

Matter 10 – Maps Issues and questions

1. Are all the changes in the Atlas of Proposed Changes to the Adopted UDP Proposals Map 2004 referred to in the CS and is the remainder of the Proposals still relevant in the light of the CS?

Very few of these changes are referred to in the CS and most relate to the DSDPD. The changes are referred under 5 below.

2. Map 1 - there are two different colours of diamonds but only one is identified in the Legend.

Agreed.

3. Map 1 – the route of Crossrail has been identified and is anticipated for completion between 2013 and 2020 and funded. Surely therefore the proposed route should be included on Map 1.

Map 1 draws on growth corridors not identified in the London Plan July 2011 which shows one regional coordination corridor west of Ealing called the Western Wedge in its Key Diagram. This should be included in Map 1.

Other omissions include:

* Other local authority boundaries would help understanding of the movement of residents for journey to work and use of other town centre facilities outside the borough.

*Ealing is represented with two corridors of movement but other links are ignored (residents shop in Richmond, Westfield, Oxford Street and South Kensington; they also use two hospitals in Hammersmith via the Central and District lines).

*Journeys to work are even more complex (not just along these two corridors) and include many rat runs to avoid the inadequate link between the M4 and A40 which is not of strategic standard.

Map 2, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 should have widths of Corridors corrected.

Map 4: there is no Key and the map is too small to show up problems with the defined neighbourhood areas which are based on ward boundaries, e.g. part of Ealing Town Centre These will take on greater importance with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework and Neighbourhood Plans. **This map should show more realistic neighbourhood areas**

Map 9 of Community facilities is too small scale to be of much use. Base detail should be used as in new map 10

4. Is the Grand Union Canal and associated mooring/access identified on the CS maps so that improved usage can be effectively directed?

Grand Union Canal is identified as a Green Corridor on Map 2 and the Brent River as a faint white line. The maps 2 & 3 should be larger so that key features can be identified

On Map 3 both GUC and the Brent are shown as a faint blue line which is lost in neighbourhood boundaries.

5. Whether the Proposals Maps and Inset Maps are correct and effective in implementing the CS development proposals and policies.

The Atlas of Changes to the Proposals Maps contains some unjustified changes, errors and ambiguities. It is unclear because street names are missing or unreadable and a full scale 1:10,000 printed version should be provided at the next deposit stage of the Development Sites DPD.

We note the following detailed points:

Volume 1

a) Site 11 does not show which 2 sites will be POS as described in the SOS chapter. There appear to be 3 sites vacant, one separated from the high rise flats and existing residents of Park Royal by the A40, the other two separated by the major gyratory of the Southern Gateway.

Volume 2

This deals primarily with sites in MOL, Public Open Space and Community Open Space. POS and COS are planning terms which are not defined in the core strategy yet the table with the maps refers to sites not 'fulfilling the criteria'. MOL has criteria for definition in the London Plan. But there are none for either POS or Community Open Space. The UDP defines them as shown on the proposals map (2004). If changes are to be made using some ad hoc criteria, they should be included in the Core Strategy. Many of the alterations are self-evident but some affect sites that have been the subject of local concerns and others exclude official public access from council owned land perhaps because of lease arrangements.

b) Site 1 - GKN playing fields are being redesignated MOL from Green Belt. As land adjacent to the Green Belt it should either be retained as such or deleted because of the school proposal to which ECS has objected. The designation does not agree with the text description which is green belt.

c) Site 2 - land at the rear of Grove Ave. It is not explained why this is being designated as residential from MOL. The site is covered by attractive private gardens that present a sloping backdrop to the Brent River Park. Their development for housing would be an unacceptable impact on the park. The garages shown on the base map are at a lower level and are almost obscured by trees. The west facing house elevations form the edge of the built up area and therefore it conforms to the policy 7.17 in the London Plan.

d) Site 3 - Tentelow Lane Depot is an important site which was included in the Brent River Park and MOL to protect its unique location as a Green Space adjacent to the canal and by the Ancient Monument of the Three Bridges. We understand the Council has failed to protect the site from housing development but the frontage is to be landscaped. The MOL should remain along the canal frontage where no built development was permitted.

e) Site 4 - St Margarets Rd Hanwell – The site removes an area of significant nature conservation value from MOL (and presumably the Brent River Park although this concept is ignored) yet leaves within the boundary housing that was built on MOL as enabling development to provide POS along the canalside.

e) Sites 12 and 22 CS defines private playing fields at East Acton lane as part of a district park. Yet the Atlas moves COS designation from one part of the playing field to another. If there is a proposal to use any of this land as part of a public park it should be defined or the reference removed from the Core Strategy. Site 23 Bromyard Ave used to be public open space and part of the district park proposal but is now COS. We do not see how club playing fields can be regarded as part of a district park without a specific proposal (see policy 5.2 a)

f) Site 26 MOL and COS cover the built up area of St Augustine's School which should be excluded as the buildings have been extended considerably since the MOL was first designated.

g) Site 30 - Perivale Park - half the area is shown as COS so that it is not longer a district park as defined in the London Plan and shown in the UDP.

h) Site 39 - Paradise Fields, Westway Shopping Centre is shown as MOL. The designation was retained as the car park was intended to provide access to Horsenden hill. This is being developed as district centre for the SOS adjacent. MOL should be deleted if the SOS is retained.

Ambiguities

Small spaces surrounded by roads are classified as POS despite the fact they cannot be used for

children's play e.g. sites 61, 64 and more.

Mistakes

Site 29 Pitshanger Park: the area outlined is actually Brentham Club;

Site 46 (parts with nature conservation value) is designated as residential without access;

Site 50 is now West London University Sports Ground not TVU;

Site 52 Gurnell Grove/Castlebar Park includes part of Hathaway Gardens road space in the POS and is incorrectly labelled.

Site 89 Walmer Gardens W13 is a small and cherished open space. Part is fenced off for orchard purposes but it is not part of the garden of the house. It should not be shown as residential development.

Site 90 Elthorne Park and waterside W13: an area was fenced to keep dogs off school pitches in the public park. Local people objected and a gate was provided so that they could have access. It should be retained as POS.

Some of the above comments do not relate to the detail needed for the core strategy but it is important that maps are correct.