

## London Borough of Ealing

### Local Plan Examination

Hearing Statement on behalf of the John Lewis Partnership  
Matter 6 – Design and Amenity, Tall Buildings, and the Historic Environment

10 July 2025



#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Savills has been instructed by the John Lewis Partnership ('JLP') to prepare this statement and participate in the forthcoming examination of the London Borough of Ealing ('LBE') Local Plan 2024 to 2039 ('the Plan').
- 1.2. JLP is the UK's largest employee-owned business and operates stores and warehouses under the John Lewis and Waitrose brands. The Partnership seeks to develop its existing portfolio of supermarket sites in its ambition to become the manager of a Build-to-Rent ('BTR') portfolio.
- 1.3. This statement has been drafted on behalf of the JLP and addresses questions raised by the Inspectors regarding the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan, as well as the implications of the appeal decision reference APP/A5270/W/24/3347877.
- 1.4. This statement is set out under the following heads:
  - Introduction to JLP
  - Context of JLP's Planning Application and Appeal Inquiry
  - Context of JLP's Engagement with LBE's Draft Local Plan
  - Main Representation
  - Summary of Recommendations

#### 2. Introduction to JLP

- 2.1. JLP is the UK's largest employee-owned business, operating two of Britain's best-loved retail businesses – John Lewis and Waitrose.
- 2.2. As JLP's retail business has expanded over many years, it has grown a sizable property portfolio of shops, warehouses and previously developed land. As a result, JLP's property portfolio is extensive. Many of JLP's stores and land holdings are close to transport links and amenities, and the company believes it has a social responsibility to make as best use of these sites as possible to play a role in addressing the housing crisis facing London and the UK.
- 2.3. By transforming some of its supermarket and car park 'brownfield' sites, JLP has the potential to deliver homes, including affordable homes. The company seek to deliver BTR homes which will be purpose-built for renters, developed and managed by the JLP. Residents would rent directly from a trusted business, providing them with greater certainty around areas such as quality, service, community and security of tenure.

#### 3. Context of JLP's Planning Application and Appeal Inquiry

- 3.1. Following an initial site sift, the partnership identified the Waitrose in West Ealing as having the potential to deliver 428 BTR homes. The Proposals (ref: 233076FUL) represent one of

the first Build-to-Rent schemes to be delivered and managed by the John Lewis Partnership BtR Ltd ('JLP').

- 3.2. An application was submitted by Savills on 4 August 2023, proposing:

*Demolition of existing buildings and structures and the phased erection of buildings for mixed-use scheme, including new homes; a replacement food store; Flexible Commercial Space; alterations to the existing access road; associated improvements to streets, open spaces, landscaping and public realm; and provision of car and bicycle parking spaces and servicing spaces and other works incidental to the proposed development.*

- 3.3. Prior to submission and throughout determination, the application underwent extensive public and statutory consultation. However, it was subsequently appealed by JLP on the grounds of non-determination on 10 July 2024.
- 3.4. The inquiry was conducted between two parties: JLP, as the applicant and the third party objector, Stop the Towers. LBE chose not to participate in the inquiry and raised no objection to the proposed development.
- 3.5. The inquiry commenced mid-November and adjourned in early December 2024. Following adjournment, both parties provided written representations on the impact of the revised National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and updated Housing Delivery Test (2023) to the Inspector on 28 January 2025. Upon retrieval of these documents, the inquiry was formally closed on 12 February 2025.
- 3.6. The Inspector granted permission on 27 May 2025.
- 3.7. The Rule 6 Party had claimed that the proposal's design was too high and bulky, and of excessive mass, which is out of keeping with the long-established scale and character of the area around it. However, in this regard, Insp. Griffiths found the proposal to be well designed; concluding that JLP's proposals manage an *'effective balance between the impacts of buildings of the height, scale and mass proposed, against the need to optimise the site'*. On that basis, the scheme accorded with London Plan Policies, D9, GG2, and D3.
- 3.8. Insp. Griffiths noted that it would be difficult to see how the indicative heights suggested for the appeal site within the relevant allocations would survive the examination. He stated *'analysis of the TBS and the TBS Appendix shows that the authors were aware of the 55 West permission but the Hasting Road permission post-dates the documents. In the light of these permissions, which in the case of the latter comfortably exceeds the suggested height limits for the EA25 site, it is difficult for me to see how the indicative heights suggested for the appeal site (15EA/EA24) would survive examination'*.
- 3.9. He also highlighted the "colossal" need for new homes in London and identified housing delivery as a "massive" benefit, with 20% affordable housing making a "major" contribution.
- 3.10. Overall, he concluded that the scheme would bring forward very significant benefits in a way that would not harm the character or appearance of the area or the significance of heritage assets. Neither would it have any undue impact on local residents, nor undermine the eventual adoption of Ealing's Local Plan. As such, planning permission was granted.

#### **4. Context of JLP's Engagement with LBE Emerging Local Plan**

- 4.1. As a committed community partner and long-standing employer within the Borough, JLP is dedicated to enhancing the community it serves and welcomes the opportunity to be heard in shaping the future of LBE.
- 4.2. JLP participated in Block 1 Hearing sessions, submitting a series of hearing statements relating to Matters 1, 3, 4 and 5

- 4.3. JLP has also previously submitted Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 representations, which can be found in Appendices 1 and 2 of this statement.
- 4.4. As such, JLP looks forward to continuing conversations with the Council regarding the Waitrose Store in West Ealing and its potential contribution to the Strategic Objectives of the DNLDP.

## 5. Main Representation - Question 2c Matter 6

### 2. In terms of the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan:

#### **c. does the character-led approach of the Plan to determining building heights strike an appropriate balance with the 'Good Growth' and appropriate densification principles of the London Plan?**

- 5.1. While we recognise the importance of respecting local character, it is important that policies strike an appropriate balance between managing change and being 'design-led'. Policy D3(a) of the London Plan states that "All development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations". Part B states that "Higher density developments should generally be promoted in locations that are well connected to jobs, services, infrastructure and amenities by public transport, walking and cycling".
- 5.2. Determining appropriate heights for development based on the existing character was something raised within the Waitrose appeal decision (Ref: APP/A5270/W/23/3347877), in which Insp. Griffiths speaks to the existing character and appearance of the area in light of a proposed tall building:

*'I appreciate, of course, that there are streets of attractive, traditional, two-storey terraced housing north and south of the railway. There would obviously be a stark contrast between these dwellings, and the proposal, in terms of scale, massing and height. However, for the reasons set out, the contrast is not arbitrary; there are good reasons why development should be more intensive along the railway, and near to the station. Moreover, contrast is not invariably negative. Indeed, there is already a contrast between the existing supermarket building and the housing on the opposite side of Alexandria Road.'*

- 5.3. This statement assures that 'character' is a consideration which needs to be balanced against a variety of others, including location, housing need, site constraints, optimisation and heritage. In this instance, the Inspector has acknowledged the stark contrast in character between the Proposal and existing terraced housing; however, stark contrast does not always equate to negative or harm, and this is an important point. Inspector Griffiths went on to find that the Proposal would be a "*positive addition*" to the local townscape and found, when assessing the scheme against the fullness of Policy D3 and D9 of the London Plan, it accorded with those policies and, ultimately, the development plan as a whole. This application of the existing policy apparatus demonstrates that the requirements in D3 and D9 of the London Plan provide a clear framework, which already takes into account character of the area, for development management decisions to be taken, but without creating rigidity and a hierarchy where "*character-led*" could be perceived and restricting development potential, notwithstanding such proposed development performing well on all other technical aspects (such as those set out in Policy D9) and genuinely demonstrated optimal development but for on account of a character assessment.
- 5.4. Furthermore, 'character' is inherently subjective, which may lead to inconsistency and uncertainty in local decision-making. JLP expresses concern that varying expert interpretations, influenced by personal judgment, could result in divergent conclusions and disputes regarding the definition and application of 'character' and creating uncertainty in

approach to development in Ealing as landowners and developers will not be clear on the interpretation and application of this proposed policy and, fundamentally, be left with a contradiction with the London Plan policy D3/D9 approach and the NPPF (2024), which is a material consideration in all development management decisions. These are circumstances that plans should seek to avoid creating, as they could lead to uncertainty and/or increased time spent in planning due to different interpretations of policy and/or an increase in planning decisions taken to appeal.

- 5.5. This policy may lead to complications when determining applications; on the one hand, the plan will be the most up-to-date by passage of time and should therefore, in theory, have full weight but, on the other, there are contradictions with London Plan and NPPF (2024) which need to be borne in mind and weighed accordingly. Creating express contradictions on policies such as these only seeks to compound that tension and make it difficult for decision makers in a time where clarity is essential for increased delivery.
- 5.6. Moreover, the elevation of 'character' as a consideration when determining appropriate building heights may inadvertently reinforce an approach focused on the preservation of existing status quo. This would overlook the dynamic nature of urban environments, where character is not fixed but evolves over time and can be shaped through the creation of new, vibrant character areas. By focusing narrowly on conserving existing character, the policy may stifle regeneration and the infrastructure required to meet pressing housing and growth needs.
- 5.7. It is within this regional policy context that JLP consider the character-led approach to tall building heights in DNLP Policy D9 to be restrictive, not enabling the optimisation of sustainably located brownfield sites, such as the West Ealing store.
- 5.8. **RECOMMENDATION:** The plan and evidence base documentation should replace the 'character-led' approach with the 'design-led' approach (or something akin to this) and reappraise the development capacity of its sites with sound methodology and/or embed sufficient flexibility within all residential proposed allocations which have been based on this character-led assessment such that those allocations do not contain a maximum quantum which has not been demonstrated, through thorough assessment, to sufficiently optimise the relevant site in question.

## **6. Main Representation - Question 2b Matter 6**

### **b. what is the evidence justifying it? Are the proposed parameters with the available evidence?**

- 6.1. The evidence base supporting the local variation to Policy D9 is the *Ealing Character Studies* (2022); *Tall Buildings Strategy* (2024) and *TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Main Report, Sept 24. Corrected edition* (2024). JLP's previous representations have provided a detailed commentary on the evidence base at Regulation 18 and 19 stages of the Local Plan preparation.
- 6.2. We have described the recent decision by Inspector Griffiths, which should now be taken into account in the evidence base supporting the local variation of Policy D9. Notwithstanding that recent planning permission, we highlight an error on page 9 of the Tall Buildings Strategy, which states that the tallest building in area E10 is 13.1 storeys.
- 6.3. The study omits 51-56 Manor Road, which is G+19 storeys and forms part of a group taller buildings that include the Majestic Wines site at 42 Hastings Road (25 storeys) and 50-54 Drayton Green Road (16 storeys) (LPA Reference: 233551FUL). Inspector Griffiths had regard to these buildings when granting planning permission for the West Ealing decision. The evidence base, as currently drafted, should be amended to reflect these heights as it has influenced the guidance for prospective tall building heights in Zone C (West Ealing).

## 7. Main Representation - Question 2d Matter 6

### 2. In terms of the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan:

**d. is the differential between the definition of a 'tall building' contained in the Policy D9 of the London Plan and the measurements which are referred to in criterion E and specified in Table DMP1 justified and in general conformity with that adopted strategic plan?**

- 7.1. London Plan Policy D9 sets the criteria for taller building definitions within Boroughs. The definition is context-sensitive, meaning what counts as “*tall*” depends on the local townscape, heritage, and character of the area. The policy establishes a blanket minimum threshold of tall buildings being no less than 6 storeys or 18 metres from the ground across London.
- 7.2. In the supporting text of Policy D9, it states that Boroughs should determine and identify locations where tall buildings may be an appropriate form of development by undertaking the following steps:
1. *based on the areas identified for growth as part of Policy D1, London's form, character and capacity for growth, undertake a sieving exercise by assessing potential visual and cumulative impacts to consider whether there are locations where tall buildings could have a role in contributing to the emerging character and vision for a place*
  2. *in these locations, determine the maximum height that could be acceptable*
  3. *identify these locations and heights on maps in Development Plans.*
- 7.3. Table DMP1 of the emerging plan sets out tall building definitions across the Borough. This is based upon a ‘*rigorous assessment of local character and prevailing heights*’. However, following interrogation of the evidence which forms the basis of the emerging policy, we have identified that Area E10 is identified as having an *Existing Tallest Building Height* of 13 storeys, which is an error.
- 7.4. In regard to step 1 (above), the document assessed the potential visual and cumulative impacts of development, but in the case of the allocation 15EA, it did not account for the fuller context around the site, as outlined by Insp. Griffiths:
- ‘Analysis of the TBS and the TBS Appendix shows that the authors were aware of the 55 West permission but the Hastings Road permission post-dates the documents. In the light of these permissions, which in the case of the latter comfortably exceeds the suggested height limits for the EA25 site, it is difficult for me to see how the indicative heights suggested for the appeal site (15EA/EA24) would survive the examination.’*
- 7.5. Therefore, the evidence base was unable to accurately establish sound conclusions as to the visual and cumulative impact of development at the Site if it had not correctly accounted for the existing baseline.
- 7.6. In regard to point 2, the Tall Building Strategy forms the basis of LBE’s determination of *maximum* building heights across the Borough. However, in the case of site allocation 15EA, the TBS fails to reflect the emerging scale of development within the West Ealing cluster. It overlooks relevant context, such as the consented scheme at 55 West—opposite West Ealing station—where a G+19-storey building was approved at appeal. In that case, the Inspector identified an emerging spine of taller development along the railway, concluding that LBE’s suggested 10-storey height limit was untenable given the absence of harm to the area’s character and appearance. The Majestic Wines site at 42 Hastings Road and 50-54 Drayton Green Road also benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission for a 16-storey mixed-use development.

- 7.7. Accordingly, the TBS imposes a disproportionate restriction on the site capacity of 15EA, as exemplified by the 13-storey height threshold applied.
- 7.8. This has also been discussed in the Waitrose appeal decision, where the Inspector agreed with Montagu Evans' interpretation of the appropriateness of LBE's tall building thresholds in relation to Waitrose Site allocation. Following detailed analysis of the Site according with the design-led approach of London Plan Policy D3 and D9 tall buildings, it was deemed heights up to 20 storeys or 100.43 metres (AOD) were appropriate, instead of the site allocation's 13 storey maximum.
- 7.9. Bringing these points together, the Tall Building Strategy and the appendices that sit behind it fail to optimise the capacity of site allocation 15EA.

## **8. Main Representation - Question 2f Matter 6**

### **2. In terms of the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan:**

**f. is the local approach to defining the parameters for tall buildings across the Borough consistent with evidence base documents EB42, EB44, EB45, EB45A, EB45B, EB46, EB47 and EB48?**

- 8.1. Generally, and without prejudice to our observations relating to the "character-led approach" in Section 8.0, LBE's approach to defining the height parameters is broadly consistent across the evidence base documents. We have already identified the error relating to existing tall building heights in area E10 as identified in Table DMP1.

## **9. Main Representation - Question 2g Matter 6**

### **2. In terms of the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan:**

**g. are the Council's suggested modifications [S24] for the design principles of specific allocations throughout the Plan to refer to 'up to' a given number of storeys needed for the allocations to be justified by evidence, effective, and therefore sound?**

- 9.1. JLP acknowledges the Council's suggested modifications of the allocation 15EA following the Regulation 19 consultation, including the introduction of the wording "up to" in relation to storey heights for specific site allocations.
- 9.2. However, it remains JLP's view that the design principles of allocation 15EA should be updated to reflect the appeal decision APP/A5270/W/23/3347877. The phrase "*up to*" continues to imply a rigid upper limit, offering little room for proposals to respond to evolving local context, design quality, or site-specific opportunities through a design-led approach. In practice, this wording implies a fixed maximum that may otherwise deter ambitious, well-designed schemes intended to deliver optimised housing capacity. It is arguable that "up to" is a worsened position given it actually means the capacity of the development sites could be lower than otherwise anticipated; furthermore, if additional detailed site-specific assessment has the ability to justify a reduced height quantum, we would submit that further assessment should too have the ability to justify increased height quantum, otherwise it seems to only operate in downward movement which may not be what is right nor optimal for that site. Such schemes may be designed beyond the suggested parameters identified in the Site Allocations and would nevertheless be acceptable, as illustrated at 15EA in the decision by Inspector Griffiths.
- 9.3. **RECOMMENDATION:** JLP considers that height parameters of the site allocation 15EA should be updated to reflect the heights considered appropriate within the appeal decision APP/A5270/W/23/3347877, or expressed with greater flexibility, through reference to a range of indicative heights or design principles that focus on delivering high-quality townscape outcomes rather than fixed storey limits and subject always to site-specific design and assessments.

## 10. Main Representation - Question 2h Matter 6

### 2. In terms of the local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan:

**h. will criteria F, G and H be effective in securing an appropriate design response that is sympathetic to the character and urban grain of the Borough, as well as any site-specific constraints, in a manner that is in general conformity with the London Plan and consistent with national policy?**

- 10.1. Criteria F, G, and H, are unlikely to be effective in securing an appropriate design response that is fully sympathetic to the urban grain of the Borough. They do not provide sufficient design-led guidance to ensure developments respond meaningfully to the Borough's context or its site-specific constraints.
- 10.2. The NPPF and the London Plan both place strong emphasis on high-quality, design-led development that reflects and enhances local character. Criteria F, G, and H do not currently establish these principles as they do not set out how new development should respond to site context, contribute positively to place-making, or reflect the distinctive qualities of the Borough.
- 10.3. These criteria should enable detailed and specific design evidence to accompany applications, which sets clear analysis and justification for how proposals can conform with Policy D9(c).
- 10.4. As demonstrated through Montagu Evans' inquiry evidence, the Tall Building Strategy compiled by Allies and Morrisons, which underpins these thresholds, contains imprecision. Specifically, Montagu Evans made three propositions that were accepted by Inspector Griffiths:
  - 10.4.1. The height range for which the Site is allocated in draft was disputed by the Appellant as we have stated elsewhere in these representations.
  - 10.4.2. Second, the design analysis referred to in the Tall Building Strategy and which informed the proposed heights, is not comprehensive. The heights proposed there were not subject to environmental testing. Accordingly, and as set out in our Regulation 19 submission to the local plan, the adoption of these policies restricting height would represent a disproportionate and unjustified restriction on site capacity. They are contrary to policies in the London Plan, specifically D3 and D9, and also contrary to framework policies comprising efficient use of land in sustainable locations.
  - 10.4.3. Third, the draft allocation did not take into account the findings of 51-56 Manor Road Inquiry, a relevant appeal decision and with which the Inspectors for this Local Plan examination will be familiar.
- 10.5. JLP maintains that appropriate building heights, massing and design responses should be determined through the development management process, guided by a robust assessment of site-specific context, opportunities and constraints. This approach is essential for optimising brownfield land in line with the London Plan's spatial and design policies D3 and D9.
- 10.6. This point was discussed in the recent appeal decision APP/A5270/W/23/3347877, whereby detailed analysis compiled by Montagu Evans was presented to Insp. Griffiths established that the Site could appropriately accommodate heights up to 20 storeys or 100.43 metres (AOD), notwithstanding the threshold of 13 storeys set out in emerging local policy.
- 10.7. The Inspector agreed that the proposals were well designed and represented a balance between the impacts of buildings on the height, scale and mass, against the need to

optimise the site, despite the Proposal being taller than the specified development site's building height threshold. Accordingly, the Proposals were deemed to positively contribute to the area consistent with London Plan Policy D9, GG2 and D3.

- 10.8. Therefore, criteria for assessing the acceptability of a tall building on a site-by-site basis, as set out in Part F should be embedded within Policy D9: Tall Building London Plan Ealing LPA – local variation. The wording needs to be altered to reflect that heights for tall buildings are guidance only, in line with London Policy D9.
- 10.9. **RECOMMENDATION:** It is suggested that Part F is reworded to remove the exceptional circumstances where tall buildings should be located. Proposed changes are set out below:

*E. The definition of a tall building in different parts of Ealing is set out in Table DMP1.*

*F. Tall buildings above defined thresholds ~~are exceptional and should be located upon specified Development Sites defined in the Development Plan~~ comply with Part C of London Plan Policy D9.*

*G. ~~The tall buildings threshold height is simply that and not a presumption that any height up to this is automatically acceptable.~~ All proposals for tall buildings will be tested under the relevant design criteria.*

*H. Tall buildings on designated industrial sites will be subject to agreed masterplans and based upon local impacts and sensitivity*

## **11. Main Representation – Question 3 Matter 6**

**3. Does appeal decision Ref: APP/A5270/W/24/3347877 for Waitrose, 2 Alexandria Road, Ealing W13 0NL have any implications on the soundness of the Council's current evidence underpinning Policy D9 and the policy requirements and capacities of the proposed site allocations? Please quality your response.**

- 11.1. The Inspector's report sets out that the evidence base lacks consistency in light of recent planning permissions around the site allocation 15EA. The Inspector highlighted two nearby schemes at 55 West (19 storeys) and 42 Hastings Road (16 storeys) as examples of developments approved at heights exceeding those indicated in the Council's emerging Local Plan. Notably, the 42 Hastings Road permission exceeds the 13-storey maximum referenced in the proposed site allocation EA25.
- 11.2. The decision also confirmed that the appeal evidenced robust site-specific analysis in line with London Plan Policies D3 and D9, justifying height on site above the thresholds set on site allocation 15EA within table DMP1.
- 11.3. In a specific statement regarding Ealing Local Plan's Examination in Public, Insp. Griffiths noted that in light of the absence of analysis of consented planning permissions and ineffective conclusions from the methodology, that:

*'it is difficult for me to see how the indicative heights suggested for the appeal site (15EA/EA24) would survive the examination.'*

- 11.4. In relation to the capacity requirements of site allocations, the Inspector also concluded for Site Allocation 15EA that:

*'I am not at all convinced that, in the emerging context of the appeal site, an upper limit of 13 storeys upon, as set out in the allocation in the new Local Plan, can realistically be said to optimise site capacity.'*

*'the approach the Council has taken to other tall buildings in the Borough, against the background of the London Plan, suggest very strongly to me that the approach to the*



*appeal site, and indeed the approach to other sites expected to house tall buildings, in the new Local Plan, is very unlikely to remain intact in any event.'*

11.5. These conclusions have been drawn following detailed analysis by Montagu Evans of the Borough's evidence base which forms part of JLP's Regulation 19 submission:

- Tall Buildings Strategy, February 2024 (EX: EB44)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Main Report, September 2024 (EX: EB45)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Site Appendix Part 1, September 2024 (EX: EB45A)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Site Appendix Part 2, September 2024 (EX: EB45B)

11.6. In summary, Montagu Evans concluded:

- The design analysis referred to in the present drafting of the evidence base is not comprehensive and the heights proposed for the JLP site have not been subject to environmental testing. Accordingly their adoption would represent a disproportionate, unjustified, restriction on the capacity of 15EA. contrary to policies in the London Plan, for example D3 and D9, framework policies comprising efficient use of land in sustainable locations;
- The heights identified as being suitable within the site allocation has not taken into account the findings of 51-56 Manor Road, a relevant appeal decision;
- The Waitrose site and Majestic Wines sites are sufficiently different in their characteristics that warrant their own separate allocations; and
- The present drafting of the D9 variant is onerous and restrictive, and not consistent with London Plan policy D9 as interpreted by the courts. It is inflexible and should be amended to reflect the environmental testing of specific proposals to have an acceptable townscape, heritage and visual impact.

#### **4. Are any modifications needed to the plan for soundness?**

11.7. We suggests that modifications are needed to the following documents, forming the tall building's evidence:

- Tall Buildings Strategy, February 2024 (EX: EB44)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Main Report, September 2024 (EX: EB45)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Site Appendix Part 1, September 2024 (EX: EB45A)
- TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Site Appendix Part 2, September 2024 (EX: EB45B)

11.8. **RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that the evidence base is reconsidered to conform with London Plan Policies D3 and D9, taking into account the need to appropriately optimise sites to meet objectively assessed needs and deliver sustainable development.

11.9. **RECOMMENDATION:** As a minimum, we would submit that height parameters for 15EA must be expressed with greater flexibility, through reference to a range of indicative heights or design principles that focus on delivering high-quality townscape outcomes rather than fixed storey limits and subject always to site-specific design and assessments which may follow for site-specific applications.

## 12. Summary of Recommended Modifications

No.	Policy to be Modified	Recommendation
1	Local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan	Any reference to 'character-led' should be replaced with 'design-led'
2	Local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan	Height parameters should reference a range of indicative heights or design principles. Apart from on sites where there is an existing planning permission, in this instance, height parameters should reflect the consented permission's heights.
3	Site Allocation Height Maximums	Remove references to 'up to' in site allocation 15EA, which was granted permission in May 2025 for a 20-storey building. Therefore, the wording should state:  <i>Design analysis indicates an appropriate height of up to 100.43 metres (AOD). <del>13 storeys (45.5 metres).</del></i> "
4	Local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan Part E	It is recommended that the tall building definitions are revisited, not based on evidence derived from the Tall Building Strategy and Character studies by Allies and Morrison.
5	Local variation to Policy D9 of the London Plan Part F	Reworded to remove the exceptional circumstances where tall buildings should be located:  <i>E. The definition of a tall building in different parts of Ealing is set out in Table DMP1.</i>  <i>F. Tall buildings above defined thresholds <del>are exceptional and should be located upon specified Development Sites defined in the Development Plan</del> comply with Part C of London Plan Policy D9.</i>  <i>G. <del>The tall buildings threshold height is simply that and not a presumption that any height up to this is automatically acceptable.</del> All proposals for tall</i>

		<p><i>buildings will be tested under the relevant design criteria.</i></p> <p><i>H. Tall buildings on designated industrial sites will be subject to agreed masterplans and based upon local impacts and sensitivity</i></p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tall Buildings Strategy (EX: EB44)</li> </ul> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices (EX: EB45)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Appendix Part 1 (EX: EB45A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Appendix Part 2 (EX: EB45B)</p>	<p>LBE should reconsider how London Policies D3 and D9 can be applied to appraise the site capacity of site allocation 15EA – in line with the appeal decision.</p>
7	<p>Tall Buildings Strategy (EX: EB44)</p> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices (EX: EB45)</p> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Appendix Part 1 (EX: EB45A)</p> <p>TB Strategy with site guidance and appendices, Appendix Part 2 (EX: EB45B)</p>	<p>Height parameters should reference a range of indicative heights or design principles. Apart from on sites where there is an existing planning permission, in this instance, height parameters should reflect the consented permission heights.</p>