

## HE/Ealing Statement of Common Ground Part 1: Policies

This statement of Common Ground addresses the matters raised by Historic England in its representation to Ealing's Reg 19 Local Plan.

### **Regulation 19 Comments:**

Reference	Summary of issues	Ealing response	HE response
Policy format and Heritage Specific Policy	<p>In our view it is important that the plan contains heritage specific policies which guide decision makers as to how to respond to development proposals that may come forward. Not all development will be on the specified development sites and therefore overarching policy is necessary to ensure heritage assets may be conserved and enhanced recognising them as an irreplaceable resource.</p> <p>We recognise the Council's desire to streamline policy and not repeat that which is already within the NPPF or the London Plan. Nevertheless, we consider there are issues for the historic environment that the Council should address through its Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Requirements for development proposals to be clear as to how they will affect the significance of heritage assets;</li> <li>– Making it clear that great weight will be given to the conservation of heritage assets and the more important the asset the greater the weight that will be given to conserving those assets and the</li> </ul>	<p>Integration of DM policies with the London Plan is a well-tested and fundamental part of the local plan. Development management coverage for the determination of planning applications is set out in London Plan Policy HC1, and the plan is consistent with other policy areas in avoiding repetition of policy that is set out in another higher-level plan. However, it would be possible for the plan to set out further detail in strategic policy and town plans.</p> <p>Further detail will be set out as appropriate in town plans and site allocations, and in the HIAs requested later in the representation.</p> <p>Proposed revisions to supporting wording of paras 3.45-3.48 are set out at the end of this document.</p> <p>The following amendment proposed by Historic England to Policy SP4.1 part E is agreed to ensure that the key requirements from the supporting text are given appropriate weight as policy.</p> <p>'E. Taking a strategic approach to the <u>conservation</u> <del>preservation</del> and enhancement of Ealing's <u>historic environment</u> <del>built heritage</del>, including the capacity for heritage-led</p>	<p>We welcome and support the Council's proposed revisions to Policy SP4.1 E and to supporting text (para 3.45-3.48).</p>

	<p>justification required for any harm or loss to its significance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ensuring that proposals demonstrate that change of use of designated heritage assets is necessary and that alternatives have been considered;</li> <li>– For conservation areas, ensuring that development proposals draw on relevant management plans and appraisals, and take appropriate account of key buildings, landmarks, views etc as well as making clear that outline proposals are not appropriate in these areas.</li> <li>– Encourage and support proposals that include solutions for assets currently on the Heritage at Risk Register;</li> <li>– Policy provision for the management of change to non-designated heritage assets including locally listed buildings; and</li> </ul> <p>Make clear that proposals should not prejudice future schemes to restore or refurbish assets.</p>	<p>regeneration and development <del>where appropriate.</del> <u>Applications will be determined on the basis of national, strategic and local planning policies for heritage, and where heritage assets may be affected, proposals should be supported by a heritage impact assessment.</u></p>	
<p>Para 3.45</p>	<p>There are many examples in the draft plan where the rich and varied heritage of the borough is mentioned as something to be celebrated, to inspire good growth and to add value to developments. We support this element of the plan which helps to put heritage at the heart of placemaking. We advise that more specific references are made to buried archaeological remains as well as above ground assets.</p>	<p><u>Proposed modifications to supporting text from paragraph 3.45 are provided at the end of this statement</u></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

	<p>Section 3.34 (3.45 in Reg. 19 version) makes a brief comment on non-designated heritage assets which is an ideal place to add a sentence about archaeological remains and the potential that archaeological discoveries have in offering opportunities for place making. More could be done to draw on London Plan HC1 which specifies improving access to, and interpretation of, the heritage assets, landscapes and archaeology within their area; and the creative re-use of heritage assets and how this might be achieved by reflecting existing or original street patterns and blocks or revealing and displaying archaeological remains.'</p>		
<p>Archaeological Priority Areas</p>	<p>Archaeological Priority Areas in Ealing are yet to be put into tiers and are due for review by 2026. We request that this is mentioned within the emerging local plan as it will have an impact on development in certain areas. Ealing has several areas with archaeological remains of very high significance which could potentially become Tier 1 APAs. These are notably around Down Barns, Horsenden Hill, Hanwell Locks, Northolt Manor and the early prehistoric remains found in Creffield Road area among others</p> <p>Tier 1 APAs help to identify where undesignated archaeological assets of equivalent to national significance to a scheduled monument, and which are known</p>	<p>Archaeological Priority Areas will be noted as a constraint layer on the interactive policies map, and added to Sites where relevant.</p> <p>See proposed modifications to supporting text from paragraph 3.45 at the end of this statement</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

	<p>or likely to be present (London Plan). Therefore, developments in these areas in particular would likely be very sensitive, with attention paid to the setting of assets. This would be best addressed through a development management policy for archaeology or the historic environment.</p>		
<p>Tall Buildings: D9.F</p>	<p>Criteria F – we note the policy provides for exceptions for tall buildings proposals above defined thresholds. In our view any proposal above the height threshold should be a departure from the London Plan, with local policy setting a maximum height. By allowing for exceptions this provides a pathway for additional height without policy provision to determine what would be acceptable. This would also conflict with the evidence base in the Tall Buildings Strategy.</p> <p>We are supportive of the policy intention to allow tall buildings on some specified development sites. However, in our view this needs to be strengthened to ensure that tall buildings <u>only</u> come forward on allocated sites in the plan.</p> <p>This is important in order that proposals do not undermine the plan-led system, by coming forward in untested locations that may result in harm to the historic environment. The London Plan Policy D9 criteria point B(3) states ‘Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans.’ We therefore consider this</p>	<p>Suggest:</p> <p>‘F. Tall buildings <u>are those</u> above defined thresholds <u>heights and</u> are exceptional. <u>Tall buildings</u> should <u>only</u> be located upon specified Development Sites defined in the Development Plan.’</p> <p>The policy does not provide exceptions for tall buildings, it defines the development of tall buildings as being exceptional and requiring provision in the plan, specifically through site allocations.</p> <p>The approach of the plan is to define what is tall in particular areas of the borough based upon their local context. Any building above this height is directed to specific development sites allocated in the plan. As per HE’s previous reps, supporting text has been elevated to the policy to make clear that buildings up to the threshold are not automatically acceptable.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

	amendment important for alignment with the objectives of the London Plan.		
Tall Building D9.G	Criteria G – we are pleased to see that our comments on lifting this wording to within the policy rather than the reasoned justification has been reflected in the Regulation 19 draft.	G – support welcomed	N/A
Policy D9.H	Criteria H – we are concerned that the policy enables provision of tall buildings on some industrial sites without identification through the plan of where these would be. We see this as being in conflict with policy D9 of the London Plan as it does not provide for a plan-led approach whereby tall buildings sites are only those which have been specifically identified through allocation, nor is there any local policy provision on what would be acceptable in such cases.	<p>'H – Tall buildings <u>may be appropriate</u> on designated industrial sites <del>will be</del> subject to agreed masterplans, <del>and based upon</del> <u>informed by the Ealing Tall Building Strategy and robust assessment of local impacts and sensitivity that seeks to avoid or minimise harm.</u>'</p> <p>Suggest the following clarification:</p> <p>Para 5.15 "...London Plan Policy D9 C. <u>Applications should therefore include Landscape/Townscape Visual Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment following appropriate guidance.</u>"</p>	Agreed.
Definition of Tall Buildings  Table DMP1 (Policy D9) and site	We note that the evidence base is not reflected by the policies for defining tall buildings in West Acton (evidence states the tall buildings threshold is 6 storeys, policy D9 states 14 storeys), Horn Lane, Action (evidence states the tall buildings threshold is 6 storeys, policy D9 states 14 storeys) and particularly Ealing Town Centre	<p>There were transcription errors in the original study which meant that the heights table did not properly reflect its conclusions.</p> <p>Specifically, the thresholds for A2, A4 and S6 should have been 6 storeys/21m, and E14 should have been 9 storeys/31.5m.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>These changes should be reflected in the site allocations, e.g. 01EA</p>

allocation policies	(evidence states the tall buildings threshold is 6 storeys, policy D9 states 21 storeys). We would argue for example whilst there have been cases where 21 storey buildings have been approved in Ealing Town Centre they should not be the threshold for defining tall in this area where the prevailing height is only 4.4 storeys. The impact of buildings of this height is clear from those that exist already and in our view has resulted in a negative effect on the character and appearance of the Ealing Town Centre and Haven Green Conservation Areas.	This has been corrected in the study itself, and the policy should read as follows: Amend Table DMP1 to correct transcription errors as follows: Town: Acton / Area: A2 / Tall Building(m): 49 <del>21</del> / Storeys: 44 <del>6</del> Town: Acton / Area: A4 / Tall Building(m): 49 <del>21</del> / Storeys: 44 <del>6</del> Town: *Ealing / Area: E14 / Tall Building(m): <del>73.5</del> 31.5 / Storeys: 24 <del>9</del> Town: Southall / Area: S6 / Tall Building(m): 24.5 <del>21</del> / Storeys: 7 <del>6</del>	*Please note that there is an error in the 2024 proposed modifications (SMM131) which indicates 45.5m and 13 storeys for E14.
Views and Kew World Heritage Site	We also remain concerned that it does not appear that views assessments have been carried out. As such the potential impact of tall buildings on significance of heritage assets across the borough and in neighbouring authorities has not been fully evidenced. The Tall Buildings Strategy Main Report December 2023 Sensitivity Section states that Views assessments will be required at the application stage to take account of potential impacts on important heritage assets such as Kew Gardens WHS. We do not find this appropriate and advise that it should be undertaken prior to allocating sites for development.	Work undertaken during the Tall Buildings Strategy has now been adapted as a formal screening report. HE colleagues have requested the inclusion of two further views which are now being run and will be included in the final submission version.	We welcome that Ealing have prepared a screening assessment considering the potential impacts to Kew Gardens WHS. We await the final report.
Policy DAA	We welcome the change made to policy DAA. We recognise criteria point (i) seeks to protect sensitive uses within or outside the development,' in our opinion this should be	This is probably more appropriate in the opening wording of the policy: 'New development must achieve a high quality of environment in itself and also in its effect upon its	Agreed.

	further strengthened by referring to important features as this infers it only relates to land use and not surrounding context or identity.	neighbours, <del>and surroundings</del> <u>and important local features.</u> '	
Design codes	In our opinion the policy would also benefit from an express commitment from the Council to produce a borough wide design code as required by paragraph 133 of the NPPF. Design guides and codes provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high-quality standard of design. Much of the early baseline work has been achieved already on this through the 2022 Character study prepared by Allies & Morrison.	The NPPF para 133 provisions on design codes appeared subsequent to the local plan text freeze necessary for the Council's committee process. This type of commitment is less appropriate in a development management policy.	Noted.
Policy ENA	<p><u>Enabling Development - Policy ENA</u></p> <p>Whilst policy ENA doesn't specifically refer to enabling development in relation to the historic environment/heritage assets the NPPF (para 208) is clear that enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy. In our view a policy on enabling development is therefore not a necessary component of a local plan document as a result should be deleted from the plan. A local plan should adequately set out a positive strategy for the historic environment without the need to include such a policy. Please see GPA4 Enabling Development and Heritage Assets <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa4-enabling-">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa4-enabling-</a></p>	<p>Note the HE guidance but also that there is no identified <u>policy</u> basis to limit development to the minimum amount necessary to secure the objective being enabled, and also that this guidance is operative only in relation to heritage assets, not other green space, which is a relevant development scenario for Ealing.</p> <p>Ealing considers that policy on enabling development is necessary to ensure clarity on 1) what objectives can be enabled in a given site and, 2) the level of development that is appropriate, i.e. the minimum necessary.</p> <p>Ealing agrees that existing guidance for enabling development that concerns heritage assets will continue to apply through the following amendment:</p>	<p>While the suggested additional supporting text goes some way to addressing our concerns, we consider it important that the policy itself is clear how cases involving enabling development and heritage assets will be assessed.</p> <p>Consequently, to ensure that the policy is consistent with national policy, we request a further policy criterion relating to enabling development and heritage, as follows:</p> <p><u>'C. Enabling development for heritage assets will be assessed according to national planning policy and</u></p>

	<p><a href="#">development-heritage-assets/</a> for further advice on this subject.</p>	<p>New para 5.65. <u>This policy applies wherever national guidance on enabling development is lacking. Enabling development for heritage assets will continue to be assessed according to Historic England guidance.</u></p>	<p><u>Historic England's enabling development guidance</u>'. This is an area of outstanding difference between Ealing and Historic England.</p>
<p>Glossary</p>	<p>There are a number of inaccuracies in the glossary that should be amended.</p> <p>Archaeological Interest Area – the correct terminology for this is Archaeological Priority Area. Any reference to Archaeological Interest Areas within the plan should be replaced with Archaeological Priority Area.</p> <p>Grade I / Grade II Listed Building – this omits Grade II* listed buildings</p> <p>Heritage Asset – this should reflect the NPPF glossary which states heritage assets are 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'</p> <p>Heritage at Risk Register – this is current inaccurate as it only refers to listed buildings. Historic England may place any</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>In addition, it is accepted that the Policies Map should also be updated to 'Archaeological Priority Areas'.</p> <p>For the online version of the Policies Map, Ealing will move the APAs to the 'Conservation' sub-section and rename the 'Heritage Land' layer 'Registered Parks and Gardens'.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

	type of heritage asset on the Heritage at Risk Register.		
Monitoring and review	<p>We commented at Regulation 18 stage that the effectiveness of the Local Plan, the delivery of its proposals and evidence to inform future Local Plan reviews is done through monitoring using appropriate indicators. It is important key indicators include those relating to the historic environment. This will contribute to the monitoring and review of local plan policies and ability to deliver positive outcomes for the historic environment.</p> <p>We are disappointed to note that the Regulation 19 plan continues to provide no indicators that relate to the historic environment and therefore no provision to monitor the effects of the plan on the historic environment.</p>	<p>As described in the monitoring framework, it has not possible to identify meaningful indicators for all policies in the plan, including in relation to built heritage. The focus instead has been to identify indicators which provide a good measure of the direct outcome of local plan policies.</p> <p>Separately change to the historic environment arising from development is already monitored as part of the AMR for the London Plan, and the need for additional indicators tied to the Local Plan has not been identified.</p> <p>Despite not identifying an additional monitoring indicator for inclusion into this framework, the LPA will continue to monitor a number of contextual heritage based KPIs, including: Change in the number of heritage assets, the number of assets on the 'Heritage at Risk Register' and appeal decisions.</p>	Noted, although it would be preferable that these KPIs were referred to in the plan.

**Proposed modification to paragraph 3.45 (replacing 2024 suggested modifications SMM24 and SMM26).**

3.45 Good Growth is about uniting the various elements of development need with what is valuable about the existing built and natural environment, particularly in light of the three core themes of the Local Plan. Land is a scarce and increasingly expensive commodity so making optimal use of land and buildings and ensuring good design in any new development are at the heart of how we enhance our borough. Ealing has a wealth of designated heritage assets including over 300 buildings and structures covered by statutory listing. This includes six scheduled monuments and four registered parks and gardens, as well as 29 conservation areas. Of these designated assets, nine listed buildings, five conservation areas, and two scheduled monuments are on the Heritage at Risk Register. In addition, Ealing also has over 700 non-designated heritage assets identified in Ealing's local heritage register and a rich archaeological heritage indicated via Archaeological Priority Areas (APAs). These APAs will be updated to reflect the new London-wide sensitivity tiering, in

which Tier 1 APAs identify non-designated archaeological assets of potential national importance that would be subject to the same policies as designated assets.

3.46 Places evolve and change over time. New development has the potential to offer significant opportunities to enhance and better reveal the significance of heritage assets and, as well as to realise their environmental, cultural, and economic benefits of these assets. This will be achieved by placing an understanding of context, including heritage, at the heart of placemaking, Good Growth and good design in line with the design-led approach.

3.47. To ensure that development proposals avoid and minimise harm to the historic environment, they should be informed and shaped by an understanding of the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by setting. To demonstrate this, Heritage Impact Assessments will be required for applications with the potential to affect heritage assets. These should be prepared in line with relevant historic environment guidance. If there is the potential to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew World Heritage Site, assessments should be in accordance with UNESCO's guidance and toolkit for impact assessment. To understand the significance of heritage assets applicants should consult the Greater London Historic Environment Record and draw on conservation area character appraisals and management plans, etc., as appropriate.

3.48 Planning decisions will be in line with statutory duties and policies for heritage contained in the London Plan, national planning policy and the Local Plan. Great weight will be given to conserving the significance of designated heritage assets. Any harm or loss of significance must be justified, and the Council may require this to be offset via a programme of recording, the results of which should be publicly disseminated. The Council will support development that conserves or enhances the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, for example by:

- Protecting and reinforcing the character and appearance of conservation areas, retaining or reinstating their positive features.
- Addressing issues that have led to assets being placed on the Heritage at Risk Register and, where appropriate, providing a sustainable future for them via sensitive repair and reuse.
- Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long-term conservation.
- Removing/remodelling fabric or setting features detrimental to an asset's significance, or reinstating lost features that contribute positively; and
- Improving public access and interpretation.

The Council will also support development that delivers wider heritage benefits, especially those which conserve or enhance the historic environment whilst delivering positive climate and nature action. Where appropriate, the council will secure heritage-related public benefits via planning conditions.

**Signed confirmation:**

The contents of this Statement of Common Ground are agreed for the purposes of the examination of the Ealing Local Plan submitted in November 2024.

**Signed on behalf of Historic England:**

Name and position	Signature	Date
<b>Kim Miller Development Advice Team Leader Historic England</b>	<i>Kim Miller</i>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> October 2025</b>

**Signed on behalf of Ealing Council:**

Name and position	Signature	Date
<b>Steve Barton, Strategic Planning Manager, Ealing Council</b>	<i>Steve Barton</i>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> October 2025</b>