

EALING BOROUGH COUNCIL**Examination of the Ealing Local Plan 2024-2039 (the Plan)**

Inspectors: D. McCreery MA BA (Hons) MRTPI and C. Dillion BA (Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Paige Gaughan

Programme Officer Address: Perceval House, 14-16 Uxbridge Road,
London W5 2HL

Tel: 020 8825 9562

Email: localplanprogrammeofficer@ealing.gov.uk

HEARING SESSION AGENDA**Matter 5: Economic Development**

- Questions relevant to this Matter are set out in the Inspectors Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)¹.
- This agenda is an abridged version of the MIQs designed to indicate the specific areas that the Inspectors would like to focus on in the Hearing session. This is to assist all participants with preparation (with the relevant question number from the MIQ document also included to allow cross referencing). Having read the hearing statements, it may be necessary to pose some supplementary questions in this session. Other MIQs within this matter that are not on the agenda are still open for discussion at the Hearing session under 'other modifications / points'.
- Guidance on the format and taking part in the Hearing sessions can be found in the Inspectors Guidance Notes². Participants will be assumed to have read paragraphs 25 to 37 of the notes in particular and should be aware that the hearings are focused sessions with limited time. As such, repeating statements already put to the Examination at length will not be permissible. Contributions should be succinct and to the point in the interests of making the best use of the time available and fairness to everyone.
- Any specific needs or questions about the procedure should be drawn to the attention of the Programme Officer as soon as possible.

Issue

Whether the Plan is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to economic development.

Plan policy focus – SP4, E3, E4, E6

¹ https://www.ealing.gov.uk/downloads/download/8246/local_plan_miqs_v2

² https://www.ealing.gov.uk/downloads/download/8243/local_plan_guidance_notes

Agenda

Item 1: Employment Growth

- What is the identified need in terms of economic development and does the Plan provide a robust approach to identifying and bringing forward developments to meet the identified need? How will progress against the expectations of the Plan be monitored [**MIQ1, MIQ4**]
- How have the locational needs of different sectors been considered in arriving at the preferred Spatial Strategy and is the approach justified? [**MIQ5**]
- Other points

Item 2: Affordable Workspace - Local variation to Policy E3 of the London Plan

- What is the background to the varied Policy E3, why is variation from the London Plan proposed? What is the evidence justifying it, including specific detailed thresholds? Does the variation proposed in (F) to (H) alter the defined circumstances approach in favour of a blanket levy and, if so, is that a sound approach? Are the requirements sufficiently flexible and appropriate to the diverse range of circumstances where they might apply? [**MIQ6a,b,d and g**]
- Is the reference to 'mixed use schemes' in Policy E3(F) precise and clear in terms of identifying which proposed developments will be subject to the requirement? To be effective, is modification needed to define a 'mixed use scheme'? Would the higher 10% levy for mixed use schemes in Policy E3(F) incentivise applicants to bring forward proposals for office and industrial schemes at the lower 5% and, if so, would that have implications for the effectiveness of the policy and/or the Spatial Strategy. [**MIQ6 h, and i**]
- Is modification required to clarify whether contributions will be based on a gross or net uplift? [**MIQ6k**]
- Other modifications / points

Item 3: Industrial Land

Local variation to Policy E4 of the London Plan:

- What is the background to the varied Policy E4, why is variation from the London Plan proposed and what is the evidence justifying it? Paying regard to Policy E5(A) and the detailed criteria at (B) of the London Plan, how does the varied E4 and the wider plan amount to the proactive management of SIL? [**MIQ7a and f**]
- Is the sequential approach to non-designated sites in industrial use consistent with national policy when regard is paid to paragraph 127 of the NPPF? [**MIQ7g**]

- For consistency with Policy E4(A) of the London Plan, is modification required to Policy E4(H) to refer to a 'sufficient supply of land and premises'? [**MIQ7b**]:
- Is the identification of 'industry, logistics and economic services' in Policy E4(H) aligned with Policy E4 more widely in terms of its identification of applicable land uses? Is the term 'economic services' sufficiently clear and understood? [**MIQ7c**]:
- Is the term 'industrial intensification and reuse' sufficiently understood? For effectiveness, is modification needed to provide additional clarity? [**MIQ7d**]:
- Other modifications / points

Local variation to Policy E6 of the London Plan:

- What is the background to the varied Policy E6, why is variation from the London Plan proposed and what is the evidence justifying it? [**MIQ8a**]
- How will whether proposals have a high employment density and economic value be judged? Is the requirement clear, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals? [**MIQ8e**]
- Is Policy E6(D)(ii) a list of 'principles' or 'requirements'? If it is the latter, is modification required for clarity? [**MIQ8f**]
- Is the term 'mixed intensification' clear? [**MIQ8h**]
- Is modification needed to clarify the aim of the policy in relation to the need for increasing industrial capacity? [**MIQ8j**]
- Other modifications / points