

## Matter 12 – Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring

### Issues and questions

**1. It is of concern that most of the transport proposals are grouped in three categories: Mayor’s Transport Strategy/Sub-Regional Transport Plan proposals, LDF/LBE Transport Schemes and the LIP corridors and neighbourhood programmes. This makes it difficult to assess the delivery timeframe of individual proposals. Priority proposal are not identified. In addition all schemes are only deliverable with additional funding which could have repercussions for growth in the Borough. What is the certainty of the identified projects being feasible and effective?**

Lack of detail is a significant problem. Some of the information provided appears to be incorrect as shown in the examples below.

1) New Map 10 on P66 shows 3 additional major transport schemes in Acton, Ealing and Southall town centres and one N-S route which uses the canal tow path which is too narrow for both safe cycling and walking. The line is so generalised that it appears to cut through a secure allotment and a district park and then joins existing roads. There is no indication in the Key to relate Major schemes to Appendix 3. The map base helps show that the N-S route is drawn incorrectly but the scale is too small to show where most of the proposals are located.

2) The LIP schemes are difficult to relate to relevant policies in the plan.

3) School sites analysis is misleading: new policy Map 10 shows schools to be expanded in the Development Corridors but the outline of the Corridors is not shown. Where areas are not directly accessible by road it is unreasonable to call them anything but hinterland. For example, North Ealing and St Gregory’s are separated from the A40 by the Brent River and the BRP including private open space. These are really located in a hinterland with a PTAL 2. Parents not within easy walking distance will bring their children by car. The scoring should be changed in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to take this into account. Other examples from the Schedule should be re-examined.

Some of the School proposals have planning permission, others such as The Grove site of Christ the Saviour are in the planning process or do not have planning permission. Yet no distinction is made in the table. This seems to disregard planning policies and any concerns of parents expressed in consultation. (On The Grove site it is proposed to build on a small staff car park adjacent to a locally listed building. Staff with difficult journeys that cannot be made easily by public transport or have children to pick up from another school will have to compete for expensive more distant places to park.)

There is no mention of the site for a 3 form entry expansion in Acton (for which the Priory Community Centre is earmarked -- planning application pending) or of the new RC School in West Acton recently granted planning permission in the face of significant local objection.

**We consider that the school provision should be re-examined, accurate proposed locations in corridors described and their planning status should be included in the score.**

4) There is no mention in Ealing Town Centre policy 2.5 where in ‘*Ealing Green – a cultural and Community quarter with important university function*’ there is a proposal to redevelop the West London University campus. The university buildings are locally listed and in a conservation area so that any redevelopment proposals would have a major impact on historic assets and should be subject to examination if they are included in this schedule.

5) Primary health care issues:

Jubilee Gardens Health Centre and library in Southall is complete and in use.

1. Mattock Lane Health Centre has been refurbished recently and there is no room to expand because the site is very restricted;
2. Provision should be made in the Dickens Yard scheme to cater for the large number of proposed residents.
3. Ealing Hospital site is in Southall not Ealing as stated. See map 3.

6) Open Spaces:

1. Northolt and Greenford Countryside Park seems to be complete. Why is it included?
2. The proposed North Acton Station Square is funded but not the two open spaces in the Southern Gateway.

7) Sports halls:

The school sites mentioned include Elthorne Park, Villiers and Drayton Manor High Schools which have all been expanded beyond the reasonable capacity of the sites. We have concerns about the impact of the proposals on protected adjoining Public Open Space and overdevelopment which would reduce open play ground and impact on residential new

**2. Generalised policies with minimal reliance on quantitative targets may cause issues for implementation.**

Generalised policies make it difficult to understand targets of the plan other than building housing and retail development.

**3. Should the canal and water environment be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule in Appendix 3?**

As British Waterways is due to become a charitable body its funding is likely to depend upon short term schemes through restricted finance. The canal is a metropolitan site for nature conservation and pollution is a problem. Pollution levels should be monitored and reduced.

Water quality in the River Brent should also be carefully monitored. Improvement requires co-operation between LB Brent, Ealing and DfT or TfL to reduce surface runoff from roads, incorrect house connections and foul water overflow. We would like to see the River Brent improved for health, amenity and wildlife. But finance would be needed for lowering pollution levels and reducing the occurrence of misconnections to the surface water drainage systems and polluted runoff from roads.

**Inclusion of the canal and the Brent River in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule would facilitate these improvements.**

**4. Whether the mechanisms in the CS for implementation and monitoring are sufficiently clear, detailed, and meet national policy requirements.**

We are particularly concerned about the need to expand schools with the increase in birth rate and the proposed population increase from implementation of the Core Strategy housing targets. The process for deciding locations of new schools does not seem sustainable or plan-led and therefore are unlikely to meet national requirements.