

Ealing 2026

Development Management Initial Proposals

September 2010

EALING
LONDON

REGENERATION & HOUSING

Contents

	Page
Chapter 1 – Introductions (including an Index of All Policies)	2
Chapter 2 - Places	9
Chapter 3 - People	13
Chapter 4 - Economy	22
Chapter 5 – Climate Change	28
Chapter 6 – Transport	44
Chapter 7 – Living Places and Spaces	50
Appendix A – Schedule of Changes Between The 2009 and 2010 Consultation Document Formats	68

1 Introduction

Regional Context

The Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD) is part of the broader Local Development Framework, which includes the Development Strategy and the Sites Document. Taken together, these documents analyse Ealing's development needs, identify opportunities arising in the borough, and describe a programme to realise these new developments. Within this framework, the role of the DM DPD is to set out the criteria by which planning applications are assessed.

The DM DPD refers principally to two main documents (both currently in draft), the council's Development Strategy, and the Replacement London Plan (RLP). The Development Strategy sets out the spatial vision for development in the borough, explaining the relationship to each other of its different areas and functions. The RLP is a combined document that incorporates the spatial vision for London with specific Development Management policies that apply to all boroughs. The wording of RLP policies set out in this document is that which was published for public consultation at the end of 2009 (with the early suggested changes published in May 2010), this is liable to change as the RLP goes through its own examination process at the end of 2010. The final Ealing DM DPD will take account of these changes.

Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document

The Ealing DM DPD should conform generally with the development management policies set out in the RLP. The council, however, is able to vary these policies according to local circumstances, and also to introduce new policies to further its Development Strategy vision. It is therefore proposed to structure the DM DPD policies in the same way as the RLP, using the same numbering and themes. In consequence of changes in the structure of the RLP from the preceding Consolidated London Plan, therefore, this new draft of the DM DPD represents a significant change of structure from that which was used before. Given these changes a table has been produced at Appendix A showing how the proposals from the previous consultation have been accommodated within this new structure.

Our Approach

The improved approach of the RLP to development management policies raises the possibility to reduce duplication and ambiguity between it and the Ealing DM DPD. RLP policies are more clearly set out and better worded for use in planning applications. This recommended the current policy approach in two ways. Firstly, this format makes RLP policies much more suitable for local use and

variation. Secondly, this improved wording risks increased conflict and appeals to the Planning Inspectorate where there is no direct co-ordination between regional and local policies. For this reason too, an entirely self-contained local policy document was considered undesirable, as it would make the final policy framework more complex and difficult to use.

The Consultation

Only policies that relate to development management are reproduced in this document. The index immediately following this introduction lists all of the policies in this document and, since this is the structure which it follows, all of the policies in the RLP.

For the sake of clarity however, the presentation of each of type of policy is differentiated.

1. Those RLP policies that do not relate to development management are shown in the index as ~~struck through~~. They are not reproduced in the main document as they will have no direct bearing on planning applications in the borough
2. Development management policies in the RLP are shown in plain text. These make up the backbone of London's shared development management framework.
3. All local policies, whether local variations or entirely new policies are shown in **yellow highlight**. Local variations to these RLP development management policies are also indented throughout the text.

Commentary summarises relevant considerations for each policy, including the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, and responses from the previous consultation where these produced a consensus. Not every policy will require local variation and policies that have been left without commentary are those for which no further refinement is proposed.

This appears in a light grey box.

Comments are invited on all of the policies in this document. We are also particularly interested to hear views on the variations that we propose to RLP policies. Accordingly, where the proposed approach raises different options, these are articulated as specific questions in the 'Consultation' section that follows the main policy.

This appears in orange text.

Index of All Policies

2 Places

Policy 2.1	London in its global, European and United Kingdom context	
Policy 2.2	London and the wider metropolitan area	
Policy 2.3	Growth Areas and Co-ordination Corridors	
Policy 2.4	The 2012 Games and their legacy	
Policy 2.5	Sub-regions	
Policy 2.6	Outer London: vision and strategy	
Policy 2.7	Outer London: economy	
Policy 2.8	Outer London: transport	
Policy 2.9	Inner London	
Policy 2.10	Central Activities Zone — strategic priorities	
Policy 2.11	Central Activities Zone — strategic functions	
Policy 2.12	Central Activities Zone — predominantly local activities	
Policy 2.13	Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas	p9
Policy 2.14	Areas for regeneration	
Policy 2.15	Town Centres	p10
Policy 2.16	Strategic outer London development centres	
Policy 2.17	Strategic industrial locations	p11
Policy 2.18	Green infrastructure: the network of open and natural space	p11

3 People

Policy 3.1	Ensuring equal life chances for all	p13
Policy 3.2	Addressing health inequalities	p13
Policy 3.3	Increasing housing supply	
Policy 3.4	Optimising housing potential	
Policy 3.5	Quality and design of housing developments	p14
Policy 3.6	Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities	p15
Policy 3.7	Large residential developments	p16
Policy 3.8	Housing choice	
Policy 3.9	Gypsies and travellers (including travelling show people)	

Policy 3.10	Mixed and balanced communities	
Policy 3.11	Definition of affordable housing	
Policy 3.12	Affordable housing targets	
Policy 3.13	Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes	p16
Policy 3.14	Affordable housing thresholds	p17
Policy 3.15	Existing housing	p18
Policy 3.16	Coordination of housing development and investment	
Policy 3.17	Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure	p18
Policy 3.18	Healthcare facilities	p19
Policy 3.19	Education facilities	p19
Policy 3.20	Sports facilities	p20

4 Economy

Policy 4.1	Developing London's economy	
Policy 4.2	Offices	
Policy 4.3	Mixed use development and offices	
Policy 4.4	Managing industrial land and premises	
Policy 4A	Employment uses	p22
Policy 4.5	London's visitor infrastructure	p23
	Local variation to Policy 4.5	p23
Policy 4.6	Support and enhance the provision for arts, culture and entertainment	p23
Policy 4.7	Retail and town centre development	p24
	Local variation to Policy 4.7	p24
Policy 4.8	Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector	p24
	Local variation to Policy 4.8	p25
Policy 4B	'A' use classes	p26
Policy 4.9	Small shops	p26
	Local variation to Policy 4.9	p27
Policy 4.10	New and emerging economic sectors	
Policy 4.11	Encouraging a connected economy	
Policy 4.12	Improving opportunities for all	p27

5 Climate change

Policy 5.1	Climate change mitigation	
Policy 5.2	Minimising carbon dioxide emissions	p28
	Local variation to Policy 5.2	p29
Policy 5A	Building efficiency and renewable energy	p31
Policy 5.3	Sustainable design and construction	p35
Policy 5.4	Retrofitting	
Policy 5.5	Decentralised energy networks	
Policy 5.6	Decentralised energy in development proposals	p35
Policy 5.7	Renewable energy	p36
Policy 5.8	Innovative energy technologies	
Policy 5.9	Overheating and cooling	p36
Policy 5.10	Urban greening	p37
	Local variation to Policy 5.10	p37
Policy 5.11	Green roofs and development site environs	p38
	Local variation to Policy 5.11	p38
Policy 5.12	Flood risk management	p38
	Local variation to Policy 5.12	p39
Policy 5.13	Sustainable drainage	p39
Policy 5.14	Water quality and sewerage infrastructure	p40
Policy 5.15	Water use and supplies	p40
Policy 5.16	Waste self-sufficiency	
Policy 5.17	Waste capacity	p41
Policy 5.18	Construction, excavation and demolition waste	p42
Policy 5.19	Hazardous waste	
Policy 5.20	Aggregates	
Policy 5.21	Contaminated land	p42
	Local variation to Policy 5.21	p42
Policy 5.22	Hazardous substances	p43

6 Transport

Policy 6.1	Strategic approach	
Policy 6.2	Providing transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport	p44
Policy 6.3	Assessing transport capacity	p44
Policy 6.4	Enhancing London's transport connectivity	
Policy 6.5	Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure	p45
Policy 6.6	Aviation	p46
Policy 6.7	Buses, bus transits, trams	
Policy 6.8	Coaches	
Policy 6.9	Cycling	p46
	Local variation to Policy 6.9	p47
Policy 6.10	Walking	p47
Policy 6.11	Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion	
Policy 6.12	Road network capacity	p47
Policy 6.13	Parking	p47
Policy 6.14	Freight	p48
	Local variation to Policy 6.14	p49
Policy 6.15	Strategic rail freight interchange	p49

7 Living Places and Spaces

Policy 7.1	Building London's neighbourhoods and communities	p50
Policy 7A	Operational Amenity	p50
Policy 7.2	An inclusive environment	p52
	Local variation to Policy 7.2	p53
Policy 7.3	Secured by design	p53
	Local variation to Policy 7.3	p53
Policy 7.4	Local character	p54
Policy 7.5	Public realm	p54
Policy 7.6	Architecture	p55
Policy 7B	Design Amenity	p55
Policy 7.7	Location and design of tall and large buildings	p57

	Local variation to Policy 7.7	p58
Policy 7.8	Heritage assets and archaeology	p59
Policy 7C	Heritage	p60
Policy 7.9	Heritage-led regeneration	
Policy 7.10	World Heritage Sites	
Policy 7.11	London View Management Framework	
Policy 7.12	Implementing the London View Management Framework	p60
	Local variation to Policy 7.12	p61
Policy 7.13	Safety, security and resilience to emergency	p62
Policy 7.14	Improving air quality	p62
	Local variation to Policy 7.14	p62
Policy 7.15	Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes	p63
Policy 7.16	Green Belt	p63
Policy 7.17	Metropolitan Open Land	p63
Policy 7D	Open space	p64
Policy 7.18	Protecting local natural space and addressing local deficiency	
Policy 7.19	Biodiversity and access to nature	p64
Policy 7.20	Geological conservation	p65
Policy 7.21	Trees and woodlands	p65
Policy 7.22	Land for food	p65
Policy 7.23	Burial spaces	
Policy 7.24	Blue Ribbon Network	
Policy 7.25	Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for passengers and tourism	
Policy 7.26	Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for freight transport	p66
Policy 7.27	Blue Ribbon Network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use	p66
Policy 7.28	Restoration of the Blue Ribbon Network	p67
Policy 7.29	The River Thames	
Policy 7.30	London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces	p67

2 Places

Introduction - This chapter links to the spatial plan for development set out in the Development Strategy. Its policies support the borough's opportunity areas and strategic hierarchies of retail, employment and services.

Policy 2.13 Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas

Planning decisions

C

Development proposals within Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas should:

- a support the strategic policy directions for the Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas set out in Annexe 1, and where relevant, in adopted Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks
- b seek to optimise residential and non-residential output and densities, provide necessary social and other infrastructure to sustain growth, and, where appropriate, contain a mix of uses
- c contribute towards meeting (or where appropriate, exceeding) the minimum guidelines for housing and/or indicative estimates for employment capacity set out in Annexe 1
- d realise scope for intensification associated with existing or proposed improvements in public transport accessibility, such as Crossrail, making better use of existing Infrastructure and promote inclusive access including cycling and walking
- e support wider regeneration (including In particular Improvements to environmental quality) and integrate development proposals to the surrounding areas especially Areas for Regeneration.

(Where Annexes are referred to in the above text they relate to the overall targets for housing and employment set out in the RLP)

Commentary – Opportunity areas are the main identified development sites in the RLP, typically with a capacity of around 5,000 jobs and/or 2,500 homes. Smaller opportunity sites are defined in local plan documents. In Ealing’s case the RLP identifies Opportunity areas at Park Royal and Southall.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Consultation –

**Are there any additional general principles which should apply specifically to the borough’s identified Opportunity Areas?
Should this policy apply more generally to the opportunity sites identified in the Sites DPD?**

Policy 2.15 | Town Centres

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals in town centres should conform with policies 4.7 and 4.8 and:

a sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the centre

b accommodate economic and/or housing growth through intensification and selective expansion in appropriate locations

c support and enhance the competitiveness, quality and diversity of town centre retail, leisure, arts and cultural, other consumer services and public services

d be in scale with the centre

e promote access by public transport, walking and cycling

f promote safety, security and ‘lifetime neighbourhoods’

g contribute towards an enhanced environment, urban greening, public realm and links to green infrastructure

h reduce delivery, servicing and road user conflict.

Commentary – The town centre boundaries will be identified on the Proposals Map.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Consultation –

Are there any other general principles that should apply specifically to development in Town Centres?

Policy 2.17 | Strategic industrial locations

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals in SILs should be refused unless:

- a they fall within the broad industrial type activities outlined in paragraph 2.71
- b they are part of a strategically coordinated process of SIL consolidation through an Opportunity Area Planning Framework or borough DPD
- c the proposal is for employment workspace to meet identified needs for small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) or new emerging industrial sectors
- d the proposal is for small scale ‘walk to’ services for industrial occupiers such as workplace crèches or cafes.

C

Development proposals within or adjacent to SILs should not compromise the integrity or effectiveness of these locations in accommodating industrial type activities.

Commentary – This policy continues the Ealing’s previously established approach to employment sites and accords with the Development Strategy. SILs is the overarching term for Preferred Industrial Locations (mainly manufacturing/industrial uses) and Industrial Business Parks (including office functions). In Ealing’s case the main SIL is Park Royal.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 2.18 | Green infrastructure: the network of open and natural spaces

Planning decisions

D

Enhancements to London’s green infrastructure should be sought from development and where a proposal falls within a regional or metropolitan park deficiency area (Policy 7.18), it should contribute to addressing this need.

E

Development proposals should:

- a incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into the wider network
- b encourage the linkage of green infrastructure to the wider public realm to improve accessibility for all and develop new links, including utilising Green Chains street trees, and other components of urban greening (Policy 5.10).

Commentary – This policy seems to give adequate guidance on the importance of green infrastructure, and its place in improving biodiversity and ensuring public open space.

A local variation is proposed to add further detail on the minimum widths required for plot boundaries where these are to serve a green corridor function, or where a soft edge is required on sites adjacent to existing natural open space. The borough's network of existing and proposed green corridors will be identified on the Proposals Map.

Consultation –

Other than existing open space, are there any places where the use of green plot boundaries should be considered for biodiversity reasons?

3 People

Introduction - This chapter describes policies that relate directly to people, such as housing and community facilities.

Policy 3.1 | Ensuring equal life chances for all

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should protect and enhance facilities that meet the needs of particular groups and communities. Proposals involving loss of these facilities without adequate justification or provision for replacement should be resisted.

C

Development proposals should have regard to the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment' and other guidance issued by the Mayor.

Commentary – This approach essentially strengthens the options suggested in the previous consultation, extending protection from community facilities in general to any facility that meet the needs of a particular group. The Accessible London SPG, which is referenced in the policy, provides extensive guidance on accessibility requirements for different types of development

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.2 | Addressing health inequalities

Planning decisions

C

New developments should be designed and constructed in ways that improve health and reduce health inequalities.

D

Health inequalities impacts of major planning applications should be considered through the use of Health Impact Assessments (HIA).

Commentary – This policy has no direct equivalent in the previous consultation document or existing UDP. It introduces the concept that major development can exercise significant influences over the lifestyle and health of its users and residents. Health Impact assessments would ensure that large new projects consider these impacts, such as their tendency to encourage walking.

This policy will not apply to smaller developments or householder applications.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.5 | Quality and design of housing developments

Planning decisions and LDF preparation

B

The design of all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context, local character, density, tenure and land use mix, and relationships with, and provision of public, communal and open spaces, taking particular account of the needs of children and older people

C

The design of all new dwellings should take account of factors relating to 'arrival' at the building and the 'home as a place of retreat', meet the dwelling space standards set out in Table 3.3, have adequately sized rooms and convenient and efficient room layouts, meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes, address climate change adaptation and mitigation and social inclusion objectives and should be conceived and developed through an effective design process

D

Development proposals which compromise the delivery of elements of this policy should be resisted unless they are otherwise of exemplary design and make significant contributions towards achievement of other objectives of this Plan

E

The Mayor will provide guidance on implementation of this policy including on housing design for all tenures.

Minimum dwelling by floor area	Dwelling type (bedroom/persons)	Essential Gross Internal Area (metres)
Flats	1b2p	50
	2b3p	61
	2b4p	70
	3b4p	74
	3b5p	86
	3b6p	100
	4b5p	90
	4b6p	99
2 storey houses	2b4p	83
	3b4p	86
	3b5p	96
	4b5p	100
	4b6p	107
3 storey houses	3b5p	102
	4b5p	106
	4b6p	113

Commentary – This policy updates existing UDP policies. Table 3.3 (above) appears on p70 of the RLP and details minimum internal space standards for flats, and 2 and 3 storey houses depending on the numbers of bedrooms and people.

A local variation is proposed which will provide more detail on room sizes and how these sizes are to be calculated. Specifically, it will deal with the height of a space necessary for it to be considered ‘usable’ floor area. This is particularly important in rooms with sloping ceilings, and loft conversions.

Additional detail is provided through the two amenity policies (Ealing policies 7A and 7B).

Consultation –

Are there any other factors relating specifically to residential design which should be included in the local variation to this policy?

Policy 3.6 | Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child

population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs. The Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Providing for Children and Young People's play and informal recreation' sets out guidance to assist in this process.

Commentary – Taken together with the existing London SPG on play and recreation space (which sets out specific requirements for provision) this policy should provide sufficient guidance as to the requirements for play and recreation space in new development.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.7 | Large residential developments

Strategic, planning decisions and LDF preparation

A

Proposals for large residential developments including complementary non-residential uses are encouraged in areas of high public transport accessibility.

B

Those on sites of over five hectares or capable of accommodating more than 500 dwellings should be subject to planning framework to coordinate provision of social, environmental and other infrastructure and create neighbourhoods with a distinctive character, sense of local pride and civic identity in line with Chapter 7. Frameworks should be prepared in consultation with local communities and other stakeholders.

Commentary – Potential extensions of this policy would require larger developments to make provision or suitable financial contributions for allotment and/or burial land.

Consultation –

Should we explore the possibility of contributions to provision of allotments and/or burial land? (If the government implements the Community Infrastructure Levy then we will probably not need to include this in the policy.)

Policy 3.13 | Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes

Planning decisions and LDF preparation

A

The maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should be sought when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes, having regard to:

- a current and future requirements for affordable housing at local and regional levels identified in line with Policies 3.8 and 3.11 and 3.12
- b affordable housing targets adopted in line with policy 3.12,
- c the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development (Policy 3.3),
- d the need to promote mixed and balanced communities (Policy 3.10)
- e the size and type of affordable housing needed in particular locations
- f the specific circumstances of individual sites.

B
Negotiations on sites should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability, the availability of public subsidy, the implications of phased development including 'overage' provisions and other scheme requirements.

See also: Development Strategy Policy 1.2a

Commentary – The previous DM DPD consultation found support for matching the profile of housing units delivered to the actual demand for different types of housing in the Borough. This policy will be augmented with further detail if this is found to be necessary in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

The RLP policy seems to give sufficient basis for any negotiations that would be necessary to realise the levels of provision which are suggested in the SHMA. No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.14 | Affordable housing thresholds

Planning decisions and LDF preparation

A
Boroughs should normally require affordable housing provision on a site that has capacity to provide 10 or more homes, applying the density guidance set out in Policy 3.4 of this Plan and Table 3.2.

B
Boroughs are encouraged to seek a lower threshold through the LDF process where this can be justified in accordance with guidance, including circumstances where this will enable proposals for larger dwellings in terms of floorspace to make an equitable contribution to affordable housing provision.

Commentary – Detail on local requirements for affordable housing provision will be based on the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This reflects the desire expressed in the previous consultation for the types of houses provided in the Borough

to reflect those in greatest demand.

The density matrix referred to is identical to that currently in operation in the Consolidated London Plan which replaced the provisions of the UDP.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.15 | Existing housing

Planning decisions and LDF preparation

B

Loss of housing, including affordable housing should be resisted unless the housing is replaced at existing or higher densities with at least equivalent floorspace.

C

This policy includes the loss of hostels, staff accommodation and shared accommodation that meet an identified housing need, unless the existing floorspace is satisfactorily re-provided to an equivalent or better standard. The loss of housing to short-term provision (lettings less than 90 days) should also be resisted.

D

Boroughs should promote efficient use of the existing stock by reducing the number of vacant, unfit and unsatisfactory dwellings, including through setting and monitoring targets for bringing properties back into use. In particular, boroughs should prioritise long term empty homes, derelict empty homes and listed buildings to be brought back into residential use.

Consultation –

Are there any other criteria which should be considered in the protection of existing housing?

Policy 3.17 | Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should support the provision of additional social infrastructure in light of local and strategic needs assessments. Proposals which would result in a net loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need should be resisted.

C

Facilities should be accessible to all sections of the community (including disabled and older people) and be located within easy reach by walking, cycling and public transport. Wherever possible, the multiple use of premises should be encouraged.

Commentary – The previous consultation dealt with social infrastructure, and healthcare and social facilities together. There was strong support for protecting existing social these existing facilities. Previous suggested policy approaches did not include a link to the importance of facilities being within walking distance of their target communities.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Consultation –

Are there any other criteria which should be considered in the protection of social infrastructure?

Policy 3.18 | Healthcare and social facilities

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals which provide high quality healthcare facilities will be supported in areas of identified need, particularly in places with accessibility by public transport, cycling and walking. Where local health services are being changed, the Mayor will expect to see replacement services operational before the facilities they replace are closed.

C

Relevant development proposals should take into account the Mayor’s Best Practice Guidance on Health Issues in Planning.

Commentary – The previous consultation dealt with social infrastructure, and healthcare and social facilities together. There was strong support for protecting these existing facilities. Previous suggested policy approaches did not include a link to the importance of facilities being within walking distance of their target communities.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Consultation –

Are there any other criteria which should be considered in the protection of social infrastructure?

Policy 3.19 | Education facilities

Planning decisions

B
Development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported, including new build, expansion of existing or change of use to educational purposes. Those which address the current projected shortage of primary school places will be particularly encouraged. Proposals which result in the net loss of education facilities should be resisted, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no ongoing or future demand.

C
Development proposals which maximise the extended or multiple use of educational facilities for community or recreational use should be encouraged.

D
Development proposals that encourage co-location of services between schools and colleges and other provision should be encouraged in order to maximise land use, reduce costs and develop the extended school or college's offer. On-site or off-site sharing of services between schools and colleges should be supported.

Commentary – Previous suggested policy approaches did not include a link to the importance of facilities being within walking distance of their target communities.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Policy 3.20 | Sports facilities

Planning decisions

B
Development proposals that increase or enhance the provision of sports and recreation facilities will be supported. Proposals that result in a net loss of sports and recreation facilities, including playing fields should be resisted. Temporary facilities may provide the means of mitigating any loss as part of proposals for permanent re-provision. Wherever possible, multi-use public facilities for sport and recreational activity should be encouraged. The provision of floodlighting should be supported in areas where there is an identified need for sports facilities to increase sports participation opportunities, unless the floodlighting gives rise to demonstrable harm to local community or biodiversity.

C
Where sports facility developments are proposed on existing open space, they will need to be considered carefully in light of policies on Green Belt and protecting open space (Chapter 7) as well as the boroughs' own assessment of needs and opportunities for both sports facilities and for green multifunctional open space.

See also: Policy 7D – Open space

Commentary – The wording of the RLP requires that there is ‘no net loss’ in the provision of sports facilities. This is a strengthening of the policy approach proposed in the previous consultation and also accords with the bulk of representations that were received on this issue.

No local variations are proposed to the RLP policy.

4 Economy

Introduction – Policies which support economic development in the Borough.

Ealing Policy 4A | Employment uses

Local Policy

A

Change of use from employment uses, or the redevelopment of the site for a non-employment use, will only be granted where all of the following can be demonstrated;

a the site is not viable for re-occupation (including renewal and refurbishment)

b the site is not viable for redevelopment/renewal for an employment use (including small offices where appropriate)

c the proposal does not constrain or introduce potential new conflicts with neighbouring employment uses

B

Where retaining a building or site in employment use is not viable the council will seek:

a mixed use development which maximises the amount of employment space retained

b use of the building or site for an alternative economic land use

Employment Uses are those which fall within the B use classes plus other closely related uses commonly found on employment sites (for example garages and motor repair).

Economic Land Uses are defined in paragraph 4 of PPS 4 (December 2009) and includes development within the B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses. It also includes other development which achieves at least one of the following objectives:

1. Provides employment opportunities
2. Generates wealth or
3. Produces or generates an economic output or product

A site is not viable for re-occupation as an employment use where it is not lettable at a reasonable market rate for a period of six months or more.

Redevelopment proposals undermine neighbouring employment uses where they create generate conflicting interests which did not

previously exist. For example, residential development would undermine neighbouring employment uses where it would necessitate reductions in operating or delivery hours.

Policy 4.5 | London's visitor infrastructure

Planning decisions

B

Developments should:

- a contribute towards the hotel provision target and ensure that at least 10 per cent of bedrooms are wheelchair accessible
- b be consistent with the strategic location principles set out above
- c not result in the loss of strategically important hotel capacity.

Commentary – This is an issue with lesser applicability to Ealing than to some central London Boroughs. The following local variation should ensure that this policy complements the spatial objectives of the Development Strategy.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 4.5 | London's visitor infrastructure

Hotel development in Ealing Borough is directed toward the Town Centres as defined in the Development Strategy and to major transport hubs.

Policy 4.6 | Support and enhance the provision for arts, culture and entertainment

Planning decisions

B

Developments should:

- a fulfil the sequential approach and where necessary, complete an impact assessment (see Policy 4.7)
- b be located on sites where there is good existing or planned access by public transport
- c be accessible to all sections of the community, including disabled and older people
- d address deficiencies in facilities and provide a cultural focus to foster more sustainable local communities.

Commentary – Arts and culture were identified as priority areas for Ealing in the Development Strategy. Specific proposals should come from the Development Strategy, the Sites DPD, and relevant the council, voluntary and private sector strategies. No additional support should be necessary in the DM DPD in order for these plans to be realised.

No local variation is proposed to the RLP policy.

Policy 4.7 | Retail and town centre development

Planning decisions

B

- a the scale of retail, commercial, culture and leisure development should be related to the size, role and function of a town centre and its catchment
- b retail, commercial, culture and leisure development should be focused on sites within town centres, or if no in-centre sites are available, on sites on the edges of centres that are, or can be, well integrated with the existing centre and public transport
- c proposals for new or extensions to existing edge or out of centre development will be subject to an assessment of impact.

Ealing Local Variation to Policy 4.7 | Retail and town centre development

Proposals for street markets will be approved where they will have a positive effect on the vitality and vibrancy of the town centre.

Development will also be tested against other relevant policies including those covering amenity, 7B and 7C.

Commentary – This approach to street markets was suggested in the previous consultation and generally supported. There is no specific development management policy in the RLP relating to street markets so it is expressed as a local variation.

Policy 4.8 | Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector

LDF and planning decision preparation

B

LDFs should:

- a bring forward capacity for additional comparison goods retailing particularly in International, Metropolitan and Major centres
- b support convenience retail particularly in District, Neighbourhood and more local centres, to secure a sustainable pattern of provision and strong, 'lifetime neighbourhoods' (see Policy 7.1)
- c provide a policy framework for maintaining, managing and enhancing local and neighbourhood shopping and facilities which

provide local goods and services, and develop policies to prevent the loss of retail and related facilities that provide essential convenience and specialist shopping

d identify areas under-served in local convenience shopping and services provision and support additional facilities at an appropriate scale in locations accessible by walking, cycling and public transport to serve existing or new residential communities

e support the range of street, farmers' and, where relevant, strategic markets, complementing other measures to improve their management, enhance their offer and contribute to the vitality of town centres

f support the development of 'e-tailing' and more efficient delivery systems.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 4.8 | Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector

Applications for change of use of A1 units to A2 and A3 in designated and non-designated retail frontages will be permitted only where they do not result in more than 30 per cent of the total number of units being in non-A1 use.

Where a frontage is designated, this percentage will be calculated based on the formal boundaries of the centre. Where it is not designated, the calculation will be based on the number of continuous or nearly continuous non-residential units.

Commentary – Current UDP policy does not fully address the change of uses within designated frontages, a percentage test seems more consistent than testing the number of adjacent units.

Consultation –

Are there any other issues relating to the protection of local shops which are not contained within a designated retail frontage?

Ealing Policy 4B | 'A' use classes

Local Policy

A

New A class development must have particular concern for its surroundings and neighbouring uses. Poor façade design is sufficient reason for refusal.

B

New development must not result in over-concentration of a particular use type where this use may erode local amenity by nature of that concentration.

C

Standards applying to common types of 'A' use class development are set out at the table below.

The A use classes are particularly important to the public realm as they present a highly visible public face and have a prominent role in Town Centres. In addition to standard design concerns, it is particularly important that new façades add quality and character to town centres.

Some uses may be acceptable as individual units but can erode the quality of the townscape and range of service offer when they concentrate in large numbers.

Type of Use	Restrictions
Fast food outlets, Amusement Arcades	Outside of town centres are not permitted within 400m radius of existing schools or youth centred facility (e.g. YMCA, after school club). Must have particular regard for the existing townscape in the design of signage and façade. Each new unit must be separated from any unit or group of units by at least two units of other uses.
Night-time uses	Must consider neighbouring uses especially residential. Officers will have particular concern for over-concentrations of these uses.

Policy 4.9 | Small shops

Planning decisions

A

In considering proposals for large retail developments, the Mayor will seek contributions through planning obligations where appropriate, feasible and viable, to support the provision of affordable shop units suitable for small or independent retailers.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 4.9 | Small Shops

The council will seek contributions to the development of small shop units also from large residential schemes where these schemes are not within a 400m radius of existing local shops. These contributions will generally be in the form of small shop units on site.

Large residential schemes, those of 50 units or more, which are located outside of convenient walking distance of existing shopping provision will create demand for local convenience retail units. This demand should be satisfied on site by the provision of at least one small shop unit on a publicly accessible street frontage.

Consultation –

Are there any other ways in which the council can facilitate the provision of small shop units?

Policy 4.12 | Improving opportunities for all

Planning decisions

B

Strategic development proposals should support local employment, skills development and training opportunities.

5 Climate Change

Introduction – policies relating directly to the efforts to reduce climate change and mitigate its effects

Policy 5.2 | Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:

- 1 Be lean: use less energy
- 2 Be clean: supply energy efficiently
- 3 Be green: use renewable energy

B

All major development proposals should meet the following targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction in buildings. These targets are expressed as minimum improvements over the Target Emission Rate (TER) outlined in the national Building Regulations leading to zero carbon residential buildings from 2016 and zero carbon non-domestic buildings from 2019.

Residential buildings:

Year.....	Improvement on 2006 Building Regulations*
2010 – 2013	44 per cent
2013 – 2016	55 per cent
2016 – 2031	Zero carbon

*

To be calculated using a 'Flat 25 per cent' approach for new homes in accordance with the final 2010 Part L Building Regulations.

Non-domestic buildings:

Year.....	Improvement on 2006 Building Regulations*
2010 – 2013	44 per cent
2013 – 2016	55 per cent
2016 – 2019	As per building regulations requirements
2019 – 2031	Zero carbon

*

To be calculated using an 'Aggregate 25 per cent' approach new non-domestic buildings in accordance with the final 2010 Part L Building Regulations.

C
Major development proposals should include a detailed energy assessment to demonstrate how the minimum targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction outlined above are to be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy.

D
As a minimum, energy assessments should include the following details:

- a Calculation of baseline energy demand and carbon dioxide emissions on a ‘whole energy’ basis, showing the contribution of emissions both from uses covered by building regulations and those that are not (see paragraph 5.22) , at each stage of the energy hierarchy;
- b Proposals to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the energy efficient design of the site, buildings and services;
- c Proposals to further reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the use of decentralised energy where feasible, such as district heating and cooling and combined heat and power (CHP); and
- d Proposals to further reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the use of onsite renewable energy technologies.

E
The carbon dioxide reduction targets should be met onsite. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the specific targets cannot be fully achieved onsite, any shortfall may be provided offsite or through a cash in lieu contribution to the relevant borough to be ring fenced to secure delivery of carbon dioxide savings elsewhere.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 5.2 / Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

New development should aim to achieve the requirements in RLP Policy 5.2 through the best practice standards set out in the table below. This table describes realistic targets for Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM), Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and Renewable Energy Systems (RES).

Major applications must include an energy assessment that demonstrates how reductions in the emissions of CO₂ have been achieved.

Use Class	Development Group	Energy Hierarchy	CO ₂ Targets	Overall CO ₂ Target
A1/A2/A3/A4/A5	Retail	EEM	15%	20%
		CHP	10%	
		RES	10%	

Use Class	Development Group	Energy Hierarchy	CO ₂ Targets	Overall CO ₂ Target
B1/B2	Office	EEM	18%	30%
		CHP	24%	
		RES	13%	
B8	Warehouse	EEM	8%	25%
		CHP	not feasible	
		RES	17%	
C1/C2	Hotel	EEM	15%	45%
		CHP	35%	
		RES	57%	
D1/D2	School	EEM	15%	30%
		CHP	not feasible	
		RES	23%	
C3	Residential Block	EEM	20%	55%
		CHP	30% (40% for 50+ units)	
		RES	34%	
C3	House	EEM	25%	50%
		CHP	not feasible	
		RES	27%	

Ealing Policy 5A | Building Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Local Policy

A

New development must demonstrate full consideration of CHP.

B

The council may require new development to connect to district heating systems as and when these are developed in the borough

C

New development which falls below the threshold of major development must achieve emissions savings according to the table below

D

Residential extensions are must incorporate reasonable energy efficiency measures up to 10% of the value of building works. These measures will be applied to the whole dwelling.

A significant proportion of the residential development in the borough falls outside of the category of major development. It is necessary for this development also to make a contribution to the

Reasonable energy efficiency measures for extensions and conversions are any forms of energy efficiency measure which are available at reasonable cost to a given development, such as increased insulation and improved boiler equipment. The 10 per cent figure is a maximum and will not be required in all cases.

Class Use	Development Group	% CO ₂ emission savings from feasible & cost effective measure:	Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM)	Combined Heat & Power (CHP)	Renewable Energy Sources (RES)
			(Regulated & Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)
A1: Shops A2: Finance/Professionals A3-5 Food & drink	Supermarket	EEM+CHP: a) 30.2% (regulated) b) 26.1% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 29.2% (regulated) b) 25.1% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 19.2% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 15.1%	11%	Biomass Heating: 10%

Class Use	Development Group	% CO ₂ emission savings from feasible & cost effective measure:	Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM)	Combined Heat & Power (CHP)	Renewable Energy Sources (RES)
			(Regulated & Regulated + Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated + Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated + Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)
	Restaurant	EEM+Biomass: a) 32.4% (regulated) b) 26.8% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+ASHP: a) 26.4% (regulated) b) 21% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 14.4% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 8.8%	Not feasible	Biomass Heating:18% ASHP: 12%
B1/B2/B8: Business General Industry Storage and distribution	Office	EEM+CHP: a)50% (regulated) b) 42.7% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 38.8% (regulated) b) 31.7% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 25.8% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 18.7%	24%	Biomass Heating: 13%
	Warehouse	EEM+ASHP: a) 27.5% (regulated) b) 25.6% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Advanced Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 10.5% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 8.6%	Not feasible	ASHP: 17%
C1 /C2 : Hotels, guest houses and boarding houses/ Residential institutions	Hotel	EEM+CHP: a) 53.3% (regulated) b) 50.1% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 75.3% (regulated) b) 72.1% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 18.3% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 15.1%	35%	Biomass Heating:57%
D1/D2: Non-residential institutions/ Assembly & leisure	School	EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 41.4% (regulated) b) 38.7% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+ Wind: a) 28.4% (regulated) b) 25.7% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 18.4% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 15.7%	Not feasible	Biomass Heating: 23% Roof mounted wind turbines: 10%

Class Use	Development Group	% CO ₂ emission savings from feasible & cost effective measure:	Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM)	Combined Heat & Power (CHP)	Renewable Energy Sources (RES)
			(Regulated & Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)
All commercial class uses	Refurbishments	EEM: Min 15%	Below 1000m² : Compliance with Building Regulations Part L2B and demonstration of at least 10% of the development costs for energy efficiency measures Equal or above 1000m² : Compliance with targets achieved from this study	Below 1000m² : Installation of one or more of the low and zero carbon technologies, where feasible. Equal or above 1000m² : Compliance with targets achieved from this study	
C3: Dwellings	Flats (1-5 units)	EEM+Biomass: 78%(regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) 57.8% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Advanced Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 43.7% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 23.75%	Not feasible	Biomass Heating: 34%
	Flats (6-10 units)	EEM+Biomass: 78%(regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) 61% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Advanced Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 43.7% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 26.9%	Not feasible	Biomass Heating: 34%
	Flats (11-50 units)	EEM+CHP: a)78.2% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 67.9% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 78% (regulated) b) 61% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Advanced Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 43.7% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 26.9%	41%	Biomass Heating: 34%
	Flats (51-100+ units)	EEM+CHP: a)74.7% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 57.9% (regulated + Non-regulated) EEM+Biomass Heating: a) 78% (regulated) b) 61% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Advanced Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 43.7% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 26.9%	31%	Biomass Heating: 34%
	Detached	EEM+ASHP: a)67.3% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 55.3% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 39.3% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 27.3%	Not feasible	ASHP: 28%

Class Use	Development Group	% CO ₂ emission savings from feasible & cost effective measure:	Energy Efficiency Measures (EEM)	Combined Heat & Power (CHP)	Renewable Energy Sources (RES)
			(Regulated & Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)	(Regulated +Non-Regulated CO ₂ reduction)
	Semi-detached	EEM+ASHP: a)65.4% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 52.8% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 39.4% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 26.8%	Not feasible	ASHP: 26%
	End-Terrace	EEM+ASHP: a)68% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 54.7% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 39% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 25.7%	Not feasible	ASHP: 29%
	Mid-Terrace	EEM+ASHP: a)65% (regulated- exceeds Code Level 4) b) 51.5% (regulated + Non-regulated)	Best Fabric Standards Regulated Emission Savings: 38% Regulated + Non-Regulated: 24.5%	Not feasible	ASHP: 27%
	Refurbishments		Maximum: 70% Up to 4 units: Compliance with Building Regulations Part L1B and demonstration of at least 10% of the development costs for energy efficiency measures More than 4 units: Compliance with targets concluded from this study.	Up to 4 units: Installation of one or more of the low and zero carbon technologies, where feasible. More than 4 units: Compliance with targets concluded from this study.	

Commentary –

National policy, including the definition of Zero Carbon Homes and the national timetable for achieving levels 4-6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, is currently uncertain. Ealing has developed an exceptionally solid evidence base on building efficiency and renewable energy which will enable us to refine this policy as soon as the national context is known.

Policy 5.3 | Sustainable design and construction

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should demonstrate that sustainable design standards are integral to the proposal, including its construction and operation, and ensure that they are considered at the beginning of the design process.

C

Major development proposals should meet the minimum standards outlined in the Mayor's supplementary planning guidance and this should be clearly demonstrated within a design and access statement. The standards include measures to achieve other policies in this plan and the following sustainable design principles:

- a minimising carbon dioxide emissions across the site, including the building and services (such as heating and cooling systems)
- b avoiding internal overheating and contributing to the urban heat island effect
- c efficient use of natural resources(including water), including making the most of natural systems both within and around buildings
- d minimising pollution (including noise, air and urban runoff)
- e minimising the generation of waste and maximising reuse or recycling
- f avoiding impacts from natural hazards (including flooding)
- g ensuring developments are comfortable and secure for users, including avoiding the creation of adverse local climatic conditions
- h securing sustainable procurement of materials, using local supplies where feasible, and
- i promoting and protecting biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy 5.6 | Decentralised energy in development proposals

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should evaluate the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems, and where a new CHP system is appropriate also examine opportunities to extend the system beyond the site boundary to adjacent sites.

B

Major development proposals should select energy systems in accordance with the following hierarchy:

- 1 Connection to existing heating or cooling networks;
- 2 Site wide CHP network;
- 3 Communal heating and cooling;

C

Potential opportunities to meet the first priority in this hierarchy are outlined in the London Heat Map tool. Where future network opportunities are identified, proposals should be designed to connect to these networks.

Commentary – It is proposed to provide further guidance to supplement the supporting text to this policy. In this regard specific requirements will be set to manage applications for development located within or near to the opportunity areas identified in the Development Strategy. Guidance around the use of conditions, including securing connections to district heating networks, and managing phased developments to be built over longer time horizons will also be incorporated into this policy. All developments will also need to ensure that they are future proofed to allow for any potential connection to a heat distribution network.

Further information regarding the identified opportunity areas for the establishment of district heating can be found in the evidence base document.

Policy 5.7 | Renewable energy

Planning decisions

B

Within the framework of the energy hierarchy (see Policy 5.2), major development proposals should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions through the use of onsite renewable energy generation, where feasible.

See also: Policies 5.2, 5A

Commentary – Minimum and advisory standards for reducing CO2 emissions from renewable energy will be required as part of the Policy 5.2

Policy 5.9 | Overheating and cooling

Planning decisions

B

Major development proposals should reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems and demonstrate this in

accordance with the following cooling hierarchy:

- 1 minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design
- 2 reduce the amount of heat entering a building in summer through orientation, shading, albedo, fenestration, insulation and green roofs and walls
- 3 manage the heat within the building through exposed internal thermal mass and high ceilings
- 4 passive ventilation
- 5 mechanical ventilation
- 6 active cooling systems (ensuring they are the lowest carbon options).

C

Major development proposals should demonstrate how the design, materials, construction and operation of the development would minimise overheating and also meet its cooling needs. New development in London should also be designed to avoid the need for energy intensive air conditioning systems as much as possible. Further details and guidance regarding overheating and cooling are outlined in the London Climate Change Adaptation Strategy.

Policy 5.10 | Urban greening

Planning decisions

C

Development proposals should integrate green infrastructure from the beginning of the design process to contribute to urban greening, including the public realm. Elements that can contribute to this include tree planting, green roofs and walls, and soft landscaping. Major development proposals within the Central Activities Zone should also demonstrate how they are contributing to the target outlined above.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 5.10 | Urban greening

Development proposals should retain existing trees and plantings on the basis of no net loss of amenity. Trees subject to Tree Protection Orders must be retained intact and in situ.

Development proposals will generally be required to make provisions for trees or plantings on site to replace those which are lost in consequence of building or building works. While the extent and location of the planting need not necessarily be the same afterward as it was before, the quality and type of amenity should be the same. For instance, where a site offered space that was inhabitable by users of the building it will not be acceptable for this provision to be replaced by, for example, green walls.

Policy 5.11 | Green roofs and development site environs

Planning decisions

A

Major development proposals should be designed to include roof, wall and site planting, especially green roofs and walls where feasible, to deliver as many of the following objectives as possible:

- a adaptation to climate change (ie aiding cooling)
- b sustainable urban drainage
- c mitigation of climate change (ie aiding energy efficiency)
- d enhancement of biodiversity
- e accessible roof space
- f improvements to appearance and resilience of the building
- g growing food.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 5.11 | Green roofs and development site environs

Green roofs should also be considered in the design of smaller schemes; they may be acceptable in respect of open space requirements for a given development where proper public access is ensured.

Policy 5.12 | Flood risk management

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals must comply with the flood risk assessment and management requirements set out in PPS25 over the lifetime of the development and have regard to measures proposed in TE2100 and Catchment Flood Management Plans.

C

Developments which are required to pass the PPS25 Exceptions Test will need to address flood resilient design and emergency planning by demonstrating that:

- a the development will remain safe and operational under flood conditions
- b a strategy of either safe evacuation and/or safely remaining in the building is followed under flood conditions
- c key utilities including electricity, water, lifts etc will continue to be operational under flood conditions

d buildings are designed for quick recovery following a flood.

D

Development adjacent to flood defences will be required to protect the integrity of existing flood defences and wherever possible be set back from those defences to allow their management, maintenance and upgrading to be undertaken in a sustainable and cost effective way.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 5.12 | Flood risk management

A

All development, including that on land that is not on a defined floodplain, must ensure that it is not vulnerable to drainage and groundwater flooding.

B

New development that reduces the extent of the floodplain or is in any way vulnerable to flooding will not be permitted within an 8m buffer strip along all main rivers, and a 5m undeveloped buffer strip alongside all ordinary watercourses.

C

There is a general presumption against the hardstanding of domestic gardens and public open space.

This policy is without prejudice to the detailed recommendations of the Ealing SFRA.

Flood risk in Ealing is primarily from surface water and sewer systems, however, the south east corner of the borough is also part of the Thames floodplain. All development proposals brought forward for the south east corner of the borough must therefore also refer to the Hammersmith and Fulham SFRA to determine that there is no potential flood risk during a breach event. For cases where this cannot be determined, FRA specific Breach Analysis should be carried out.

The restrictions that operate in the buffer zones of watercourses mean that in practice the only development that will be allowed in these areas is occasional uses such as outdoor seating areas or water/electricity facilities for canal boats.

Policy 5.13 | Sustainable drainage

Planning decisions

A

Development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water runoff is managed as close to its source as possible in

line with the following drainage hierarchy:

- 1 store rainwater for later use
- 2 use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas
- 3 attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
- 4 attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release
- 5 discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
- 6 discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain
- 7 discharge rainwater to the combined sewer.

Policy 5.14 | Water quality and sewerage infrastructure

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals must ensure that adequate sewerage infrastructure capacity is available. Proposals that would result in contravention of the requirements of the Water Framework Directive should be refused.

C

Development proposals to upgrade London's sewage (including sludge) treatment capacity should be supported provided they utilise best available technology and energy capture.

D

The development of the Thames Tideway Sewer Tunnels to address London's combined sewer overflows should be supported in principle.

Policy 5.15 | Water use and supplies

Planning decisions

B

Development should minimise the use of treated water by:

- a incorporating water saving measures and equipment
- b meeting water consumption targets of 105l/p/d in residential development.

C

New development for sustainable water supply infrastructure will be supported.

Policy 5.17 | Waste capacity

Planning decisions

B

Proposals for waste management should be evaluated against the following criteria:

a locational suitability (see LDF preparation F and G below)

b proximity to the source of waste

c the nature of activity proposed and its scale

d a positive carbon outcome of waste treatment methods and technologies (including the transportation of waste, recyclates and waste derived products) resulting in greenhouse gas savings, particularly from treatment of waste derived products to generate energy

e the environmental impact on surrounding areas, particularly noise emissions, odour and visual impact and impact on water resources

f the full transport and environmental impact of all collection, transfer and disposal movements, particularly maximising the potential use of rail and water transport using the Blue Ribbon Network

The following will be supported:

g developments that include a range of complementary waste facilities on a single site

h developments for manufacturing related to recycled waste

i developments that contribute towards renewable energy generation, in particular the use of technologies that produce a renewable gas

j developments for producing renewable energy from organic/biomass waste.

C

Wherever possible, opportunities should be taken to provide combined heat and power and combined cooling heat and power.

D

Developments adjacent to waste management sites should be designed to minimise the potential for disturbance and conflicts of use.

E

Suitable waste and recycling storage facilities are required in all new developments.

See also: Ealing Waste SPG

Policy 5.18 | Construction, excavation and demolition waste

Planning decisions

A

New construction, excavation and demolition (CE&D) waste management facilities should be encouraged at existing waste sites, including safeguarded wharves, and supported by:

a using mineral extraction sites for CE&D recycling

b ensuring that major development sites are required to recycle CE&D waste on-site, wherever practicable, supported through planning conditions.

B

Waste should be removed from construction sites, and materials brought to the site, by water or rail transport wherever that is practicable.

Commentary – Policies 5.17 and 5.18 will be supplemented by a further suite of policies currently being developed as part of the emerging waste development plan document – a document jointly being prepared by the six West London Waste Authority Boroughs. Consultation on the next draft of this document is due to commence in late autumn 2010.

Policy 5.21 | Contaminated land

Planning decisions

B

Appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that development on previously contaminated land does not activate or spread contamination.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 5.21 | Contaminated land

Contaminated land must be treated in a manner appropriate for its end use. Evidence of the appropriateness of the measures taken must be submitted as part of the planning application.

Officers can advise on the correct approach to the development of contaminated land as part of pre-application engagement.

Policy 5.22 | Hazardous substances

Planning decisions

A

When assessing developments near hazardous installations:

a site specific circumstances and proposed mitigation measures should be taken into account when applying the Health and Safety

Executive's Planning Advice Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI)42 methodology

b the risks should be balanced with the benefits of development and should take account of existing patterns of development.

6 Transport

Introduction – policies designed to support new development with appropriate transport provision.

Policy 6.2 | Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals that do not provide adequate safeguarding for the schemes outlined in Table 6.3 should be refused.

Commentary – Table 6.3 lists transport improvements of national or regional significance for which land should be safeguarded in specific locations. In Ealing these are principally CrossRail and High Speed 2, but there are also some non-geographically specific elements such as the bus stop accessibility programme which may also affect the Borough.

No local variation to the policy is proposed.

Policy 6.3 | Assessing effects of development on transport capacity

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network, at both a corridor and local level, are fully assessed.

B

Where existing transport capacity is insufficient to allow for the travel generated by proposed developments, and no firm plans exist for an increase in capacity to cater for this, boroughs should ensure that development proposals are phased until it is known these requirements can be met, otherwise they may be refused. The cumulative impacts of development on transport requirements must be taken into account.

C

Transport assessments will be required in accordance with TfL's Transport Assessment Best Practice Guidance for major planning applications. Workplace and/or Residential Travel Plans should be provided for planning applications exceeding the thresholds in, and produced in accordance with, the relevant TfL guidance. Construction Logistics Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans should be secured in line with the London Freight Plan and should be coordinated with Travel Plans.

See also: SPG 3 Air quality, SPG 7 Accessible Ealing, SPG 20 Sustainable transport: transport assessments.

Policy 6.5 | Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure

A

In view of the strategic regional importance of Crossrail to London's economic regeneration and development, and In order to bring the project to fruition In a suitably timely and economic manner, contributions will be sought from developments likely to add to, or create, congestion on London's rail network that Crossrail Is Intended to mitigate. This will be through planning obligations, arrangements for the use of which will be established at strategic level, in accordance with relevant legislation and policy guidance.

B

The Mayor will provide guidance for boroughs and other partners for the negotiation of planning obligations requiring, where appropriate, developers to contribute towards the costs of funding Crossrail having regard to:

- a the requirement for contributions from development of up to £600 million under the arrangements for funding Crossrail agreed with Government
- b central Government policy and guidance
- c strategic and local considerations
- d the impacts of different types of development in particular locations in contributing to transport needs, and
- e economic viability of each development concerned.

C

In addition, the Mayor will produce guidance for the handling of planning applications. The guidance will include:

- a criteria for identifying developments in respect of which Crossrail contributions should be required in accordance with national policy guidance
- b standard charges and formulae for calculating fair and reasonable contributions to be sought and guidance on how these should be applied in specific localities and different kinds of development
- c the period over which contributions will be sought and arrangements for periodic review.

D

The Mayor will, when considering relevant planning applications of potential strategic importance, take account of the existence and content of planning obligations supporting the funding of Crossrail among other material planning considerations.

E

The approach outlined in this Policy could where appropriate also be applied to other transport infrastructure of regional strategic importance to London's economic regeneration and development and other objectives of this Plan (such as extension of the Northern Line to Battersea). Any proposal of this kind will have regard to the issues outlined above.

Commentary – The development of CrossRail is of considerable significance to Ealing. However, the project is clearly subject to a broader timetable and objectives and it is difficult to see that any local variation would add further value.

No local variation to this policy is proposed.

Consultation –

Are there any other requirements that should be made of development near to CrossRail stations?

Policy 6.6 | Aviation

Planning decisions

D

Airport operations need to give a high priority to sustainability and taking full account of environmental impacts when making decisions on patterns of aircraft operation.

E

Development proposals for heliports should be resisted, other than for emergency services.

Commentary – This policy is unlikely to apply to any development in Ealing itself, but its provisions are welcomed in reducing the impact of Heathrow on the borough and its residents.

A local variation will indicate the areas of the borough in which flight paths necessitate notification for taller buildings.

Policy 6.9 | Cycling

Planning decisions

B

Developments should:

- a provide secure, integrated and accessible cycle parking facilities in line with the minimum standards set out in Table 6.2
- b provide on-site changing facilities and showers for cyclists
- c facilitate the Cycle Super Highways shown on Map 6.2
- d facilitate the central London cycle hire scheme.

See also: Table 6.2 RLP

Commentary – A future draft will contain or reference an updated cycle route map for the borough.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 6.9 | Cycling

Major development that is on or near a footpath of a cycle route identified on the borough network will contribute to enhancing the route and (if necessary) improving access between the development site and the route.

Policy 6.10 | Walking

Planning decisions

B

Ensure pedestrian environments in and around new developments emphasise the quality of the pedestrian and street space.

Policy 6.12 | Road network capacity

Planning decisions

B

In assessing proposals for increasing road capacity, including new roads, the following criteria should be taken into account:

- a the contribution to London's sustainable development and regeneration including improved connectivity
- b the extent to which congestion is reduced
- c how net benefit to London's environment can be provided
- d how conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, freight and local residents can be improved
- e how safety for all is improved.

C

Proposals should show, overall, a net benefits across these criteria when taken as a whole. All proposals must show how any dis-benefits will be mitigated.

Policy 6.13 | Parking**Planning decisions****C**

The maximum standards set out in Table 6.1 in the Parking Addendum to this chapter should be applied to planning applications.

D

In addition, developments must:

- a ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles
- b provide parking for disabled people in line with Table 6.1
- c meet the minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.2
- d provide for the needs of businesses for delivery and servicing.

Commentary – Provision for disabled parking under this policy is insufficient, it is therefore proposed to carry forward the existing June 2007 standards.

Further guidance will be provided in respect of how to deal with disabled parking provision where general parking provision is below current maximum standards, in, for example, low car housing.

Policy 6.14 | Freight**Planning decisions****B**

Development proposals that;

- a locate developments that generate high numbers of freight movements close to major transport routes
- b promote the uptake of the Freight Operators Recognition Scheme, Construction Logistics Plans and Delivery & Servicing Plans. These should be secured in line with the London Freight Plan and should be coordinated with Travel Plans, and the development of approaches to consolidate freight
- c increase the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for freight transport will be encouraged.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 6.14 | Freight

Warehouse development in Ealing Borough will be directed toward the Major Employment Locations in line with the findings of the Employment Land Review.

Permission will be granted for freight development where the benefits of employment are judged to outweigh the generation of noise and congestion. Officers will restrict the permitted hours of servicing and operation, and the size of vehicle making delivery where this is necessary to protect local amenity.

Hours of servicing and operation, and the size of vehicle making delivery will be restricted in line with Ealing Policy 7A, on the principle of preserving the amenity of surrounding uses.

Policy 6.15 | Strategic rail freight interchanges

Planning decisions

A

The provision of strategic rail freight interchanges should be supported, including enabling the potential of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link to be exploited for freight serving London and the wider region.

B

These facilities must:

a deliver modal shift from road to rail

b minimize any adverse impact on the wider transport network

c be well-related to rail and road corridors capable of accommodating the anticipated level of freight movements

d be well-related to their proposed markets.

7 Living Places and Spaces

Introduction – policies relating to the urban environment including green spaces.

Policy 7.1 | Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Planning decisions

B

Development should be designed so that the layout, tenure, mix of uses and interface with surrounding land will improve people's access to social and community infrastructure (including green spaces), the Blue Ribbon Network, local shops, employment opportunities, commercial services and public transport.

C

Development should maximize the opportunity for community diversity, inclusion and cohesion and should contribute to people's sense of place, safety and security. Places of work and leisure, streets, neighbourhoods, parks and open spaces should be designed to meet the needs of the community at all stages of people's lives, and should meet the 'lifetime neighbourhoods' criteria (see para 7.5).

D

The design of new buildings and the spaces they create should help reinforce or enhance the character, legibility and permeability of the neighbourhood.

E

The policies in this chapter provide the context within which the targets set out in other chapters of this Plan should be met.

Ealing Policy 7A | Operational amenity

Local Policy

A

New development which in the course of its operations causes any sort of emissions must;

- a not erode the amenity of surrounding uses
- b take all reasonable steps to ameliorate these emissions
- c provide all reasonable evidence of mitigation that is requested by the council

B

The requirement to properly regulate and ameliorate emissions also applies to functionally separate areas within a given development, for instance between separate flats or dwellings.

C

Applicants should seek advice as to the most appropriate forms of evidence and mitigation for their proposed development.

D

Development which is sensitive to operational emissions of a particular type must avoid locating in areas in which there are established concentrations of such emissions.

All forms of development are potential sources of operational emissions that may erode the amenity of surrounding uses.

Types of emissions will typically include, but are not limited to; noise, vibration, particulate matter, odour, light, and electromagnetic radiation.

Sensitive uses will typically include, but are not limited to; residential, schools, hospitals, public open space, and nature sites.

Emissive uses will typically include, but are not limited to; waste processing, manufacturing, radio/telephone masts, and all vehicle-serviced uses.

The obligation to safeguard amenity is reciprocal between all use types. Developments of sensitive uses should avoid exposure to established concentrations of emissions just as developments of emissive uses should limit their impact on the surrounding environment.

Sensitive uses will not be permitted where these would achieve acceptable levels of amenity only by sealing residents or users off from their surrounding environment. Such isolation would constitute in and of itself an erosion of amenity.

Context

The context of the new development is the primary determinant of what levels of emissions will be acceptable, and what measures are necessary for their attenuation. For example, residential uses are unlikely to cause disturbance to other residential uses simply by nature of their proximity.

Layout

Layout of a development is a principal consideration in safeguarding amenity. Co-location of disruptive functions, such as 'stacking' of kitchens and bathrooms in flatted development can help to reduce loss of amenity for residents. Similarly, over-concentration of, for example, mechanical ventilation units can create unacceptable levels of noise at a given location.

Noisy developments, for example, could seek to ameliorate their emissions through greater sound insulation, by changing access points, or by screening part or all of the site.

Cumulative Impact

Particular attention should be paid to the risk of cumulative impact. Development close to use types which make similar emissions (for example of one mobile telephone mast in proximity to another) should take the existing context of emissions into account in its development proposals.

Suitable Evidence

The type of evidence of mitigation will vary according to the type of emissions involved. In the case of development of mobile telephone masts, for example, International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) certification is typically the most useful source of information. Applicants should seek advice as to the evidence which is most relevant to their application.

Refusal

Any development which is unable to effectively remediate emissions that cause significant loss of amenity to surrounding uses should be refused.

Policy 7.2 | An inclusive environment

Planning decisions

C

Development proposals should meet the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design and should demonstrate that they meet the principles of inclusive design so that developments:

a can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all regardless of disability, age, gender, ethnicity or economic circumstances

b are convenient and welcoming with no disabling barriers, so everyone can use them independently without undue effort, separation or special treatment

c are flexible and responsive taking account of what different people say they need and want, so people can use them in different ways

d are realistic, offering more than one solution to help balance everyone's needs, recognising that one solution may not work for all.

D

Design and access statements submitted with development proposals should explain how the principles of inclusive design,

including the specific needs of older and disabled people, have been integrated into the proposed development, whether relevant best practice standards such as British Standard BS 8300:2009 have been complied with, and how inclusion will be maintained and managed.

See also: SPG 7 Accessible Ealing

Commentary – This policy will be used alongside the Accessible London SPG.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 7.2 | An inclusive environment

All new residential development must be constructed to the Lifetime Homes standard.

Policy 7.3 | Secured by design

Planning decisions

B

Development should reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour and contribute to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. In particular:

a routes and spaces should be legible, overlooked and well maintained

b there should be an indication of whether a space is private, semi-public or public, with a mix of uses, where appropriate, to maximize activity throughout the day and night

c places, buildings and structures should incorporate features that maximize the security of people and property

d the above measures should be incorporated at the design stage to ensure that overall design quality is not compromised.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 7.3 | Secured by design

Applicants must present evidence at the time of application that they have consulted with the local Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor (CPDA).

Development must not place unreasonable pressure on police resources.

Development should make contributions to community safety works where appropriate.

The Metropolitan Police provide a vital service to applicants and the Local Planning Authority through the CPDA. This service is intended to function as a form of pre-application advice and should inform the design of schemes from an early stage. The principal interest of the CPDA will be in new dwellings (including conversions) and central areas applications.

Residential conversions may result in unsuitable lines of access or insecure placement of doors etc. These schemes will particularly benefit from the advice of the CPDA.

Unreasonable pressure on police resources is defined as pressure which is avoidable through affordable changes to design or layout, or basic security measures like gating etc.

Community safety works are minor works such as gating alleys. Development can make contributions to these works either financially or in kind. Where appropriate, the council will seek to co-ordinate the measures employed by neighbouring schemes to achieve the greatest possible increase in security.

Policy 7.4 | Local character

Planning decisions

B

Development should provide a contemporary architectural response that:

- a has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass
- b contributes to a positive relationship between the urban structure and local natural landscape features, including the underlying landform and topography of an area
- c is human in scale
- d allows existing buildings and structures that make a positive contribution to the character of a place, to influence the future character of the area
- e is informed by the surrounding historic environment.

Policy 7.5 | Public realm

Planning decisions and LDF Preparation

B

New development should make the public realm comprehensible at a human scale, using gateways, focal points and landmarks to

help people find their way. Landscape treatment, street furniture and infrastructure should be of the highest quality, have a clear purpose, maintain uncluttered spaces and should contribute to the easy movement of people through the space. Opportunities for the integration of high quality public art should be considered, and opportunities for greening, such as through planting of trees and other soft landscaping wherever possible, should be maximised. Treatment of the public realm should be informed by the history of the place, where appropriate.

C

New development should incorporate local social infrastructure such as public toilets, drinking water fountains and seating, where appropriate. New development should also reinforce the connection between public spaces and existing local features such as the Blue Ribbon Network and parks and others that may be of heritage significance.

Policy 7.6 | Architecture

Planning decisions

B

Buildings and structures should:

a be of the highest architectural quality

b be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately encloses the public realm

c comprise details and materials that complement, not necessarily replicate, the local architectural character

d not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate. This is particularly important for tall buildings

e incorporate best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation

f provide high quality indoor and outdoor spaces and integrate well with the surrounding streets and open spaces

g be adaptable to different activities and land uses, particularly at ground level

h meet the principles of inclusive design.

Ealing Policy 7B | Design amenity

Local Policy

A

New development must achieve a high standard of amenity for users and a good relationship with adjacent uses by avoiding;

a material lack or loss of daylight or sunlight

b unreasonable lack or loss of privacy

c piecemeal development of the site

d overdevelopment of the site

- e negative visual impact including overbearing
- f illegibility

B

Development adjacent to residential uses must have particular concern for amenity. Similarly, residential schemes which do not provide satisfactory amenity for residents will not be permitted.

C

All external treatments, fittings and materials must complement original building/site and must not impair the visual amenity of surrounding uses.

High quality design is essential to all development and offers the opportunity to overcome constraints which would otherwise prevent the implementation of a development scheme.

Material lack or loss of daylight or sunlight is a lack or loss of daylight or sunlight below the current level and which could significantly affect the amenity of internal rooms or external spaces within the curtilage of the building. In the case of residential development, for example, this makes it unlikely that single aspect dwellings will be an acceptable form of development. This shorthand definition is not taken to contradict the Building Research Establishment publication *Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice* (1991), which constitutes the main technical guidance on this topic.

Unreasonable lack or loss of privacy is a lack or loss of privacy below that which might reasonably be expected for the use type concerned. For example, residential accommodation could be reasonably expected not to suffer direct overlooking of internal spaces. External spaces within the curtilage of a building, however, including private gardens, will typically be subject to some overlooking and consequent limitations to privacy.

Piecemeal development is that which does not successfully resolve into a coherent scheme for the given site, whether or not it is undertaken at separate times. Symptoms of piecemeal development may include broken or ragged external spaces offering poor amenity to users, mismatched building materials, and poorly designed massing or changes in scale.

Overdevelopment of the site is considered to be any level of build which is untypical of local character or morphology in massing or extent of site coverage, and which is not specifically permitted in area development plans or the Development Strategy. Development which is untypical of local character in the extent of site coverage may be acceptable where it is accompanied by high quality design and resolves successfully as a completed scheme, see *back land and infill development* below.

Negative visual impact is any visual impact on neighbouring uses or more generally which is negative due to the size, location, or design of the development. All development must have regard for visual impact, including more minor developments.

Illegibility is when the access and function of a building or site are difficult to discern to the extent that they impair the successful use of the building. In addition to causing access problems, illegible developments can create unsafe spaces

Back land and Infill development

Urban infill and development on back sites offers scope for additional residential and other provision through intelligent architectural treatments. By definition this sort of development is a deviation from the local character or urban morphology. The infilling of back land, for example, requires that this land has previously been preserved in the form of service yards, back gardens etc. This form of development can therefore only be acceptable where it achieves good quality internal spaces and does not compromise the amenity of surrounding uses. Proposals of this sort, therefore, will be particularly scrutinised for loss of light and privacy to adjacent uses, good internal space and layouts, and sufficient remaining amenity/garden space.

Residential Uses

The Replacement London Plan encourages consideration of the home as a place of retreat, and residential uses have particular need for privacy and quiet. This obligation is reciprocal both to new development which will impact upon adjacent residential uses and to new residential developments themselves. Applications for residential use will be subject to greater scrutiny of their quality of amenity than will other applications. Particular consideration will be given to use of residential buildings at night as this use is unusual in being occupied chiefly at this time.

Policy 7.7 | Location and design of tall and large buildings

Planning decisions

B

Applications for tall or large buildings should include an urban design analysis that demonstrates the proposal is part of a strategy that will meet the criteria below. This is particularly important if the site of the proposed tall building is not identified as a location for tall buildings in the borough's LDF.

C

Tall and large buildings should:

- a generally be limited to sites in the Central Activity Zone, Opportunity Areas, Areas of Intensification or Town Centres that have good access to public transport
- b only be considered in areas whose character would not be adversely affected by the scale, mass or bulk of a tall or large building
- c relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings, urban grain and public realm (including landscape features), particularly at street level;
- d individually or as a group, form a distinctive landmark that emphasises a point of civic or visual significance, and enhances the

skyline and image of London
e incorporate the highest standards of architecture and materials including sustainable design and construction practices
f have ground floor activities that provide a positive relationship to the surrounding streets
g incorporate publicly accessible areas on the upper floors, where appropriate
h make a significant contribution to local regeneration.

D

Tall buildings should not:

- a affect adversely their surroundings in terms of microclimate, wind turbulence, overshadowing, noise, reflected glare, aviation, navigation and telecommunication interference
- b impact adversely on local or strategic views
- c be encouraged in areas that would be sensitive to their impact. Such areas might include conservation areas, the setting of listed buildings, historic parks and gardens, the edge of the green belt or metropolitan open land, the setting of World Heritage Sites or other areas designated by boroughs as being unsuitable for tall buildings.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 7.7 | Location and design of tall and large buildings

Tall buildings will only be permitted where they;

- a accord with the spatial objectives of the Development Strategy*
- b offer an outstanding quality of design*
- c make a positive contribution to the urban environment*

Tall buildings have a greater impact on their surroundings and on the borough as a whole than other forms of development, as such, they must be held to higher standards than other development which will be less visually prominent. If the proposal complies with the spatial guidance of the Development Strategy, then the primary consideration for any scheme is therefore that it makes a positive contribution to the urban environment.

After its location, the quality of design is the overriding consideration in assessing the appropriateness of a tall building. This includes the suitability of the proposed design to its surroundings.

Commentary – Tall buildings generated considerable commentary in the previous consultation, much of which sought more detail on the proposed policy approach. The RLP policy sets out a good level of detail and relates well to the spatial role played by the Development Strategy in guiding these schemes.

The existing UDP uses a 20m threshold for tall buildings. However, this effectively invites applications up to that height outside of Town Centres, and does nothing to guide development within them, where the issue of tall buildings is arguably more contentious.

It is not therefore proposed to pursue specific height restrictions in the DM DPD but rather to refuse any new building that fails to make a positive contribution to the urban environment. This is a stronger than a negative wording which would simply require tall buildings not to erode existing amenity and places the correct onus on applicants to prove the positive impact of any new visually prominent development.

**Consultation –
What do you think of this approach to tall buildings?**

Policy 7.8 | Heritage assets and archaeology

Planning decisions

C

Development should preserve, refurbish and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.

D

New development in the setting of heritage assets, and conservation areas should be sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

E

New development should make provision for the protection of archaeological resources and significant memorials. Where the artefact or memorial cannot be moved from the site without damaging its cultural value, the assets should where possible be made available to the public on-site.

Ealing Policy 7C | Heritage

A

Development of any heritage asset or its setting must be made with reference to relevant guidance and statutory protections.

B

Development within or adjacent to Conservation Areas must be guided by the relevant conservation area appraisal.

Listed buildings, Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Interest Areas are subject to statutory protections that apply irrespective of any local or regional planning policies.

Local Designations

Local policy extends these protections also to buildings of local importance, whether as a whole structure in the case of Locally Listed Buildings, or because of specific features in the case of Façade Value or Incidental Features.

Local designations may be awarded to buildings singly or in groups in recognition of

- historical or aesthetic merit
- prominence within or importance to the townscape

It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate why their development is a suitable use of a heritage asset. If the significance of a local designation is questioned then this should be in the form of a conservation appraisal from an appropriately qualified body or individual, for example, English Heritage.

Policy 7.12 | Implementing the London View Management Framework

Planning decisions

B

Development in the foreground and middle ground of a designated view should not be overly intrusive, unsightly, prominent to the detriment of the view, block a view or create an intrusive element in the view.

C

Development proposals in the background of a view should give context to landmarks and not harm the composition of the view as a whole. Where a silhouette of a World Heritage Site is identified by the Mayor as prominent in a townscape or river prospect, and well preserved within its setting, it should not be altered by new development appearing in its background. Assessment of the impact of development in the foreground, middle ground or background of the view or the setting of a landmark should take into

account the effects of distance and atmospheric or seasonal changes.

D

In addition to the above, new development in designated views should comply with the following:

- a London Panoramas – should be managed so that development fits within the prevailing pattern of buildings and spaces and should not detract from the panorama as a whole. The management of views containing Strategically Important Landmarks should afford them an appropriate setting and prevent a canyon effect from new buildings crowding in too close to the Landmark in the foreground, or background where appropriate.
- b River Prospects – views should be managed to ensure that the juxtaposition between elements, including the river frontages and key landmarks, can be appreciated within their wider London context.
- c Townscape and Linear Views – should be managed so that the ability to see specific buildings, or groups of buildings, in conjunction with the surrounding environment, including distant buildings within views, is preserved.

E

Viewing places should be accessible and managed so that they enhance people’s experience of the view.

F

In addition to the above, where there is a Protected Vista:

- a development that exceeds the threshold height of a Landmark Viewing Corridor should be refused
- b development in the Wider Setting Consultation Area should form an attractive element in its own right and preserve the viewer’s ability to recognise and to appreciate the Strategically Important Landmark. It should not cause a canyon effect around the Protected Vista
- c development in the foreground of the Wider Setting Consultation Area should not detract from the prominence of the Strategically Important Landmark in this part of the view.

G

In complying with the above new development should not cause negative or undesirable local urban design outcomes.

H

The Mayor will identify, in some designated views, situations where the silhouette of a World Heritage Site, or part of a World Heritage Site, should be preserved.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 7.12 | Implementing the London View Management Framework

The above principles will also apply to Ealing’s local protected views.

(These are the same as mapped in the current 2004 UDP).

There are no special constraints in Ealing specifically relating to World Heritage Sites.

Policy 7.13 | Safety, security and resilience to emergency

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should contribute to the minimisation of potential physical risks, including those arising as a result of fire, flood and related hazards. Development should include measures that, in proportion to the risk, deter terrorism, assist in the detection of terrorist activity and help defer its effects.

Policy 7.14 | Improving air quality

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should:

- a promote sustainable design and construction to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings following the best practice guidance in the GLA and London Councils' 'The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition'
- b where biomass boilers are included, set out a detailed air quality assessment comparing forecast pollutant concentrations with that of a conventional gas boiler. Permission should only be granted if no adverse impacts from the biomass boiler relative to the use of a conventional gas boiler are identified
- c aim to be 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)). Offsetting should be used to ameliorate negative impacts associated with development proposals. Increased exposure to existing poor air quality should be minimised

See also: Policy 7A Operational amenity, SPG 3 Air quality.

Ealing Local Variation to RLP Policy 7.14 | Improving air quality

As required by national policy, planning applications should include an Air Quality Assessment. The council will have particular concern for cumulative impact of development on air quality.

Policy 7.15 | Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals should seek to reduce noise by:

a minimising the existing and potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, or in the vicinity of, development proposals

b separating new noise sensitive development from major noise sources wherever practicable through the use of distance, screening, or internal layout in preference to sole reliance on sound insulation

c promoting new technologies and improved practices to reduce noise at source.

See also: SPG 10 Noise and vibration

Commentary – Scope for refusal for this policy is defined in policy 7A – Operational amenity.

No further local variation to this policy is considered necessary.

Policy 7.16 | Green Belt

Planning decisions

B

The strongest protection should be given to London’s Green Belt, in accordance with PPG2. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Forms of development that might be appropriate together with high quality management practices that improve access to and/or the environmental and landscape quality of London’s Green Belt, while ensuring it continues to meet its statutory purposes, will be supported.

Policy 7.17 | Metropolitan Open Land

Planning decisions

B

The strongest protection should be given to London’s Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

Commentary – Strong support for the protection of MOL was expressed in the previous consultation. This proposed RLP policy seems to meet these concerns while also allowing any necessary flexibility for the provision of ancillary facilities for the enjoyment of

public open space.

The policy approach to this issue is further refined in policy 7D.

Policy 7D | Open Space

Sub/Local Policy

A

Open Space Provision Standards – Further details to follow in the next draft of the DPD – awaiting initial findings on the open space strategy.

B

Any development adjacent to or neighbouring existing open space should not compromise the character of that open space. A buffer strip of 5m around existing or proposed open spaces, or 10m in the case of SINC/SMI sites, will be protected from built.

C

Loss of existing open space, including back gardens, will be resisted particularly in areas of identified open space deficiency.

Commentary – This local policy incorporates the popular proposals set out in Initial Proposal 16 from the previous consultation. It is proposed that this policy consolidates a range of open space provision standards required or triggered by new development. This will include: i) Park/Public Open Space provision, to be applied in the case of large strategic applications (i.e. for sites capable of accommodating 500 dwellings plus, ii) Amenity/garden space provision for all new residential schemes including conversion where appropriate, iii) Child play space, iv) Active recreation/sports provision, to be applied in the case of large strategic applications, v) Burial Space, again to be applied in the case of large strategic applications, vi) allotment space provision, triggered by strategic applications. This policy will also provide guidance on how standards should be adjusted in order to reflect deficiency, and in which cases it will be acceptable to accept off-site provision or contributions to improve the quality of existing (including investing in adjoining open space), should it not be possible to achieve standards on site, or to make quantitative provision off-site. The above standards will be defined in light of the findings of the open space strategy which is currently underway

Policy 7.19 | Biodiversity and access to nature

Planning decisions

C

Development Proposals should:

a wherever possible, make a positive contribution to the protection, promotion and management of biodiversity

b prioritise assisting in achieving targets in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs), set out in Table 7.3, and/or improving access to nature in areas deficient in accessible wildlife sites

c be resisted where they have significant adverse impact on European or nationally designated sites or on the population or conservation status of a protected species or a priority species identified in a UK, London or borough BAP.

D

On Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation:

a give the highest protection to sites with existing or proposed international designations (SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites) and national designations (SSSIs, NNRs) in line with the relevant EU and UK guidance and regulations

b give strong protection to Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMIs). These are sites jointly identified by the Mayor and boroughs as having strategic nature conservation importance

c give Sites of Borough and Local Importance for Nature Conservation the level of protection commensurate with their importance.

E

When considering proposals that would affect a site and/or species of importance, the following hierarchy will apply:

1 avoid adverse impact to the biodiversity interest

2 minimize impact and seek mitigation

3 only in exceptional cases where the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the biodiversity impacts, seek appropriate compensation.

See also: Ealing Biodiversity Action Plan

Policy 7.20 | Geological conservation

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should ensure the protection and enhancement of geodiversity. The highest level of protection should be given to nationally designated sites of special scientific interest (SSSIs) in accordance with Government guidance.³² Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) are also of strategic importance for geodiversity across London and should also be protected.

Policy 7.21 | Trees and woodlands

Planning decisions

B

Existing trees should be retained wherever possible and any loss as the result of development should be replaced following the principle of 'right place, right tree'. Wherever possible the planting of additional trees should be included in new developments.

Policy 7.26 | Increasing the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for freight transport

Planning decisions

B

Development proposals:

- a should protect existing facilities for waterborne freight traffic, in particular safeguarded wharves should only be used for waterborne freight handling use. The redevelopment of safeguarded wharves for other land uses should only be accepted if the wharf is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne freight handling, (The criteria for assessing the viability of wharves are set out in paragraph 7.65). Temporary uses should only be allowed where they do not preclude the wharf being re-used for waterborne freight handling uses, see paragraph 7.66. The Mayor will review the designation of safeguarded wharves prior to 2012.
- b which increase the use of safeguarded wharves for waterborne freight transport, especially on wharves which are currently not handling freight by water, will be supported
- c adjacent or opposite safeguarded wharves should be designed to minimise the potential for conflicts of use and disturbance
- d close to navigable waterways should maximize water transport for bulk materials, particularly during demolition and construction phases.

Policy 7.27 | Blue Ribbon Network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should enhance the use of the Blue Ribbon Network, in particular proposals:

- a that result in the loss of existing facilities for waterborne sport and leisure should be refused, unless suitable replacement facilities are provided
- b should protect and improve existing access points to (including from land into water such as slipways and steps) or alongside the Blue Ribbon Network (including paths). New access infrastructure into and alongside the Blue Ribbon Network will be supported
- c should protect waterway support infrastructure such as boatyards, moorings, jetties and safety equipment etc. New infrastructure to support water dependent uses will be supported. New mooring facilities should normally be off line from main navigation routes, ie in basins or docks.

Policy 7.28 | Restoration of the Blue Ribbon Network

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals should restore and enhance the Blue Ribbon Network by:

- a taking opportunities to open culverts and naturalise river channels
- b increasing habitat value. Development which reduces biodiversity should be refused
- c preventing development and structures into the water space unless it serves a water-dependent purpose
- d protecting the value of the foreshore of the Thames and tidal rivers
- e resisting the impounding of rivers
- f protecting the open character of the Blue Ribbon Network.

Policy 7.30 | London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces

Planning decisions

A

Development proposals along London's canal network and other rivers and waterbodies (such as reservoirs, lakes and ponds) should respect their local character and contribute to their accessibility and active water related uses, in particular transport uses, where these are possible.

B

Development within or alongside London's docks should protect and promote the vitality, attractiveness and historical interest of London's remaining dock areas by:

- a preventing their partial or complete in-filling
- b promoting their use for mooring visiting cruise ships and other vessels
- c encouraging the sensitive use of natural landscaping and materials in and around dock areas
- d promoting their use for water recreation
- e promoting their use for transport

Appendix 1: Schedule of Changes Between The 2009 and 2010 Consultation Document Formats

The previous consultation document was prepared before the structure of the RLP became known and consequently its structure varies from the current document. The following table should make it easier to see where different issues from the previous consultation have been addressed in the current document.

Issues and Options	Proposed DM DPD
Initial Proposal 1: <u>Proposals Map</u>	Proposals Map
Initial Proposal 2: <u>New and Renovated Housing</u>	Development Strategy RLP policies 3.5 and 3.15
Initial Proposal 3: <u>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</u>	Policy 3A
Issue 1: How should we respond to the demand for smaller units and their suitability in mixed use development in busy areas, while also attempting to cater for the continuing need for affordable family housing, including large units so that extended families can be accommodated?	Development Strategy and Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Issue 2: Should we provide more guidance on good living conditions for residents, architectural quality, the relationship of the development to its setting and sustainability principles as they relate to residential development?	RLP 5.2 and 7.6
Issue 3: To what extent should we provide for hostels catering for temporary shelter, and other types of specialist housing such as houses in multiple occupation, and student or nurses accommodation, which competes for land with other general needs housing?	RLP 3.15
Issue 4: How should we facilitate appropriate and good quality extensions and alterations to private houses and gardens?	RLP 7.6. DM DPD 7B, 7C.
Initial Proposal 4: <u>Regeneration Opportunity Areas</u>	Proposals Map
Initial Proposal 5: <u>Community Facilities</u>	RLP 3.1, 3.6, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.20.
Issue 5: What is the best approach to achieving greater capacity for community provision?	RLP 3.1

Issue 6: What sort of development should we allow on the site of a community facility that does not need to be retained?	Development Strategy
Issue 7: How should we guide the location of new community facilities?	Development Strategy
Issue 8: Should we require developers to ensure that their projects would be family friendly?	RLP 3.6
Issue 9: How should we balance the need to protect school playing fields with other education priorities?	DM DPD 7D
Initial Proposal 6: <u>Employment Land</u>	Proposals Map, ELR
Initial Proposal 7: <u>Major Identified sites for Mixed Development</u>	Proposals Map, Sites DPD.
Issue 10: How should we respond to the demand for small business activity on sites not designated for this purpose, balancing the need to facilitate enterprise with the environmental impacts of such activity in residential areas?	ELR
Initial Proposal 8: <u>Transport Proposals</u>	Development Strategy, Proposals Map.
Initial Proposal 9: Low car housing will be encouraged where there is evidence that car ownership and use will be low enough to justify the proposal. It is expected that this type of proposal will be appropriate in any of the following areas: i) Development sites within 200m of stations, in town centres, and at other locations where there are on-street parking controls; ii) Controlled parking zones, provided that developers enter into legal agreement preventing residents from having parking permits; and, iii) Any area of the borough, on the basis that the developer undertakes to form or contribute to a car club in the immediate vicinity of the development, and that the residents and/or employees occupying the development are committed to contribute to its management as indicated in a Travel Plan and confirmed in a legal agreement.	Development Strategy, Proposals Map.

<p>Initial Proposal 10: The council will require development proposals to have regard to the safety and ease of movement of cyclists and pedestrians by ensuring that; i) The layout of the proposed development includes direct and where appropriate separate footpaths and cycleways to local shopping and community facilities and places of work; ii) Any major development which is on or near a footpath of a cycle route identified on the borough network should contribute to enhancing the route and (if necessary) improving access between the site and the route; iii) There is careful consideration of the choice and location of surface material and street furniture, including lighting, signposts, planting, seating, etc following the principles of inclusive design; iv) Cyclists and pedestrians have safe and easy crossing facilities, particularly where cycle and pedestrian routes cross main roads; v) Secure cycle parking is provided in lockable cycle parking cages for employees and residents, and with cycle stands for short term visitors; all should be provided as near as possible to the entrance of the building and under cover where appropriate; also, in major non-residential development, there should be showers and changing facilities for cyclists.</p>	<p>RLP 6.9, 6.10. DM DPD Local variation 6.9, 7B</p>
<p>Initial Proposal 11: In managing development, the council will consider the environmental impacts of goods delivery movements, and where necessary will restrict the permitted hours of servicing and operation and the size of vehicle making the delivery; warehousing development will be encouraged to locate in Major Employment Locations, provided that the environmental costs of heavy goods traffic do not outweigh the benefits of the employment generated.</p>	<p>RLP 6.14.DM DPD Local variation 6.14</p>
<p>Issue 11: How should we respond to the potential for electric cars and other forms of environmentally-friendly motor transport to succeed in London?</p>	<p>RLP 6.13</p>
<p>Initial Proposal 12: Ealing's development management policy document and proposals map define the Borough's network of metropolitan, major and district town centres, neighbourhood shopping centres and local centres, and specific designated shopping frontages. These are to remain as indicated on the UDP proposals map, except as shown in the map of Southall and of Northolt neighbourhood shopping centre, at maps DM2 and DM3 respectively at Appendix 1 (see pages 58-61). In considering proposals for the development of land within these areas, the council will expect; i) No loss of shopping floorspace (Class A1) in the designated frontages; ii) No loss of existing shop units (Class A1) where this would result in the surrounding area being more than 400m from the nearest operational retail shop.</p>	<p>Proposals Map</p>

<p>Initial Proposal 13: When considering proposals for street markets, the council will have regard to the following criteria: i) Maintaining the viability and vitality of the existing town centre; ii) Minimising local environmental impacts, especially on the amenity of nearby residents; iii) The impact on existing transport infrastructure, particularly parking and pedestrian flows; iv) The adequacy of the arrangements for access, servicing, recycling and refuse disposal.</p>	<p>DM DPD local variation 4.7</p>
<p>Initial Proposal 14: When considering proposals for eating, drinking and entertainment uses (both new premises and extensions) the council will have particular regard to the impact on amenity, and proposals will be considered in relation to the following criteria: i) The concentration of eating, drinking and entertainment uses; ii) The location of the proposal; iii) The proximity of residential development; iv) The preservation of the appearance and the character of the area; v) The existing level of disturbance from eating, drinking and entertainment uses; vi) The negative impact from the proposed hours of operation; vii) The traffic implications including public transport accessibility; viii) The arrangements provided for any likely pollution, including ventilation equipment, refuse disposal (including customer litter), grease traps, and noise insulation. The council will have regard to the differential impacts of businesses selling food and drink for consumption off the premises, and between restaurants and cafes as opposed to public houses and night clubs, in considering changes of use between proposed uses with classes A3-5 of the Use Classes Order.</p>	<p>DM DPD 4A, 7A, 7B</p>
<p>Initial Proposal 15: The council will encourage development proposals involving cultural, sports and leisure activity in the borough's town centres, and will prevent the loss of such facilities; neighbourhood facilities will also be encouraged in the network of local schools and libraries, and there may be occasion for specialist locations, such as GWR at Southall and appropriate canalside development. More specifically, the council will promote the following: i) Artistic and cultural quarters centred on Bond Street/Ealing Green, Central Southall, Central Acton, Greenford Town Centre and Hanwell Broadway; ii) Hotel development, consistent with London's tourist bedspace needs, in town centres and at public transport exchanges, subject to there being no loss of housing.</p>	<p>Development Strategy.</p>
<p>Issue 12: How should we ensure that amusement centres would not damage the attractiveness of town centres?</p>	<p>DM DPD 4A</p>
<p>Issue 13: How should we regulate fast food outlets proposed near schools so that they do not undermine healthy eating in schools?</p>	<p>DM DPD 4A</p>

<p>Initial Proposal 16: Ealing's development management policy document and proposals map define the Borough's network of open/green space, comprising Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, Green Corridors, Heritage Land, Public Open Space, Community Open Space, Nature Conservation sites and management areas. These are to remain as indicated on the UDP proposals map, except as shown at Appendix 1 for nature conservation areas (see map DM5 at page 66) and MOL (see map DM2 at page 58). Within these areas there will be a general presumption against built development, unless it is directly related to and supports the open space use of the land. Development proposals adjoining such land will also be expected to preserve and enhance the open character of these areas, and in considering such proposals the council will have regard to the following criteria (to be developed further): - Any development must respect the style and character of the surrounding area, and be of a small scale, with sensitive boundary treatment, and not destroy/compromise the open character of the area. - A buffer strip of 5m (10m in the case of SINC/SMI sites) is provided on land immediately adjoining the open space. - Any development should not make adjacent areas of open space less defensible against further encroachment. - Any development should not have an adverse impact on the water environment, particularly in relation to the Green Corridors. - Any development must not compromise/jeopardise access to the open space, and will be positively encourages to enhance access. A general presumption against inappropriate development will also be extended to other open spaces which are not formally designated including incidental spaces, such as road verges and back gardens, and particular priority will be placed on their protection in areas of open space deficiency.</p>	<p>Proposals Map. RPL 7.17 DM DPD 7D</p>
<p>Initial Proposal 17: The council encourages and supports the enhancement of existing open space in the Borough, including improved access for pedestrians and cyclists, and via public transport. Development directly related to the purposes of the openspace and which accord with its open character will be permitted, subject to the satisfaction of the following criteria: i) The openness of the site will not be compromised. ii) The proposed changes will not compromise an already established informal open space function of the sites, for example for sitting out, walking or nature conservation. iii) The proportion of buildings and hard surfaced areas are not materially increased. iv) The proposition of buildings and hard surfaced areas are not materially increased. iv) The use of floodlighting would not harm adjoining amenity or biodiversity value on the site or on adjoining land. v) Built development is of an ancillary nature, and is of a modest size preserving the overall open character of the site. vi) Areas important for their landscape and nature conservation value should be protected.</p>	<p>DM DPD 7D</p>

Issue 14: What standards should we require in terms of open space provision standards as part of new development? How do we relate this to deficiency areas?	???
Initial Proposal 18: The council whilst recognising the need to contribute towards the supply of land won aggregates in London, will resist the extraction of mineral aggregates on sites where this would have an adverse impact on the local environment; including landscape, nature conservation, ground and surface water, archaeological interests and the effects of operation and traffic on residential amenity. The council will also seek to minimise the movement of aggregates by road, having regard to the proximity principle, and maximise the movement of aggregates via rail or canal network, and encourage recycling at depot sites in Ealing - including Horn Lane and Park Royal Road.	Development Strategy.
Issue 15: How should we best achieve carbon emission savings as part of new development?	RLP 5.2, 5.3 DM DPD 5A
Issue 16: Should we provide more guidance in relation to material to be use and adaptability of new buildings and places?	DM DPD 7B
Issue 17: How should we ensure all new development promotes social inclusion, and specifically caters for people with varied disabilities?	RLP 3.1
Issue 18: How should we ensure new developments are safe and secure?	RLP 7.3 DM DPD Local variation 7.3
Issue 19: How do we ensure new and existing landscaping, trees and planting are maintained and protected?	RLP 5.10, 7.2 DM DPD Local variation 5.10
Issue 20: How do we protect and enhance Ealing's statutory Listed buildings in their settings?	RLP 7.8 DM DPD 7C
Issue 21: How do we protect and enhance Ealing's Locally Listed Buildings, Buildings with Façade values, and Incidental Features?	RLP 7.8 DM DPD 7C
Issue 22: How do we protect and enhance Ealing's Conservation Areas and their settings?	RLP 7.8 DM DPD 7C
Issue 23: How do we protect Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Interest Area and their settings?	RLP 7.8 DM DPD 7C

Issue 24: How do we control the design and appearance of commercial frontages and advertising signs?	DM DPD 7B, 7C
Issue 25: How do we minimise the impacts of developments that generate or are sensitive to noise and vibration?	DM DPD 7A
Issue 26: How do we minimise the impacts of development which include flood lighting and illumination?	DM DPD 7A
Issue 27: How should we guide telecommunications development so that the economic and social benefits are maximised and health impacts maintained?	DM DPD 7A

For further copies of this document or any of Ealing's local development framework documents, please contact:

Planning Policy
Ealing Council
Perceval House
14/16 Uxbridge Road
London W5 2HL

Tel: 020 8825 5882

Email: Planpol@ealing.gov.uk

Visit: www.ealinginlondon.com