

**London Borough of Ealing
Development (or Core) Strategy
Submission Development Plan Document – Independent
Examination**

Inspector: Elizabeth Fieldhouse DIPTP DIPUD MRTPI
Programme Officer: Caroline Caldwell
Email: ldfprogrammeofficer@gmail.com
Tel: 020 8825 7944

**Discrepancy queries
8th August 2011**

I have been through the Development (or Core) Strategy Incorporating Minor Changes , Submission Document EAL2, comparing it to the published Schedule of Minor and Technical Changes (EAL3) and the Development (or Core) Strategy with Minor Track Changes (EAL1). I had started this when I saw discrepancies between the proposed change and the text in relation to the tables that were later covered by the errata published. There are a number of minor queries just on consistency that could perhaps be raised with The Council - for ease of reference I have used the reference number in EAL3.

MC17	Should it cover the reference to proposals in the final as well as the penultimate sentences?
MC21	There is reference to 5 Strategic Industrial Locations but only 4 are shown on the Key Diagram, I believe that Greenford may have been omitted.
MC24	Error in the errata slip under Greenford - 4700 shown whereas the change refers to 470. I need to know which number is correct, as the former would alter the totals.
MC23/24 and errata slip	Are the pie charts correct or do they need altering to take account of the changes to the tables?
MC30	Very minor - lack of space between words and changed dated.
MC33	Not done, still refers to 'proposal'.
MC47	Wording left out of footnote, 'anticipated to come forward for development', after 'in the Housing Trajectory' - this also applies to MC51, MC60, MC64, MC69, MC72, MC76, MC83, MC97, MC143, MC149, MC152, MC156, MC158, MC159, MC160, and MC163. As it is the same omission, it may be deliberate.
MC68	Only partially changed no capital given to the 'C' of Centre.
MC96	Text in bracket still refers to 'two percent' not 'one percent' as in change. I need to know which is correct
MC114	'Promote' still in text not 'enhance' as in change.
MC128	Change not made, reference is till to appendix 4 that does not exist in EAL2.
MC132	'Covering' deleted/needed before Community Infrastructure Levy.

MC153	Is emphasis meant to be given to the replacement wording by underlining?
-------	--

Appendix 1 and at times in the overall text reference in made to The London Plan or specific policies (for example page 24 first paragraph of supporting text). These need to be updated to take account of the recently adopted plan or at least it needs to be made very clear any changes in the policies or text. The new policy numbers are necessary for cross referencing.

Also could consideration be given to an appendix covering abbreviations used in the text. They are clear when first used but there is not a quick referencing system to assist when they appear as an abbreviation later in the text.

Council's Response 15th August 2011

MC17	Should it cover the reference to proposals in the final as well as the penultimate sentences?
Council's response	Yes, this is an omission. The penultimate sentence should read 'It sets out the Council's vision and proposals for the future development of the borough'. Moreover, it is noted that the reference to 'policies' was not updated in EAL2
MC21	There is reference to 5 Strategic Industrial Locations but only 4 are shown on the Key Diagram, I believe that Greenford may have been omitted.
Council's response	Given their close proximity Greenford and Northolt are indicated on the Key Diagram with a single notation. The key diagram can however be amended to illustrate two separate Strategic Industrial Locations.
MC24	Error in the errata slip under Greenford - 4700 shown whereas the change refers to 470. I need to know which number is correct, as the former would alter the totals.
Council's response	470 is the correct figure.
MC23/24 and errata slip	Are the pie charts correct or do they need altering to take account of the changes to the tables?
Council's response	The pie charts illustrated in the errata slip are correct, reflecting the updated figures in the tables.
MC30	Very minor - lack of space between words and changed dated.
Council's response	Noted. Space to be added in future iterations of the plan/errata.
MC33	Not done, still refers to 'proposal'.
Council's response	Noted. Agreed that any reference to 'Proposal' should be updated to read as 'policies/policy'.
MC47	Wording left out of footnote, 'anticipated to come forward for development', after 'in the Housing Trajectory' - this also applies to MC51, MC60, MC64, MC69, MC72, MC76, MC83, MC97, MC143, MC149, MC152, MC156, MC158, MC159, MC160, and

	MC163. As it is the same omission, it may be deliberate.
Council's response	Noted. This is an omission. '..For development...' to be inserted in future iterations of the plan/errata.
MC68	Only partially changed no capital given to the 'C' of Centre.
Council's response	Noted, and agreed.
MC96	Text in bracket still refers to 'two percent' not 'one percent' as in change. I need to know which is correct
Council's response	This is an error. One percent is the correct figure.
MC114	'Promote' still in text not 'enhance' as in change.
Council's response	Noted. This is an omission. Text to be updated to read as '...enhance...'
MC128	Change not made, reference is till to appendix 4 that does not exist in EAL2.
Council's response	Noted. This is an omission. Text to be updated to refer to Appendix 3.
MC132	'Covering' deleted/needed before Community Infrastructure Levy.
Council's response	Noted. This is an omission. '...covering...' to be inserted between 'SPD 9' and 'Community Infrastructure Levy'.
MC153	Is emphasis meant to be given to the replacement wording by underlining?
Council's response	Noted. This is an error. The underlining should be removed from the new text in EAL2.

Appendix 1 and at times in the overall text reference in made to The London Plan or specific policies (for example page 24 first paragraph of supporting text). These need to be updated to take account of the recently adopted plan or at least it needs to be made very clear any changes in the policies or text. The new policy numbers are necessary for cross referencing.

Noted and agreed. All references to the draft replacement London Plan, including policy referencing, will be updated.

Also could consideration be given to an appendix covering abbreviations used in the text. They are clear when first used but there is not a quick referencing system to assist when they appear as an abbreviation later in the text.

We are happy to cover this in the appendix. Alternatively would it be helpful to prepare an LDF glossary as a stand-alone document?