intensification, enhancement and improvement*', the Local Plan should review its narrative in respect of industrial sites. Policy should focus on modernisation, estate efficiency, investment, building resilience, and enhancing sustainability and quality, rather than purely '*intensification*'.

Intensification from a floorspace perspective should only take place on sites where it is feasible and appropriate to do so.

- 4.3.2 Whilst SILs are referred to in supporting paragraphs to draft Policy G.1 (para 4.3.50), SEGRO requests that SILs are referenced directly within G.1, to ensure they are enshrined in policy. To ensure an 'effective' policy in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(c), we therefore propose the following amendments to G1(d):

*'Greenford's industrial estates (including SILS) will be intensified (where feasible), enhanced and improved (see Policy G6)'*

- 4.3.3 In relation to Policy G1 (l), draft policy refers to a prosperous economy through the provision of affordable space and infrastructure, including safeguarding and intensifying employment sites [l(i)] and ensuring employment land and premises meets the needs of a wide range of businesses from small start-ups looking for affordable premises, to large well established businesses [l(iii)]. To ensure a 'justified' policy as per NPPF 35(b), Policy G1(l) should be amended as follows:

*'Greenford will be a prosperous economy with a good range of employment opportunities. This will be achieved by providing appropriate ~~and affordable~~ workspace, and infrastructure for business, including those seeking to start, grow and thrive.'*

- 4.3.4 As per our comments on draft Policy SP4.2 Part G, we ask that the Local Plan excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class (E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8) from the affordable workspace obligation, given the proposed unprecedented discount rate and duration (80% over 15 years), the unsuitability of industrial sites to provide affordable workspace due their scale and internal configuration, viability and other economic benefits industrial and logistic sites can deliver.
- 4.3.5 The Council should set no specific requirement for small/ medium sized units in local policy. There is a clear shortage of industrial space in West London, and only a limited number of sites can support the needs of growing businesses looking to upscale or accommodate within larger units. To impact on planning for these larger units would undermine the London economy. Instead, each site should be assessed on its own merits and consideration given to planning applications that respond directly to addressing/planning for modern business needs. This approach is 'justified' by the 'West London Employment Land Review' (2022) and is therefore in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b).
- 4.3.6 Finally, SEGRO welcomes the inclusion of the Greenford Flood Alleviation Scheme and proposed active travel improvements as set out in draft Schedule G1.

### **Draft Policy G.6 Greenford Industrial Estate**

- 4.3.7 SEGRO welcomes the inclusion of draft policy G6 'Greenford Industrial Estate'. As per comments on G.1, to ensure an 'effective' policy as per NPPF paragraph 35 (c), SEGRO requests that SILs are explicitly referenced within draft Policy G6. Our proposed amendments are:

*'To protect and grow the important industrial cluster, including SILS, at Greenford reflecting its important role in the A40 and West London logistics cluster by:...*

- 4.3.8 In respect of intensification in point (i), SEGRO again requests that additional text is included within the policy stating, '*where feasible*'. The definition of '*industrial intensification*' should be updated to include floorspace, estate efficiency, building height, infrastructure investment, operational flexibility (24/7 use). Further, in the interests of securing a resilient and successful local economy, policy should not prescribe specific target industries. Over the plan period, the

economy is likely to evolve and change. To be 'effective', policy needs to respond accordingly. This should be directly reflected within this Plan, and more critically decision taking. To ensure an 'effective' policy as per paragraph 35(c) of the NPPF, we propose the following amendments:

*'(i) Industrial intensification, where feasible, new floorspace, improved estate efficiency, increased building height-volume, infrastructure investment, and operational flexibility (24/7 use), to unlock significant new industrial floorspace fit for modern businesses, creating new jobs focused in the modern growth sectors, which may include green and creative industries. green, circular and creative sectors.'*

- 4.3.9 SEGRO welcomes point (ii), which references retrofit and upgrades. Investment of industrial sites will often involve improvements to existing units, modifying to meet the needs of the existing business market and enhancing sustainability.

- 4.3.10 Point (iv) seeks to explore opportunities for active frontage to industrial units, particularly where these can showcase existing industrial uses and contribute to facilities for local people and workers. Whilst SEGRO supports the positioning of offices and entrances, to positively contribute to streetscapes and provide activation, it must be led by operational efficiency, so as to ensure Ealing's estates remain competitive at attracting businesses and investment. Point (iv) drafting is too onerous and should be deleted. First and foremost, design, particularly within SIL/LSIS, must take into consideration the efficient function of industrial units (as per London Plan Policy E5 'Strategic Industrial Locations' (d)), reflecting the primary function of these estates to provide the right conditions for industrial operators to function and grow.

- 4.3.11 On some sites, development of multi-storey industrial units may be viable/feasible over the plan period. To accommodate this, draft Policy G6 should include a further section stating:

*'On designated SILs there is an opportunity for tall buildings, subject to agreed masterplans and based upon local impacts and sensitivities.'*

- 4.3.12 This would be in accordance with London Plan Policy E7 'Industrial intensification, co-location and substitution' Part A, which realises the relationship between intensification and multi-storey development. Introducing this drafting would also ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 35(d).

- 4.3.13 Finally draft Policy G6 makes reference to enhancing active travel options, particularly in relation to the Brent River Valley network. The Local Plan should expand on this matter, providing further clarity to developers. Currently, this policy is ambiguous and ineffective, contrary to NPPF paragraph 35(c).

## **4.4 Perivale Town Centre**

### **Draft Policy P1 Perivale Spatial Strategy**

- 4.4.1 Policy P1(g)(i) refers to the safeguarding, intensifying, diversifying and enhancing of Perivale's industrial core. Firstly, SEGRO requests that reference is made to SILs within the policy itself, as the 'industrial core' is not a defined term or area and is therefore unclear as to what area the policy is applicable to. This amendment is accordingly required for the policy to be 'effective', as per NPPF paragraph 35(c).

- 4.4.2 Secondly, as is the case for Acton and Greenford, in respect of intensification, the policy should include the phrase 'where feasible'. Appropriate redevelopment of industrial sites comes in various forms, including intensification, improved floorspace, increased building height, infrastructure investment and operational flexibility. This should be reflected in policy drafting and decision making. Policy P1(g)(i) also makes reference to affordable workspace for small

businesses and new startups. As per our comments on draft Policy SP4.2 Part (g), we ask that the Local Plan excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class (E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8) from the affordable workspace obligation. This is necessary due to the unsuitability of industrial sites to provide affordable workspace due their scale and internal configuration, viability and other economic benefits industrial and logistic sites can otherwise deliver. It is considered that the provision of affordable workspace within these Use Classes has not been 'justified', based upon proportionate evidence, and is therefore contrary to NPPF paragraph 35(b).

### **Draft Policy P4 Perivale Station and Environs**

- 4.4.3 In respect of Policy P4, SEGRO is supportive of the aspiration to provide a Neighbourhood Centre in the vicinity of the Station. However, whilst SEGRO recognises the benefits of such a facility, clarity is required in both in terms of the extent of the retail offer to be provided and the land which might be required to deliver such development. This will enable the policy to be 'effective' and deliverable, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(c).
- 4.4.4 As part of SEGRO's vision for the Perivale Estate, small scale retail and amenity uses (such as a café) may be introduced. These amenities would likely be temporary to begin with, to establish the level and nature of demand, before more permanent facilities are introduced if the concept is successful.

### **Draft Policy P5 Perivale Industrial Estate**

- 4.4.5 SEGRO welcomes Policy E5 'Perivale Industrial Estate' which seeks to protect and enhance the broader Perivale industrial estate. We would, however, ask that the Council clarifies what '*embrace the existing clusters of employment*' means on Perivale Industrial Estate in practice (as referenced in Part (a)(i)). Again, this clarity is required in order to ensure the policy is 'effective', in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(c).
- 4.4.6 We note Policy E5 Part (b) makes reference to active frontage, particularly around Aintree Road, where these can showcase existing industrial uses and contribute to facilities for local people and workers. Whilst SEGRO supports the positioning of offices and entrances, to positively contribute to streetscapes and provide activation, it must be led by operational efficiency. Part B drafting is too onerous and should be deleted.

## 5 Development Management Policies

### 5.1 General Comments on the Development Management Policies

5.1.1 As per the Regulation 18 consultation, this section of the plan sets out the development management policies to provide the standards and guidelines for planning applications will need to comply with. These are organised by policy topic areas that respond specifically to Chapters 3 to 10 of the London Plan (2021). The policies are set out in 2 forms:

- Local variations to the London Plan (2021), which append new text to those London Plan policies and should be read alongside them – policy name includes both letters and numbers; and
- New policies which can be read independently but which also sit within Ealing's broader development plan which includes the London Plan (2021). – policy name includes letters alone.

### 5.2 Draft Policy DAA: Design and Amenity (local policy)

5.2.1 SEGRO generally agrees with the principles outlined in Policy DAA concerning adverse impacts. However, it contends that new developments should only be held responsible for mitigating adverse effects deemed 'unacceptable,' as stipulated in Paragraph 180 e) of the NPPF, rather than shouldering the burden for 'any' adverse effects on neighbours and surroundings. To ensure an 'effective' and 'justified' policy in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b) and (c), we therefore propose the policy wording is amended to state '*unacceptable harm*' instead of '*any adverse impact*'.

5.2.2 In Parts (iii – v), the policy emphasises the importance of ensuring adequate levels of daylight and sunlight, privacy, and a visually appealing environment. Nonetheless, the vagueness of terms like '*good*' and '*positive*' fails to provide clear benchmarks for assessment. While supporting Paragraphs 5.7 – 5.12 aim to clarify these standards, it is essential to adhere to Paragraph 16 of the NPPF, which mandates policies to be explicit and unambiguous. Despite the supplementary text, Policy DAA lacks clarity on defining '*good*' levels of daylight and sunlight, privacy, and positive visual impact, thus hindering the ability to ensure policy compliance.

5.2.3 Moreover, it is crucial to recognise that some sites, where appropriate, may undergo redevelopment or intensification whilst retaining their established principal use within specific area and contextual surroundings. Therefore, the Council should evaluate each site individually, considering its existing use and structures concerning the proposed development, in adherence to this Policy.

5.2.4 Consequently, further refinement of Policy DAA is necessary to delineate these terms more precisely and acknowledge the need to balance these objectives with other priorities and objectives outlined in the Local Plan.

### 5.3 Draft Policy D9: Tall Buildings London Plan (local variation)

5.3.1 Policy D9 aims to establish a definition for '*Tall Buildings*', recognising that this definition may vary depending on the geographical location within the Borough. However, Point (h) specifies that '*Tall buildings on designated industrial sites will be subject to agreed masterplans and based upon local impacts and sensitivity.*'



- 5.3.2 SEGRO acknowledges and supports Policy D9, particularly the flexibility it provides for designated industrial sites.
- 5.3.3 From the Policy it is understood that a tall building in Greenford is over 21m, in Perivale its 21m, and in Action Park its 24.5m. We understand that whilst tall building would be over 31.5m in North Acton/Park Royal; and 21m at Westway Industrial Estate, where sites fall within the OPDC, we understand that Policy D9 would not apply. Where buildings exceed the defined threshold (set out in DMP1) these may be considered acceptable but would be subject to a master planning process.
- 5.3.4 A point of clarification required relates to Figure DMP1. Some areas in Greenford, such as the east boundary of G3, and west/north boundary of P1 in Perivale are shown as blank. It is unclear why this is the case. The figure should be reviewed accordingly.
- 5.3.5 We understand that Policy D9(f) does not pertain to designated industrial estates; rather, in these cases, Policy D9(h) will be applicable. We would recommend that recognition is given in the supporting text to multi-storey industrial developments under construction in London that are 35-40-meter tall, in line with the purpose of DP(h) to facilitate the construction of high-capacity, modern industrial buildings, including multi-storey warehouses where commercially feasible.
- 5.3.6 The Policy acknowledges the economic viability of such developments in densely populated urban areas like London, aiming to optimise land utilisation and enhance industrial infrastructure efficiency. By aligning with current trends and addressing the evolving needs of industrial operations, policy will support sustainable urban development and foster economic growth in London's industrial sector.
- 5.3.7 It should be also recognised that tall industrial buildings are likely to have large footprints to accommodate vehicular ramps and/or goods lifts.
- 5.3.8 Whilst this approach is 'justified' by the 'Tall buildings strategy' (2023), we would recommend that the tall building threshold for industrial estates gives recognitions to requirements of multi-storey buildings.

#### **5.4 Draft Policy E3: Affordable Workspace London Plan (local variation)**

- 5.4.1 Policy E3 mandates the provision of affordable workspace at an 80% discount for a duration of 15 years, with specific requirements for different types of developments:
- Mixed-use schemes: 10% of gross floor area
  - Office and industrial schemes: 5% of net floor area
- 5.4.2 Policy E3 requires that when the provision of affordable workspace reaches certain thresholds (1,000 sqm for mixed-use, 2,000 sqm for office, or 3,000 sqm for industrial), it should be provided onsite. Otherwise, offsite contributions are acceptable.
- 5.4.3 SEGRO raises a number of concerns regarding Policy E3 in its current form:
- a. Lack of justification for the discount rate and duration:
- The Affordable Workspace Study identifies rising commercial property rents but fails to explain why an 80% discount over 15 years is warranted. It is considered that this is not in itself justification for an affordable workspace policy. Furthermore, the study does not specify which businesses will benefit from subsidised space, their space requirements, or the optimal locations for accommodating them.

b. Unrealistic discount rate:

An 80% discount would be unprecedented and financially burdensome. It would potentially deter investment in estates in direct conflict with the Borough's other aspirations to enhance them and create the right conditions for investment. Such a large discount to certain businesses creates an unfair advantage over others. Without any strategy for what type of business will be supported, and where, why and how they will be assisted, we consider this approach to be unjustified.

c. Unsuitability for industrial development:

Industrial sites present challenges for providing affordable workspace due to difficulties in subdividing large warehouse and external spaces. Flexible office and shared workspaces are better suited for this purpose, which operate on a smaller scale and are either easily sub-divided or are able to operate as 'shared spaces'. Such spaces are also more attractive to occupiers, as they are typically located in a location and environment that is more conducive to micro-businesses.

d. Viability concerns:

The Local Plan viability study demonstrates that at realistic existing use values, this policy requirement is unviable. Please refer to SEGRO's response to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule at **Appendix 1**.

e. Economic benefits of industrial/logistics development:

Industrial/logistics schemes on brownfield sites contribute significantly to job creation, training opportunities, and economic growth, outweighing the feasibility of providing affordable workspace.

- 5.4.4 Based on the above, the policy is not considered to be 'effective' or 'justified' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b) and (c). Therefore, we propose the policy is revised in a way that excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8 from the affordable workspace obligation.

## 5.5 Draft Policy E4: Land for Industry, Logistics and Services to Support London's Economic Function (local variation)

- 5.5.1 SEGRO fully supports the imperative to safeguard and uphold an ample supply of land designated for industrial, logistics, and economic services. Additionally, we endorse the fundamental principle of intensifying (where feasible) and repurposing existing employment land, including Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs), to optimise land use efficiency.

## 5.6 Draft Policy E6: Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) (local variation)

- 5.6.1 We acknowledge and endorse the overarching concept of prioritising industrial requirements as the primary consideration on designated Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSISs). However, we advocate clarification and necessary adjustments to Point C regarding the definition of *'high employment density and economic value'*.
- 5.6.2 It is imperative that the language used in the policy provides clear parameters for what constitutes *'high employment density and economic value'* uses. Without precise definitions, there is ambiguity regarding which types of activities qualify under this designation. Clarity in this regard is essential to ensure effective implementation and alignment with broader economic



development objectives, and to ensure development meets the identified need for industrial and logistics space (as opposed to other forms of employment space such as office).

- 5.6.3 Furthermore, while supporting paragraph 5.32 attempts to elaborate on the term '*substantial contribution*,' it falls short of providing adequate clarification. The phrase "*substantial contribution*" remains open to interpretation, leaving room for uncertainty regarding the specific criteria and benchmarks used to determine what qualifies as such a contribution.
- 5.6.4 In summary, while we support the fundamental premise of prioritising industrial needs on LSISs, we urge for specific revisions to (c) to define '*high employment density and economic value*' uses more clearly. Additionally, further clarification is needed regarding the notion of a '*substantial contribution*' as outlined in supporting paragraph 5.32. These adjustments are necessary to ensure the effectiveness and coherence of the policy framework.
- 5.6.5 In relation to Part (d) (iii), it is crucial to highlight that the provision of affordable workspace must be contingent upon viability. This aspect should be explicitly addressed in the drafting of planning policies. Both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 58 and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (ref ID: 10-002-20190509 and 10-005-20180724) emphasise the importance of viability assessment at the plan stage. SEGRO has raised a number of concerns relating to the lack of justification for the unprecedented discount rate and duration (80% over 15 years), the unsuitability of industrial sites to provide affordable workspace due their scale and internal configuration, viability and other economic benefits industrial and logistic sites can deliver. We therefore ask that policy excludes industrial and relevant parts of E Class (E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8) and logistics development from the affordable workspace obligation.
- 5.6.6 By adopting this approach, the planning process can strike a balance between promoting affordability and ensuring the financial viability of developments. It is imperative that the planning policies reflect this nuanced perspective to facilitate sustainable and feasible development within the borough.
- 5.6.7 In summary whilst we acknowledge and endorse the overarching concept of prioritising industrial requirements as the primary consideration on designated LSISs, to ensure an 'effective' policy in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b), further clarification is required regarding the definition of '*high employment density and economic value*.'

## 5.7 Draft Policy G5: Urban Greening (local variation)

- 5.7.1 Part (b) of Policy G5 in the London Plan explicitly stipulates a target score of 0.3 for predominantly commercial development, with **exceptions for B2 and B8 uses**. However, Ealing's approach appears to deviate and it unclear the rationale for doing so without clear justification.
- 5.7.2 Regarding warehousing uses (which would include **Class B2 and B8**), we advocate for maintaining the exclusion as per the Inspector's report on the examination of the London Plan. Paragraph 451 of the report highlights the inherent challenges in achieving most Urban Greening Factors for industrial and warehouse developments, citing limitations and practical difficulties. Specifically, the report notes that while green roofs may be feasible, they come with additional construction costs, loading concerns, and maintenance issues. The viability evidence presented is deemed inconclusive. Until further evidence elucidates the practical implications for such developments, it is recommended to exclude them from the policy, as endorsed in recommendations PR39 and PR40 of the Inspector's report.
- 5.7.3 To ensure a 'justified' policy as per NPPF 35(b), it should be amended as follows:

*'Ealing will apply the Urban Greening Factor as set out in the London Plan with a target of 0.4 for residential development and 0.3 for commercial development (excluding Class B2 and B8 uses).'*

## 5.8 Draft Policy G6: Biodiversity and Access to Nature London Plan (local variation)

- 5.8.1 The 20% requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) above the national minimum is not supported. No clear guidance has been provided to justify why such a high BNG requirement is prescribed within Ealing, either across various types of development or in general. Additionally, we find no justification for surpassing the 10% BNG set by future national requirements under the Environment Act, effective as of February 12, 2024.
- 5.8.2 Moreover, the recent changes to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) emphasise that Local Plans should not stipulate BNG levels exceeding the minimum 10% unless adequately justified.

Plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified. To justify such policies they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented.

- 5.8.3 While developers can be encouraged to exceed the 10% threshold voluntarily, local plan policies should not mandate BNG levels beyond national standards. Imposing higher requirements could potentially jeopardise the viability of development sites and hinder the delivery of essential employment and industrial spaces. A more pragmatic approach would be for policies to align with national requirements while incentivising developers to achieve greater levels of BNG wherever feasible.
- 5.8.4 In light of the above, we do not consider the policy justified, and to ensure a 'justified' policy as per NPPF 35(b), (f) should be amended as follows:

~~'Development proposals should achieve a biodiversity net gain of at least 20% or the advised national minimum amount, whichever is greater, as follows~~ Qualifying development proposals are required to be consistent with the biodiversity net gain standard consistent with that prescribed through National Guidance. Biodiversity net gain above the minimum standard will be encouraged and supported'.

## 5.9 Draft Policy S5: Sports and Recreation Facilities (local variation)

- 5.9.1 It is recommended that the policy language be clarified and specified to explicitly state that 'Residential developments' and/or 'Residential-led mixed-use developments' are the specific types of developments obligated to provide adequate sports provision. This clarification is essential to prevent ambiguity and ensure that developers clearly understand their obligations regarding sports facilities within residential projects. By delineating the types of developments subject to this requirement, the policy can effectively guide planning decisions and promote the integration of sports facilities into residential developments where appropriate.

- 5.9.2 To ensure an 'effective' policy in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b), we therefore propose the policy wording as follows:

*'Residential developments and/or residential-led mixed-use developments Development should ensure sufficient quality of sports provision in line with Ealing's Sports Facilities Strategy. Loss of existing sports facilities will not be supported, unless it forms part of the strategy to improve the quality or range of overall provision'.*

## 5.10 Draft Policy OEP: Operational Energy Performance (local policy)

- 5.10.1 SEGRO notes the target of 15kWh/m<sup>2</sup> for heating set out in draft Policy OEP. Whilst this target will be easily achieved in larger industrial units, this will prove more challenging in smaller units. Larger estate regeneration will often include various sized units. For larger projects, SEGRO urges the Council to adopt an estate wide approach whereby developers can undertake calculations for a whole development and then calculate the heating energy demand accordingly.
- 5.10.2 The same principle applies for the EUI target of 35kWh/m<sup>2</sup> for warehousing and light industrial units. Based on our previous projects, the average EUI is 40kWh/m<sup>2</sup> -50kWh/m<sup>2</sup> for the warehouse and light industrial units considering all the small equipment and small powers. This limit is 55kWh/m<sup>2</sup> (Commercial) for NZC buildings in the LETI guidance for this category. Thus, the proposed targets in Ealing Local Plan are lower than the average practise and NZC targets. Many developments will struggle to achieve such targets and may lead to projects becoming undeliverable. Further targets to be listed for unheated or heated warehouse units etc. SEGRO welcomes further engagement with the Council on this point. Furthermore, monitoring and submitting the total energy use and renewable energy generation for 1-2 years are sufficient to identify the performance gap if there any. Therefore, 5 years monitoring targets can also be reduced to 1-2 years.
- 5.10.3 It is important to address the implications of net zero policies on multi-storey industrial buildings. It is evident that the current evidence base has not sufficiently accounted for the distinctive impacts of net zero policy and the associated benchmarks on multi storey industrial developments and the impact on their viability.
- 5.10.4 Consequently, there is a crucial need for a clear and explicit provision that acknowledges this gap. Specifically, it is necessary to outline that multi-storey schemes should demonstrate efforts to minimise carbon emissions, however given the constraints of such development, it should be noted that the mandate to offset any emissions surpassing net zero targets should not be applicable in this scenario.
- 5.10.5 These recognitions and amendments will ensure that the development of multi-storey industrial buildings aligns with sustainability goals while acknowledging the unique challenges and considerations inherent to such projects.
- 5.10.6 Based on the above, the policy is not considered to be 'effective' or 'justified' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b) and (c). Therefore, we propose the policy is revised to provide further targets that are appropriately flexible for various sized units and also accounts for the challenging natures of multi-story industrial buildings.

## 5.11 Draft Policy ECP: Embodied Carbon (local policy)

- 5.11.1 There are two different targets set out in Table DM4 contained within draft Policy ECP, however, it is unclear how these differentiate from one another.

- 5.11.2 We are assuming that the yellow table is the embodied carbon limits until 2030 and green tables are the limits after 2030. Furthermore, the RICS modules have not been mentioned in the targets, whether they are for the whole life cycle (Modules A-C) or for only the construction stage (Module A1-5). There are differences of embodied carbon emissions in between the small scale and large scale, multi-storied, residential/ non-residential buildings which was not considered in the carbon limits.
- 5.11.3 Whilst we acknowledge the design requirements to achieve pre-2030 (yellow) targets, we are raising concerns regarding the higher (green) targets. Whether these targets are achievable in relation to viability and functionality is largely untested. The lack of evidence base is reflected in the local plan viability assessment, where the feasibility of attaining these higher targets remains untested. Therefore, the policy is considered unjustified, and contrary to NPPF paragraph 35(b).
- 5.11.4 In addition to the above, it is imperative to recognise the unique nature of multi-storey industrial buildings regarding embodied carbon considerations as well. This is particularly pertinent given the unique requirements associated with such structures, including goods vehicle ramps, elevated yards, goods lifts, heavy floor loadings, and additional structures necessitated to accommodate these features. By recognising these challenges and implementing tailored provisions, the policy would ensure that multi-storey industrial developments align with sustainability objectives without compromising practicality and viability.
- 5.11.5 The Council must provide further clarity in draft Policy ECP in relation to both of these points. Only when clarification has been provided, will SEGRO be able to comment on the suitability of targets set out in table DM4.
- 5.11.6 Based on the above, the policy is not considered to be 'effective' or 'justified' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b) and (c), therefore, we propose the requirements set by the policy are further clarified.

## **5.12 Draft Policy WLC: Whole Life Cycle Carbon Approach (local policy)**

- 5.12.1 It is not agreed that major developments requiring demolition should be mandated to undertake carbon optioneering to assess the optimal approach to building form and reuse. There are no further instructions for the reporting format, methodology, number of required options and how this information need to be included in the whole life cycle carbon assessment. The council should also provide further explanation of best practice standards as the options need to be capable of comparison reflecting this best practice standard.
- 5.12.2 Such a requirement could significantly impact the viability of projects. Imposing additional requirements without careful consideration of their practical implications may lead to projects becoming undeliverable. Therefore, it is essential to balance environmental considerations with the practical realities of development to ensure that policies support sustainable outcomes without unduly burdening stakeholders.
- 5.12.3 The policy is not considered to be 'effective' or 'justified' in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35(b) and (c). Accordingly, this policy should introduce the following drafting:

*'Major developments should undertake a Whole Life Carbon assessment, or similar assessment as agreed with the Council, in accordance with the requirements set out in the London Plan (2021). B. Major developments involving demolition should undertake carbon optioneering, or similar assessment as agreed with the Council, to determine the best approach to building form and reuse.'*

### 5.13 Draft Policy FLP: Funding – The Local Plan (local policy)

- 5.13.1 SEGRO does not support the assertion made in Policy FLP that additional detail will be furnished in a separate Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) concerning Planning Obligations and Legal Agreements. While supplementary guidance can be beneficial if it elaborates on existing policies, it should refrain from introducing new policies or detailing aspects that have not undergone adequate testing or consideration within the viability assessment of the Local Plan. Any supplementary documents must align closely with established policies and ensure consistency in implementation.
- 5.13.2 Regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) consultation, a separate response will be provided. However, in summary the response concludes that industrial, workshop and warehouse uses, including re-investment, re-development and intensification are critical to achieving the Local Plan outcomes and are central to the future of the area. Ealing Council's own evidence suggests that such development does not achieve EUV benchmarks and it is therefore inappropriate to set a CIL rate for these uses (E(g)(ii), E(g)(iii), B2 and B8).
- 5.13.3 For Data Centres the Viability Study does not provide sufficient evidence to understand how the proposed rate was arrived at therefore doesn't provide 'appropriate available evidence' to justify the proposed rates.
- 5.13.4 The full response included in **Appendix 1** and offer insights into SEGRO's position and perspectives on the CIL consultation and should be considered along this representation, ensuring transparency and clarity in our engagement with the consultation process.
- 5.13.5 In light of the above, we do not consider the policy 'justified' as per NPPF 35(b).



## 6 Summary

- 6.1.1 This comprehensive document, prepared by Stantec on behalf of SEGRO, offers a detailed response to the Ealing Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation, specifically focusing on policies relevant to SEGRO's extensive industrial estates in the area.
- 6.1.2 As a major UK Real Estate Investment Trust, SEGRO manages a diverse portfolio of industrial estates across Ealing, playing a crucial role in supporting businesses across 30 sectors, thus contributing significantly to job creation and economic growth.
- 6.1.3 The representation aims to align SEGRO's interests with the overarching vision outlined by the Council for Ealing's growth and development. It underscores the vital role of industrial areas in fostering economic development and job creation, while also emphasising the importance of policies that facilitate modernization, efficiency, and sustainability within these industrial spaces.
- 6.1.4 While expressing overall support for the Council's vision, SEGRO highlights the need for clarity and refinement in certain policy areas, particularly concerning land use, intensification, and modernization of industrial spaces. Additionally, SEGRO raises concerns regarding proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rates, stressing the potential adverse impact on industrial and warehouse developments and advocating for policies that strike a balance between investment support and viability considerations.
- 6.1.5 Furthermore, SEGRO fully supports the imperative to safeguard and uphold an ample supply of land designated for industrial, logistics, and economic services. Whilst we endorse the fundamental principle of intensifying (where feasible) and repurposing existing employment land, including SILs and LSISs, to optimise land use efficiency, a pragmatic approach must be adopted, focusing on modernization and operational flexibility rather than purely intensification.
- 6.1.6 SEGRO also express opposition to mandates for affordable workspace provision within industrial sites, due to viability and suitability concerns. SEGRO emphasises the need for policies that support business growth and investment without imposing unrealistic obligations. Instead, it advocates for pragmatic redevelopment approaches that prioritize modernization and operational flexibility.
- 6.1.7 In specific town centres like Acton, Greenford and Perivale, SEGRO offers critiques and suggestions, urging for clarity, viability considerations, and alignment with broader economic objectives.
- 6.1.8 Regarding Development Management Policies, SEGRO supports underlying principles but seeks clarification and adjustments in certain policy wordings, particularly in areas like affordable workspace provision and site viability assessments, to ensure the draft Local Plan complies with NPPF paragraph 35.
- 6.1.9 Overall, the representation underscores the importance of clear definitions, considerations for site viability, and alignment with broader economic objectives in both the local plan and development management policies to ensure sustainable and equitable growth across Ealing.
- 6.1.10 SEGRO is keen to engage with the Council and work collaboratively to ensure policies align with the needs of businesses and the community.

## Appendix 1

DRAFT

**Your ref:** Ealing CIL Draft Charging Schedule Consultation 2024  
**Email:** tom.dobson@quod.com  
**Date:** 08 April 2024



CIL CONSULTATION,  
LB Ealing,  
Strategic planning team,  
Perceval House, 14-16 Uxbridge Road,  
London W5 2HL

By Email: localplan@ealing.gov.uk

Dear Ealing Planning Policy Team,

## **RE: Ealing CIL Draft Charging Schedule**

### **1 Introduction/Summary**

I am writing on behalf of SEGRO in response to your Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule (DCS).

Government guidance on setting CIL rates requires, among other things, for Charging Authorities to consider the impacts of proposed rates on delivering the types of sites and uses set out in their Local Plan.

SEGRO is one of the largest landowners in Ealing with an extensive industrial land portfolio in the 'Ealing Productivity Arc' identified in the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan as central to delivering 'good growth' in the Borough. It is an innovative and active provider of business space, testing new models of delivery (including multi-storey space) which will be essential to the delivery of the Local Plan in a place where industrial uses are of regional and national significance.

These representations make specific reference to two issues: the viability of industrial uses, and the information provided on Data Centres in the Viability Study.

#### *Industrial and Warehouse Uses*

SEGRO is concerned that while the Local Plan relies on the re-development and intensification of existing industrial floorspace the Viability Study demonstrates that industrial and warehouse uses cannot afford to pay the proposed CIL rate when reasonable assumptions are made about existing use value. Additional policy obligations proposed in the Draft Local Plan worsen this position. The proposed rate is also significantly above the £35/sqm recently adopted by the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation.

The Council should also be aware that by adopting an Industrial rate of £100/sqm which is significantly higher than the proposed rates for other uses such as offices and retail (£0/sqm), and hotels (£50/sqm), the Council will be signalling to investors that the Council is disincentivising industrial development.





Not only is this rate much higher than other proposed uses in Ealing but it would be the highest Industrial CIL rate in London by far.<sup>1</sup> The large majority of boroughs do not charge CIL for industrial uses and the average across London (including the OPDC) is £4.82 (See list of Industrial rates in Appendix A). This signals to investors that other boroughs in London will be better destinations for investment than Ealing.

This contradicts the stated aims in the Local Plan that encourage the growth of industrial employment in the 'Productivity Arc' as outlined below.

It is therefore not appropriate to charge a CIL rate for industrial and warehouse development. This should include use Classes B2 and B8, and relevant parts of E Class which provide such uses: E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes and E(g)(iii) Industrial processes. These uses could be removed from the 'all other uses' category and be set at a zero rate.

#### *Data Centres*

The evidence on Data Centres provided in the report is very limited and does not provide 'appropriate available evidence' to justify the proposed rate. SEGRO has extensive experience of data centre development and would be happy to engage with Ealing Council and its advisers to address these issues.

We set out more detail on these points below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note this excludes Redbridge which does not have an Industrial specific rate but has a flat rate for all development of £70 (£119.60 indexed to 2024).



## 2 SEGRO in Ealing

SEGRO is one of Europe's largest industrial real estate companies and provides premises for all types of businesses ranging from small businesses to the largest multi-national companies. SEGRO's portfolio includes warehouses, industrial space, data centres and film studios.

SEGRO is one of the major business space providers in Ealing, with large estates in Perivale and Greenford, which will be covered by this Charging Schedule, as well as in Park Royal but within the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) area.

The major estates that are covered by the Ealing Local Plan and Draft Charging Schedule are:

- SEGRO Park Perivale
- SEGRO Park Greenford Central
- SEGRO Park Greenford
- SEGRO Centre Greenford North
- SEGRO Park Fairway Drive (Greenford)
- SEGRO Park Acton

SEGRO actively manages and invests in its estate and therefore has a long-term interest in policy for its sites. It is a leading innovator in the development and management of modern business space including urban multi-storey industrial development. Through its 'Responsible SEGRO' Framework SEGRO is seeking to lead sustainable industrial design and low carbon growth aiming to be net zero carbon by 2030. This includes brand new, best-in-class, carbon neutral units which are currently being delivered at Fairway Park in the Borough.

SEGRO is supportive of LB Ealing following best practice and consulting on its CIL charging schedule alongside its draft Local Plan with a shared evidence base. The Plan makes clear that the investment in existing industrial locations, including intensification, is a priority for the Borough and critical to meeting strategic policy objectives. SEGRO's portfolio and expertise mean that they are a critical partner in delivering these objectives.

SEGRO is therefore interested in the potential effects of the CIL rates in the types of uses within its portfolio. These are:

- Industry: £100/sqm
- Data Centres: £150/sqm
- All Other Uses: £25/sqm

These obligations would be in addition to £60/sqm of MCIL2 for all uses.

SEGRO wishes to continue to be active in Park Royal and for re-development and re-investment to be incentivised to deliver the Local Plan policy requirements and wider aspirations.



SEGRO wishes to work collaboratively with LB Ealing to ensure that CIL is set in a way that allows it to continue to deliver development viably and would be happy to share further evidence with you and your advisers to demonstrate potential impacts on development.

### 3 Guidance on Setting CIL Rates

The Government publishes guidance on setting CIL rates as part of its Planning Practice Guidance. This sets out the following:

- 1 When deciding the levy rates, an authority must strike an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments. (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 25-010-20190901)
- 2 Authorities should show how “their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area”. In this case the relevant Local Plan is the London Plan (2021), and the emerging (Regulation 19 Draft) Local Plan (2024)
- 3 The regulations allow Charging Authorities to apply differential rates in a flexible way, to help ensure the viability of development is not put at risk. (Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 25-022-20190901)
- 4 If the evidence shows that the area includes a zone, which could be a strategic site, which has low, very low or zero viability, the charging authority should consider setting a low or zero levy rate in that area. The same principle should apply where the evidence shows similarly low viability for particular types and/or scales of development. (Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 25-022-20190901)

### 4 Delivering the Relevant Plan

Policy SP1 of the draft Plan sets out the Council’s vision. Part B states that:

“B. Ealing will become the engine of West London’s new economy, with growth managed to provide equitable access to jobs that provide decent living incomes that can support genuinely affordable homes for all. We want growth in Ealing to be inclusive so that people can both contribute to and benefit from growth. Ealing will grow and diversify its business space, and further strengthen the role of its industrial areas.”

Draft Policy SP4 expands on this setting out how the Council intends to support “Creating Jobs and Good Growth”. This includes:

- Ensuring that the most efficient use of land is made so that development on sites is optimised, which will contribute to more sustainable patterns of development and land uses. (SP4.1c)
- Maintaining the existing supply of industrial land on designated and undesignated sites and adding to this where possible. (SP4.2a)
- Managing Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) exclusively for conforming uses and undertaking any necessary consolidation through the plan-making process. (SP4.2b)



Figure 2.2 of the Draft Plan, which sets out the context for the Spatial Strategy identifies a ‘Productivity Arc’:

*“which places Ealing in the centre of west London’s economic activity, by linking Heathrow Airport and Hillingdon with the proposed HS2 terminal at Old Oak Common. The Arc connects strategic industrial growth opportunities across Perivale, Greenford, Northolt, and Southall to Heathrow.” (para 2.13)*

This then structures the remainder of the Plan which identifies ‘town level’ policies for sub-areas within the Borough which aims to:

*“reinforce and intensify existing Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) and Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) within the borough and explore options to improve industrial land and intensify employment, where appropriate.” (para 3.69)*

Two of those sub-areas are Greenford and Perivale, in which the SEGRO estates described above are located. Each has a separate Chapter of the draft Plan with area specific policies. Both include reference to the need to secure re-investment and intensification, retain existing businesses and attract new higher value added sectors. The Plan has a strong focus on re-balancing housing and employment growth with a focus on securing more jobs.

There are sector specific policies in each of the Chapters to promote intensification, retrofit, and job creation including in green and circular economy sectors. These are set out in Policy G6 (Greenford) and Policy P5 (Perivale).

The strategic and area specific policies are supported by several relevant Development Management Policies. These include:

- Policy E3 on Affordable Workspace: which is subject of a separate evidence base and viability assessment. Which does not include any allowance for LB Ealing CIL and Section 106 obligations significantly lower than the proposed CIL rates. This includes a requirement for either on site provision for industrial uses equivalent of 5% of net floorspace (we would note that this should be clarified to confirm net ‘additional’ floorspace) where that exceeds 3,000 sqm, to be provided at an 80% discount for 15 years. It allows for an equivalent off site contribution below the 1,000sqm threshold
- Policy E4, stating that industrial intensification and re-use will be the primary consideration for industrial land, that there is no identified capacity for release and that sites in Strategic Industrial Locations will only accommodate conforming uses;
- Policies on Operational Energy Performance (Policy OEP) and Embodied Carbon (ECP) which set challenging targets for new development including warehouses and industrial.

It is clear therefore that the re-investment and re-development in SEGRO’s sites is critical to the implementation of the Local Plan.

These policy requirements will, where appropriate, be secured through planning conditions and obligations which will potentially impose significant costs on development.



To be viable any development will need to be able to incorporate these costs along with other development costs and deliver a viable return. In virtually all cases in the Park Royal area there are existing uses on site which will trigger these policies, and there will also be site specific costs including infrastructure and access and in some cases remediation and site preparation which also need to be taken into account. CIL rates should be set with reference to these policies as well as other more standard requirements.

We note that in relation to the affordable workspace policy the OPDC's Planning Obligations SPD, which uses the same evidence base as the Draft Ealing Local Plan policy, allows for a negotiated approach, reflecting viability concerns raised at consultation. It states:

"A lower quantum of floorspace (below this thresholds) may be considered appropriate for on site provision if it can be demonstrated that this would meet needs. Vice-versa, an in lieu contribution may be more appropriate for certain schemes above the thresholds. This would be considered on a case-by-case basis."

SEGRO suggest that a similar approach should be taken in this policy, given the cumulative impacts of proposed obligations identified in the following section of this letter.

SEGRO also notes that within the OPDC, there is a nil rate for "Enclosed access roads, ramps and service yards within multistorey industrial developments". This policy is necessary where a Local Plan wishes to encourage intensification of industrial sites because these spaces only exist to facilitate schemes with multiple storeys and design solutions to providing high quality industrial space on constrained sites. In low density industrial developments these areas do not have to be enclosed (and therefore would not be relevant). A nil rate should therefore also be applied here to avoid discouraging the intensification of industrial sites and innovative design solutions.

## **5 Viability Evidence: Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study**

The Council has published a 'Local Plan Viability Assessment' (December 2023) alongside the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan. This is intended to provide the context for judging the impact of CIL and other obligations on development and in striking the right 'balance' to ensure that the delivery of the sites and scale of development in the plan are not put at risk.

The report takes a standard approach to CIL viability assessment covering a range of residential and commercial appraisals. For relevant commercial uses these include:

- Data Centre (Typology 23, 0.83 hectares, 2,000 sqm total GIA) – nb the data inputs for this use are not clear as it also states it is 2 stories and 5,000 sqm GIA data centre floorspace)
- Light Industrial Scheme (Typology 28, 2 stories, 0.5 ha, 6,000 sqm)
- Industrial Scheme (Typology 29, 1 storey, 1 ha, 5,000 sqm)
- Industrial Scheme (Typology 30, 1 storey, 1 ha, 6,000 sqm)

As we have noted above the delivery of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan is dependent on development and intensification in Strategic Industrial Locations including Greenford and Perivale.



The evidence base for the plan is supported by the West London Employment Land Review 2021/22 Update. This found:

*“For Ealing, CoStar report that Ealing's industrial vacancy rate (2.8%) remains close to a historical low, and a lack of new construction and steady demand for last-mile units should keep it at low levels in the medium term.” (para 1.27)*

And:

*“Demand is acute and the protection of space and provision of new premises is essential, whilst the upgrading of older stock is desirable. Overall it is critical that in Ealing as much functional industrial floorspace as possible is retained and upgraded; and there is a need to deliver additional floorspace where feasible.” (paragraph 1.21)*

In short, the main opportunity to meet the Council's objectively assessed need for employment floorspace is on existing high quality industrial land which is already in active use. Such an approach needs to be incentivised to ensure that Developers can achieve appropriate returns on any investment. Otherwise, in a tight market with low vacancy the incentive is to make minor incremental improvements to maintain occupancy of current stock.

However, the Viability Assessment does not test such sites and instead explicitly assumes that *“there is a general lack of demand for the type of space (ie the benchmark land value sites), resulting in low rentals, high yields and high vacancies (or in some cases no occupation at all over a lengthy period).”* (para 4.41)

As a result, the report uses unrealistically low benchmark land values for Industrial Uses of £3.57 million per hectare. By comparison, the Affordable Workspace Study uses industrial values of £7.2 million per hectare for general industrial in Ealing and £12 to 14 million for secondary industrial in the OPDC area. In SEGRO's experience, estates in Ealing (Acton, Greenford, Perivale) are valued at closer to £20 million per hectare.

The highest benchmark land values in the report are for Secondary Retail and Secondary Office values (£6.6 million and £10.1 million respectively) set out in Table 4.42.1, and even then these are lower than realistic values described above. Unlike vacant or greenfield sites current industrial land, even for open storage, generates ongoing income streams, and any re-development requires returns to exceed this, covering costs of re-development and lost income during the re-development period. Otherwise re-development simply won't happen.

The Table below summarises the findings of the assessments based on the four benchmark land values. This demonstrates that, for the two higher land values, which are significantly lower than a realistic level for current estates (the types of sites on which the plan relies and SEGRO has an interest development) development is not viable.



Per HA>				£10,175,259	£6,656,344	£3,565,943	£500,000
No.	Type	HA	Residual Land Value	BLV1 (Secondary Offices)	BLV2 (Secondary Retail)	BLV3 (Secondary Industrial)	BLV4 (Undeveloped)
23	Data Centre	0.83	4,847,465	£8,445,465	£5,524,766	£2,959,733	£415,000
28	Light industrial scheme	0.50	3,217,453	£5,087,629	£3,328,172	£1,782,971	£250,000
29	Industrial Scheme (50% plot ratio)	1.00	4,013,171	£10,175,259	£6,656,344	£3,565,943	£500,000
30	Industrial scheme (60% plot ratio)	1.00	4,815,804	£10,175,259	£6,656,344	£3,565,943	£500,000

**Tables 6.30.1, 6.30.2 and 6.30.3, then show the implications of applying policies on Bio-Diversity Net Gain, Urban Greening, and Net Zero carbon (Embodied and Operational). These demonstrate that none of the data centre or industrial typologies are viable after the application of these policies for any of the Benchmark Land Values.**

The report goes on to suggest that the cumulative impact of the policy costs, CIL and other obligations will have a relatively small impact on residual land value and that other factors have a more significant impact on viability. In circumstances where employment development is critical to the delivery of the plan, vacancy is low and there has been low recent construction, it is absolutely critical that additional burdens are not added to that development which disincentivise owners and landowners from re-investing in their sites.

In SEGROs view, the combination of additional policy requirements and a new CIL charge will have the unintended consequence of reducing development, significantly disincentivising intensification/modernisation/decarbonisation which the plan seeks to encourage, and therefore put at risk the Council's good growth objectives and the benefits that new development will bring.

**It is therefore not appropriate, on the basis of LB Ealing's own evidence and following the CIL guidance to charge a CIL rate for industrial development. This should include use Classes B2 and B8, and relevant parts of E Class which provide such uses: E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes and E(g)(iii) Industrial processes.**

On the specific inputs to the assessment, we would make the following points, which would tend to worsen the viability:

- The appraisals do not take into account requirements for re-location, including decanting and interim moves as part of any re-development, and requirements for bespoke replacement property. Given the focus of policy on intensification this should have been included;
- The Build Costs appear low, possibly reflecting in part the sharp inflation since the initial inputs were sourced. The costs for industrial typologies in the report range from £113 to £134 per sqft , whereas SEGRO's recent experience has been costs ranging from c. £160/sqft to c. £300 to £400/sqft for multi-storey or intensive/specialist development;
- The Local Plan in part relies on the intensification of employment uses in the SIL. As the Council is aware multi storey industrial/warehouse developments are not yet common. SEGRO has been



involved in one of the only multi-storey developments in London (X2 at Hatton Cross) and is on site with V-Park Grand Union, in Park Royal. SEGRO's experience in developing these proposals has been that they have higher development costs (see previous point) as well as a lower rents on the upper floors. In addition, valuers will also apply a higher yield than traditional industrial in order to reflect the more bespoke nature of the asset;

- Professional fees are typically 12.5% as opposed to 10% in the report.

### Data Centres

In relation to the Data Centre appraisals, significantly less information is provided about the appraisal inputs and as we note above, the summary of the Data Centres appraisal is unclear on what areas and assumptions were tested.

Table 4.11.1 sets out the rents, yields and rent free period for commercial uses. The source for this information is identified as Co-Star with the background set out in Appendix 3. That appendix shows retail, office and industrial uses but as far as we can identify no Data Centre comparables.

In terms of development costs the assessment appears to use a BCIS median general cost. It is again unclear whether any utilities or other costs are included in the assessment.

The data centre market has different models, for example SEGRO is a shell developer of Data Centres not an operator. It is unclear which model is used in the assessment.

**On this basis we don't think that the report provides 'appropriate available evidence' to support the proposed rates in the Charging Schedule which are higher than industrial, and warehouse uses.** SEGRO has extensive experience of data centre development and is Europe's leading shell data centre provider having built over 30 data centres. They would be happy to engage with Ealing Council and its advisers to address these issues.

## 6 Summary and Conclusions

SEGRO is a key landowner in Ealing and will play a central role in helping deliver the Local Plan vision and targets. It is keen to work positively with the Council to ensure that policy requirements, including CIL, are appropriate and will incentivise development, noting that in most cases this will involve expensive re-development.

As we have set out above SEGRO's current view is:

- Industrial, workshop and warehouse uses, including re-investment, re-development and intensification are critical to achieving the Local Plan outcomes and are central to the future of the area. Ealing Council's own evidence suggests that such development does not achieve EUV benchmarks and it is therefore inappropriate to set a CIL rate for these uses;
- For Data Centres the Viability Study does not provide sufficient evidence to understand how the proposed rate was arrived at therefore doesn't provide 'appropriate available evidence' to justify the proposed rates.





SEGRO is keen to work with LB Ealing to address these issues before the Charging Schedule is submitted for Examination. In the meantime, they would like to reserve the right to be represented at any Examination Hearing.

If you require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

**Tom Dobson**  
**Director**

cc.

Laura Elias (SEGRO)



## 7 Appendix A

Council	Industrial Rate	Adoption year	2024 indexation
Barking and Dagenham	£5	2015	£7.36
Brent	£0	2020	£0.00
Bromley	£0	2021	£0.00
Croydon (outside Metropolitan Centre)	£0	2013	£0.00
Hammersmith and Fulham	£0	2015	£0.00
Harrow	£0	2013	£0.00
Hillingdon	£5 (B8)	2014	£7.97
Hounslow	£20	2015	£29.42
Lambeth	£0	2022	£0.00
Merton	£0	2014	£0.00
OPDC	£35	2023	£37.56
Richmond	£0	2014	£0.00
Wandsworth	£0	2012	£0.00
Sutton	£0	2014	£0.00
Tower Hamlets	£0	2020	£0.00
Barnet	£20	2022	£22.95
Bexley	£10	2015	£14.71
Camden	£0	2020	£0.00
Enfield	£0	2016	£0.00
Greenwich	£0	2015	£0.00
Hackney	£0	2015	£0.00
Haringey	£0	2022	£0.00
Havering	£0	2019	£0.00
Islington	£0	2014	£0.00
Kensington and Chelsea	£0	2015	£0.00
Kingston upon Thames	£20	2015	£29.42
Lewisham	£0	2015	£0.00
Newham	£0	2014	£0.00
Redbridge	£70 (flat rate across all uses)	2012	£119.60
Southwark	£0	2017	£0.00
Waltham Forest	£0	2014	£0.00
Westminster	£0	2016	£0.00
London average excluding Redbridge flat rate for all uses (which is an outlier)			£4.82
London average including Redbridge flat rate for all uses (which is an outlier)			£8.41