

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES

SEPTEMBER 2010

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT ISSUES
AND OPTIONS DOCUMENT**

LONDON BOROUGH OF EALING

INITIAL PROPOSAL 1

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 1
Nature of Comment: Object		
<p>Initial Proposal 1 - (HOUSING) - CLP3A.1 requires increases in London's housing supply imposing on Ealing 9150 in 10 years. We object strongly to this high total. The LDF is totally housing driven. Sites are shown symbolically on the diagrams in the text but no justification is given for site totals. We object to adaptation of Special Opportunity Areas, which in the UDP covered a range of uses including leisure facilities, not just business and housing. In the current state of the office market housing is most likely. Those in MELs need justification because the environment is poor with a lack of supporting facilities. Glade Lane SOA was defined on MOL specifically for leisure, yet housing is now proposed. Renovation is more sustainable than redevelopment. Highrise redevelopment uses large amounts of energy-rich materials and can be less adaptable than low rise buildings. Building up high rise flats around stations may save energy on transport but definitely wastes energy on materials. Concentrating new housing in the defined corridors justified on the grounds of Crossrail, does not respect existing communities or neighbourhoods; or indeed green space and conservation areas. We agree with most of the designations on the UDP proposals map but object to mixed business and housing areas, as well as development sites</p>		
Response: Not accepted		
<p>With regard to residential development quanta, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides an overview of housing need and demand and the findings are linked to regional and sub-regional targets. In addition to this, the Council has worked with the GLA to produce its London-wide Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The figures generated through the SHLAA process in terms of deliverable and developable sites will also inform the revised housing targets outlined in the revised London Plan. It is Ealing Council's obligation to meet these targets.</p>		
<p>The adaptation of Special Opportunity Areas will be considered on a site-by-site basis and those considered appropriate for re-designation will be assessed as part of the Development Sites Document. The Development Sites Document is a supporting document to the strategy and its purpose is to set out in greater detail the suitability of individual sites, including sites in MELs for specific uses and densities. More detailed maps for each site will be provided in tandem with this document. Proposed development on these sites will be required to take account of the potential impacts on both the site itself and the surrounding areas. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will also support the growth proposals as set out in the Development Strategy and supporting DPD's by identifying what, how, when and where necessary infrastructure will be required and delivered over the Plan period. The IDP will also help establish priorities for seeking and spending 106 monies.</p>		
<p>The reconfiguration of open space, employment land, special opportunity site and residential space in the Glade Lane area is designed to improve its function and usability. Although the exact arrangement of this space is still to be finalised, it is intended that there would be no net loss of open space. Furthermore, given the ecological value of the canal, a buffer would be formed between any built development and the canal edge.</p>		
<p>It is acknowledged that renovation is one sustainable method of regenerating existing buildings, however no evidence has been put forward to suggest that it is more sustainable than redevelopment or redevelopment at higher densities.</p>		
<p>The concentration of future development along the Uxbridge Road/A40 corridors has not been justified by Crossrail alone, as these two corridors have already been identified as the most sustainable locations for development based on existing infrastructure and high PTAL levels.</p>		

Outcome: No change.

The comments are spatial issues which are addressed in the Development Strategy.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

There must be adequate road access to these locations and parking facilities to avoid congestion, overcrowding and road safety problems.

Response: Noted.

The impact of development at these locations will be carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation will be secured through legal agreements to ensure that any proposals can be accommodated within the highway network.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Object

Firstly, I would like to say that this is an extremely difficult document to fill in and I have already lost my first set of comments by thinking I could go back a page. I have had chance to read through parts of the UDP again and it seems to be a very sensible and comprehensive document that has been completely ignored by the council and the planning committee. I would also like to point out that this is hardly a public consultation given that very few people will have the time and patience to fill in these questionnaires. I would also suggest that the brief presentations that the council has organized does not constitute a public consultation. And I cannot believe that the 20 people who attended the Southall presentation are the only people in that area interested in the Gas Works development and future of Southall. The quality of the maps is absolutely appalling and should never have been handed out. What is fundamental to the strategy is the knowledge of exactly how many people live in Ealing and to quote Background Paper 1 'The Council's ability to plan services, development and regeneration is seriously jeopardised by poor knowledge of basic demographic information'. Currently development is developer led and they seem to be able to bend the UDP to maximise their profits and not benefit of the population of Ealing. What is missing from the document is an overall vision for Ealing based on ideology and not corridors.

Response: Noted.

It is acknowledged that there were issues with submitting representations through the online system and it is intended that a more accessible method of making representations will be in place for the next stage of consultation. Active consideration is also being given to the proposal to extend the consultation period beyond the six-week statutory period. This will allow for a longer consultation period which should consequently make it easier for a higher number of people to participate in the process. A full review of the council's engagement plan is planned before the next round of consultation that will take place in Autumn 2010 and this will include better and more creative use of publicity including the council's own magazine "Around Ealing". It is acknowledged that planning public meetings and events is always difficult as it is not always possible to keep all sections of the audience happy. The format adopted at the public meetings was discussed and agreed at the Planning and Community Working Group and that includes a number of prominent community representatives. Membership is open and active participation is encouraged and will be further promoted through the web pages and e-bulletin. Some significant improvements have already taken place including the establishment of regular e-bulletin to everyone on the LDF mailing list to keep people informed as to progress, events and activities and a revamp of the planning policy pages of the council's web-site due to be launched shortly.

The maps provided are indicative only and their purpose was not to include the finer detail which will be provided in a Proposals Map DPD. The Proposals Map DPD, which specifies sites, areas, and other locations identified in the Development Strategy, Development Sites and Development Management DPDs will be prepared and published in Spring 2012. These will help build on the existing maps provided to date and provide a greater level of clarity and detail.

The current proposals have emerged from a series of reports and studies that have formed the evidence base for our proposals. With regard to residential development quanta, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides an overview of housing need and demand and the findings are linked to regional and sub-regional targets. In addition to this, the Council has worked with the GLA to produce its London-wide Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The figures generated through the SHLAA process in terms of deliverable and developable sites will also inform the revised housing targets outlined in the revised London Plan. It is Ealing Council's obligation to conform to these targets.

Outcome: No change.

These comments will inform a review of the engagement plan before the next round of consultation in Autumn 2010. Further information to be provided in the Proposals Map DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 1
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 1
Nature of Comment: Object		
What proposal Map? Ealing is full. We can't handle more people. If more people are forced upon us build new complete communities in Greenford, Northolt and Park Royal.		
Response: Noted.		
The proposals map referred to refers to the existing UDP proposals map. Proposed changes to designations of specific sites were outlined as an appendix to the Development Management document. In addition to this, a Proposals Map DPD is currently being prepared which will show on an Ordnance Survey Base the sites, areas, and other locations referred to in the Development Strategy, Development Sites and Development Management documents. It is expected that this DPD will be adopted in 2013.		
The broad spatial strategy of locating the majority of development along the Uxbridge Road/A40 corridors and not in the residential hinterlands is justified by the need to locate development in sustainable areas where there is good access to transport and other infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify all items of infrastructure needed to ensure the sustainable delivery of the growth targets contained in the Development Strategy 2026. It will demonstrate what, how, when and where such infrastructure will be required and delivered over the Plan period.		
Outcome: No change.		
Further detail to be provided in the Proposals Map DPD, Development Management and Development Sites Document.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 1
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Object

Too much emphasis on high-density development along Uxbridge Road Corridor at the expense of lower density (family housing) elsewhere.

Response: Noted.

The broad spatial strategy of locating the majority of residential development along the Uxbridge Road justified by the need to locate development in sustainable areas where there is good access to transport and other infrastructure and the high PTAL rating that exists along this route. By ensuring high quality development and design it will be possible to provide family housing in areas of higher density. The residential hinterlands of the borough will also receive housing, which will be suitable for lower density housing.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 1

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.**Outcome: No change.**

INITIAL PROPOSAL 2

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial Proposal 2 CLP policy 3A.6 refers to quality of new housing provision with numerous cross reference to other policies. This is not user friendly so it would help if LDF policies are drafted to reflect and build upon national and regional policies taking into account local conditions as proposed in PPS 1.		
Third bullet point - design excellence should be a priority for all housing not just high-density development. Redeveloping problem estates at higher densities is no way to solve their problems.		
Response: Noted.		
Subsequent to this consultation CLP policy 3A.6 has been replaced in the Draft Replacement London Plan mainly by policy 3.5. A revised structure for the DM DPD should make the use of the regional plan much easier.		
RLP 3.5 has an improved wording and does not imply a disparity of design necessity for high density development.		
Outcome: No change		
Problem has already been rectified in RLP.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
There must be adequate road access to these locations and parking facilities to avoid congestion, overcrowding and road safety problems.		
Response: Noted.		
The impact of development at these locations will be carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation will be secured through legal agreements to ensure that any proposals can be accommodated within the highway network.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Whilst the overall aim is supported, this proposal needs to be expanded to ensure that it can be used as an effective development control policy. The requirement to ensure design excellence is supported, but should be expanded to provide further guidance. In addition, reference to design excellence should not be just in relation to high-density development, but should be expected from all forms of development. The Council should also develop a strategy for the efficient use of existing stock, including setting and monitoring targets for bringing properties back into use.

Response: Noted.

Since the publication of the RLP, London-wide policies relating to design quality will automatically apply in Ealing. There will also be a number of local policies which provide detail and context.

Reuse of existing stock is encouraged in RLP 3.15 and will be underpinned by a range of local policies, however, we must acknowledge that UK housing vacancy levels are already significantly below those of our Western European neighbours, reflecting the influence of historically high house prices. It is highly improbable that significantly greater efficiency is achievable in any market housing system.

Outcome:
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

I would also suggest that the council stops selling off council owned land and involves itself more in CPOs. For instance numerous flats above shops in conservation areas are empty and of course there is the Lammertons site. In the good old days of the GLC there were more levels of social housing and one could rent properties that came under Single Person Higher Rented Accommodation. There should also be more key worker housing under council control. I feel the days of the unscrupulous landlord are on us again.

Response: Noted.

Sales of council land are generally intended precisely to realise new development that will provide additional housing units or other public benefits. Even if resources were available for programmes of compulsory purchase it is difficult to see that moving land from private to public ownership would in and of itself result in more efficient use of existing resources.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Support		
Design excellence - I don't think Dickens Yard and Arcadia are a good example.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Yes - but no more high density housing		
Response: Not accepted		
High-density development does not mean low environmental value. Many of the more central areas of Ealing are already characterised by high-density low-rise development which was the norm in the Victorian era.		
Regional and local policies are designed to ensure quality of design and this is the basis on which new development will be judged.		
Outcome: No change		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 2
Nature of Comment: Object		
Strongly object to creation of two 200+ housing sites in Acton Town Centre North of Uxbridge Road as indicated on Hsng-4A to 4C. This area has special character & should be protected from over development.		
Response: Noted.		
High-density development does not mean low environmental value. Many of the more accessible areas of Ealing are already characterised by high-density low-rise development which was the norm in the Victorian era.		
Regional and local policies are designed to ensure quality of design and this is the basis on which new development will be judged.		
Greater detail of the nature of proposals for these sites will be available in the Development Sites DPD.		

Outcome: No change to DM DPD, to be considered in Development Strategy and Development Sites DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

'Design Excellence' not just for high density schemes

Response: Noted.

Subsequent to this consultation CLP policy 3A.6 has been replaced in the Draft Replacement London Plan, mainly by policy 3.5.

RLP 3.5 has an improved wording and does not imply a disparity of necessity for quality design.

Outcome: No change

Problem has already been rectified in RPL.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 2

Nature of Comment: Support

Social housing is the barometer of how we care for the not so well off in London and the Home Counties

Response: Support welcomed.

The council is promoting a major investment and regeneration programme to transform many of its homes, estates, town centres and neighbourhoods. It aims to provide residents with the best possible homes and housing services that will match the standards that they have told us they want. These ambitious plans seek to transform parts of the borough that need significant investment, care and attention as well as boost the economic, social prosperity and quality of life for our residents.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 3

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 3 - Improvements at Bashley Rd supported. CLP3A.14 requires boroughs to provide criteria for identification of new sites. UDP Policy 5.8 seems adequate.		
Response: Noted.		
CLP is in the process of being replaced, and the regional process for pitch figures is subject to revision by national government. The new approach will flow from the RLP. The identification of new sites will be undertaken through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Development Sites DPD.		
Outcome: No change.		
Further detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Development Sites DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
The policy approach to Gypsy and travellers sites should be further developed to ensure compliance with Policy 3.9 and Table 3.4 of the draft replacement London Plan, including the need to identify sites through the LDF site allocations process		
Response: Noted.		
The regional process for pitch figures is subject to revision by national government. The new approach will flow from the RLP. The identification of new sites will be undertaken through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Development Sites DPD.		
Outcome: Noted.		
Policy will be revised in line with new government guidance and the final text of the RLP.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 3

Nature of Comment: Support
No further comment
Response: Support welcomed
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 3
Nature of Comment: Support		
Hard Love for these people as they need direction, discipline to their lives		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 4

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial Proposal 4 (COMMUNITIES) What definitions and where are the community regeneration areas. They are not on the proposals map and they are very important because they may attract grants (GLA tree planting)		
Response: Noted.		
These areas will be delineated on the Proposals Map DPD.		
Outcome: No change.		
Further detail to be provided in the Proposals Map DPD and Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Referred to previously		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 4 - We have very few council controlled community facilities in the borough and what we do have the council seems determined to sell off. Day centres and libraries are beginning to look like hospitals. Libraries are becoming internet cafes instead of being the focal point of a community. When I originally came to live in Ealing, swimming pools, football pitches, boating lakes, tennis courts etc were all run by the council and were successfully run.		
Response: Noted.		
The ownership and operation of community facilities are not subject to planning controls.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Not broad enough - all communities have to build on existing		
Response: Noted.		
The definition of community facilities is broadened by RLP policy 3.1.		
Outcome: No change.		
Problem has already been rectified in RPL.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Comment		
What Proposals Map?		
Response: Noted.		
The proposals map referred to above is the existing UDP proposals map. The Proposals Map DPD, which specifies sites, areas, and other locations identified in the Development Strategy, Development Sites and Development Management DPDs will be prepared and published in Spring 2012. These will help build on the existing maps provided to date and provide a greater level of clarity and detail.		
Outcome: No change.		
More detail to be provided in the Proposals Map DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 4
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
South Acton Estate planning needs to make more effort to "open up" the estate to non-residents similar to Castlevale, Birminghams efforts to transform a rundown insular estate.		

Response: Noted.

The council is promoting a major investment and regeneration programme to transform many of its homes, estates, town centres and neighbourhoods. It aims to provide residents with the best possible homes and housing services that will match the standards that they have told us they want. These ambitious plans seek to transform parts of the borough that need significant investment, care and attention as well as boost the economic, social prosperity and quality of life for our residents. As part of the regeneration programme for the South Acton Estate, it is intended that there will be a mix of tenures which will contribute to more balanced social mix. The Masterplan will be available for public consultation in the coming months and there will be an opportunity to comment at that stage.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 4

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Too much reliance on S106 contributions, rather than requiring new facilities to be provided on site - to benefit both new residents and existing communities

Response: Noted.

There is no presumption in favour of s106 contributions in preference to provision on site. Decisions will be made in the context of each scheme and with reference to the IDP.

Outcome: No change.

Further detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SPD on Legal Agreements

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 4

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 4

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 4

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 5

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Support		
<p>Initial Proposal 5 states that developers will be required to submit a social impact statement to address any increase in demand for community facilities, and that the Council will negotiate planning obligations with developers to mitigate against any increased demand for community services in the area. This approach is consistent with Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1), Circular 05/05 and the London Plan Policy 3A.18 in particular, and is generally supported by the MPA. However it is noted within Initial Proposal 5 that the Council will generally resist development that would lead to the loss of community facilities. The proposal should be amended to ensure that there will be no requirement for developers to re-provide community facilities on sites where the former community facility has been successfully relocated. This approach is supported by Policy 3A.18 of the London Plan which states that the net loss of community facilities must be resisted. To ensure this aspect of the emerging Development Management Policy document is consistent with the London Plan and reflects the MPA's Estate Strategy, the following amendment is suggested. Recommendation: The MPA suggest that the wording to this paragraph be changed to read (additional wording underlined): 'The Council will resist any development that would lead to a net loss of community facilities unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for community facilities at that location'.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>The preferred approach adopted by the Council is to ensure that any loss of community facilities is offset by re-providing these facilities on site, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the facilities at that location. The re-provision of community facilities on a different site or at a different location will have to be assessed on a case by case basis, as even though there is no net loss, the facilities may not be in a location that is accessible to residents.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Object		
<p>We object to the idea of asking applicants to demonstrate that there is no longer a need for community facilities at a particular location. This is not a borough of population decline and an alternative facility should be sought because they are essential. Planning Obligations only provide for the increase in demand for community facilities. Section 106 funding is inadequate in providing facilities where lacking for everyone and alternative funding is difficult to find. It is important in a multi-cultural area like Ealing that sites are not lost to the community. The Council should identify these deficiencies and sites; then funds can be raised from a range of development and sources. PPS12 states Community infrastructure Levies would be introduced in Spring 2009.</p>		

Response: Noted.

It is acknowledged that community facilities should be protected where they are still necessary, however in some instances the community use may have become redundant.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan process will identify the various elements of community infrastructure that will be required in order to support the housing and growth targets and population projections set out in the Strategy. In particular, deficits will be identified and where relevant, proposals to address these deficits will be outlined.

The Council's IDP will also help establish priorities for planning obligations across the borough. The draft SPD on Legal Agreements will be progressed to adoption in June 2012. The Local Planning Authority will consider whether to adopt CIL alongside s106 in due course.

Outcome: No change.

Further detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SPD on Legal Agreements.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Thomas Wrenn Homes Ltd	Business	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support

Initial Proposal 5 - Support recognition that loss of a community facility may be acceptable where there is no longer a need at the location.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Object

Initial Proposal 5 - This should be reworded so that the onus is on the developer to provide 'on site' community facilities for the residents of any development.

Developers should not be allowed to proceed with a development, which would lead to a reduction in any pre-existing community facilities. Pressure on Community Resources - Additional housing units should only be permitted where community resources, such as schools, doctors' surgeries and day centres, either already have the surplus capacity to accommodate the additional residents or the proposed development will include the necessary additional community facilities on site or within a short distance. New residents should not be expected to add to the congestion on an already overloaded road network in order to reach their doctors, schools, etc.

Response: Noted.

The preferred approach adopted by the Council is to ensure that any loss of community facilities is offset by re-providing these facilities on site, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the facilities at that location. The re-provision of community facilities on a different site or at a different location will have to be assessed on a case by case basis, as even though there is no net loss, the facilities may not be in a location that is accessible to residents. The text will be amended to reflect this.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan process will identify the various elements of community infrastructure that will be required in order to support the housing and growth targets and population projections set out in the Strategy. In particular, deficits will be identified and where relevant, proposals to address these deficits will be outlined.

Outcome:

More detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Business	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

We believe there should be far greater transparency about both enforcing planning obligations for new developments (e.g. Lidl's total failure to provide a public toilet at its Hanwell branch) and about making public exactly how any Section 106 money has been spent on local facilities. We favour a policy that ensures proper and adequate community facilities take precedence over residential accommodation.

Response: Noted.

Details of S106 spend are regularly reported to the Cabinet and these reports are available on Ealing Council's website.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan process will identify the various elements of community infrastructure that will be required in order to support the housing and growth targets and population projections set out in the Strategy. In particular, deficits will be identified and where relevant, proposals to address these deficits will be outlined. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will also help establish priorities for seeking and spending future 106 monies.

Outcome: No change.

Further detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Object

CLP3A.18.5 - NGP object to the requirement to submit a Social Impact Statement in support of major residential and business proposals. The principles of assessing the impact of residential schemes on the social infrastructure are accepted. However, this is often covered in other documents such as the socio-economics section of an Environmental Statement or in Planning Statements and/or will often be addressed through the consultation process on any planning application. The requirement to provide a separate Social Impact Statement is an unnecessary additional costly requirement on any application proposal.

Response: Not accepted.

Local plans are not competent to contradict the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The CLP is in the process of being replaced by the RLP and we will follow its recommendations for the assessment of major schemes.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Comment		
This is not really developed - Night and day classes - libraries (localised) etc.		
Response: Noted.		
It is unclear how this comment relates to Initial Proposal 5		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Support		
Again bearing in mind Dickens Yard and Arcadia, has full consideration been provided for issues discussed in this section e.g community facilities, Education, Health, Atmospheric pollution - I think not - you will do better in future.		
Response: Noted.		
These comments relate to specific planning applications. The purpose of this proposal is to ensure that any increased demand for community infrastructure, which arises as a result of new development, will be met by that development. This will ensure that in future, the need for additional community facilities will be addressed at planning application stage.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Guidance on what could be acceptable needs to be provided

Response: Noted.

The RLP provides greater detail in policies 3.1, 3.6, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19 and 3.20.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

'May negotiate' should become 'will negotiate', thereby strengthening the Council's position

Response: Not accepted

The issues and options policy wording is only a starting point, the actually proposed policy will be available in the next round of consultation. However, the use of 'may' or 'will' would in this instance only be a statement of intent and would do nothing to alter the strength of the council's position either positively or negatively.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 5

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 5
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 6

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Chapter 3: Working in Ealing - employment sites and the central Ealing office area. Whilst these allow for some degree of flexibility for alternative uses to be located in these areas, the MPA recommend that a specific criterion should be included which allows for alternative uses such as social infrastructure and housing. This will ensure consistency with London Plan Policy 3B.4 (Industrial Locations) which supports the use of surplus industrial sites for such uses.		
Response: Not accepted.		
Surplus employment land will be released from employment use and made available for alternative development. The effect of the proposed amendment would only be to weaken the protection of land that has specifically been retained in employment use.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 6 (EMPLOYMENT) Mixes of uses will only end up as housing because they give developers the most profit. Land by the canal in MELs should be retained for uses that can benefit from canal transport.		
Response: Noted.		
Mixed development must be precisely that; single use types other than employment will not be permitted on employment sites which the ELR identifies as still needed. Current viability studies show no premium for residential development on former industrial sites in the Borough.		
Canal transport is a minority use of the canal network both nationally and across the region. Diversification of use, primarily for leisure, is essential to the survival and maintenance of this form of infrastructure.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
GSK	Business	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial proposal 6 - GSK is concerned that the Development Management Policies Document is inconsistent with the Development strategy in so far as it treats the GSK Greenford Site. The latter suggests that the GSK site as well as the Butlers Wharf Site should be developed for appropriate employment/mixed use as part of regeneration proposal for Greenford Green. However, the former document only appears to deal with Butlers Wharf Site suggesting that it should become a 'Mixed Business and Residential Area' not only is it unclear how this defers from its current SOA designation but we believe that there is sense in treating the two sites i.e. including the GSK Site, together as supported by the Development Strategy document. At present therefore the Development Management only serves to confuse and it is unclear how these sites will in due course be treated by the Development Sites Document.		

Response: Noted.

In respect of the Greenford Green site, the council acknowledges the significance of this site and recognises this in particular in the Development Strategy. The council will produce a supplementary planning document to guide development and set out Ealing Council's vision for the area and its expectations in regard to land uses, the form and layout of the area, design principles, and guidance regarding planning obligations and the phasing of development. Its main role is as a planning policy document will be to add more detail than is found in the LDF DPDs (Local Development Framework Development Plan Documents) including the Development Strategy 2026 and the Development Sites policy document. The guidance within this SPD is intended to be complimentary to the current LDF.

Outcome: No change.

The emerging policy will be further reviewed in the light of Employment Land Review, following further discussions with the GLA and the emerging draft of the Greenford Green SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Business	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Small business activity can be appropriate on some residential areas. For example, we would support including a small number of business start-up premises in the redeveloped Green Man Lane Estate.

Response: Support welcomed.

The council is promoting a major investment and regeneration programme to transform many of its homes, estates, town centres and neighbourhoods. It aims to provide residents with the best possible homes and housing services that will match the standards that they have told us they want. These ambitious plans seek to transform parts of the borough that need significant investment, care and attention as well as boost the economic, social prosperity and quality of life for our residents.

In relation to the Green Man Lane Estate, entrepreneurial units will be provided as part of Phase 1 of the redevelopment. These units will offer office space to small start up businesses.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Support

Support proposal 6 (I), especially opportunities for a mix of uses to improve the sustainability of the area.

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Object

Object to 6 (ii). Flexibility should be provided for consistency with 6 (I) to allow a mix of business and non-business uses that where appropriate (ie. considered on a site by site basis, especially where existing industrial areas are located adjacent to residential uses), whilst ensuring that any such developers would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. In addition, the proposals should factor the validity and historical occupancy/vacancy rates of existing industrial locations to allow rationalisation, redevelopment, in part to alternative uses. Proposals (i) and (iii) - Office accommodation should also be considered in existing industrial parks, such as Perivale industrial estate and this can form a complementary use to non-existing B1(a) uses

Response: Noted.

We are currently preparing an Employment Land Review (ELR) and this will review all our employment sites, including current Industrial Land designations. It will also identify any surplus lands. The Development Sites DPD will assess these surpluses and will recommend alternative uses as deemed appropriate and this will be in conformity with both the 2008 Consolidated London Plan and the draft Replacement London Plan.

It is accepted that 6 (i) and 6 (ii) appear slightly at odds and these will be re-worded in the revised Development Management DPD in order to provide clarity as to which designations and sites each policy is referring to. In Major Employment Locations, particularly Strategic Industrial Locations, the existing use will be protected and will not be re-designated unless it is deemed appropriate as a result of the findings of the ELR. Other employment sites may be suitable for facilitating a mix of uses depending on local circumstances and again this will be assessed as part of the ELR and Development Sites Document.

It is not considered that office accommodation is an acceptable use in existing industrial parks.

Outcome:

The wording of the policy will be revised in order to differentiate and provide greater clarity as to what will be acceptable in the different employment land designations. More detail will be provided as part of the Employment Land Review and in the Development Sites Document.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

This proposed policy should have a greater emphasis on protecting employment land from redevelopment for non-employment related uses, particularly Strategic Industrial Locations. The policy as currently worded suggests that some sites could be lost for mixed-use related uses throughout the plan period. The Council should establish clearer land-use designations at this stage, based on an up-to-date employment land review, and then seek appropriate policy protection for each site. The reference to safeguarding existing aggregate depots is supported, in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 5.20. However, further consideration should be given to identifying new sites. No reference is made in this section to the need to protect existing, and allocate new, waste sites.

Response: Noted.

We are currently preparing an Employment Land Review (ELR) and this will review all our employment sites, including current Industrial Land designations. It will also identify any surplus lands. The Development Sites DPD will assess these surpluses and will recommend alternative uses as deemed appropriate and this will be in conformity with both the 2008 Consolidated London Plan and the draft Replacement London Plan.

It is accepted that 6 (i) and 6 (ii) appear slightly at odds and these will be re-worded in the revised Development Management DPD in order to provide clarity as to which designations and sites each policy is referring to. In Major Employment Locations, particularly Strategic Industrial Locations, the existing use will be protected and will not be re-designated unless it is deemed appropriate as a result of the findings of the ELR. Other employment sites may be suitable for facilitating a mix of uses depending on local circumstances and again this will be assessed as part of the ELR and Development Sites Document.

Further consideration will be given to identifying new sites for aggregates in the Development Sites DPD. In relation to waste, we are currently preparing a joint Waste DPD with the five other West London Boroughs and this will identify possible new waste sites along with safeguarding the existing sites for future use.

Outcome:

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 6

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
------	--------------	------------------

Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
6ii - 'access' is irrelevant - change of use should be conditional on verifiable usage of transport modes, air quality assessments re. Impacts and Green Travel Plan		
Response: Not accepted.		
In order for a variety of transport modes to be utilized, good site access will be essential. As with all planning applications, a proposed change of use from industrial to warehousing will be assessed in relation to its potential impacts on its surroundings, including any environmental impacts.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 6
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 7

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 7
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial Proposal 7 Details of objection to be included in comments on the Development Sites policy document. Particular objection to redevelopment of Greenford Station.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
GSK	Business	IP 7
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial proposal 7 - GSK is concerned that the Development Management Policies Document is inconsistent with the Development strategy in so far as it treats the GSK Greenford Site. The latter suggests that the GSK site as well as the Butlers Wharf Site should be developed for appropriate employment/mixed use as part of regeneration proposal for Greenford Green. However, the former document only appears to deal with Butlers Wharf Site suggesting that it should become a 'Mixed Business and Residential Area' not only is it unclear how this defers from its current SOA designation but we believe that there is sense in treating the two sites i.e. including the GSK Site, together as supported by the Development Strategy document. At present therefore the Development Management only serves to confuse and it is unclear how these sites will in due course be treated by the Development Sites Document.		
Response: Noted.		
In respect of the Greenford Green site, the council acknowledges the significance of this site and recognises this in particular in the Development Strategy. The council will produce a supplementary planning document to guide development and sets out Ealing Council's vision for the area and its expectations in regard to land uses, the form and layout of the area, design principles, and guidance regarding planning obligations and the phasing of development. Its main role is as a planning policy document will be to add more detail than is found in the LDF DPDs (Local Development Framework Development Plan Documents) including the Development Strategy 2026 and the Development Sites policy document. The guidance within this SPD is intended to be complimentary to the current LDF.		
Outcome: No change.		
The emerging policy will be further reviewed in the light of Employment Land Review, following further discussions with the GLA and the emerging draft of the Greenford Green SPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
SEGRO	Business	IP 7
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Employment - • seek clarity on the Council's emerging employment land strategy, in particular, seek differentiation between protected SIL and other employment land and promote a more flexible approach firstly to non-SIL employment land. • recommend that in responding to strategic GLA policy, a more robust employment land evidence base will be required will be required. • note and support the principle of Initial Proposal 7 subject to clarification requested in the DS comments above as to the boundaries to growth areas and the differentiation of approach to SIL land.		

Response: Noted.

This will be guided by the ELR currently in preparation and the emerging DRLP.

Outcome:

More detail will be provided as part of the Employment Land Review and in the Development Sites Document.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Object

Initial Proposal 7 - I don't understand the question as it is a rather strange use of the word regeneration. Regeneration can through Arts and Culture. Or in the case of Ealing-hanging baskets.

Response: Noted.

In this context, regeneration refers to the improvement through new development of an area of currently impaired amenity.

Outcome: No change.

The proposed uses will be detailed in the Development Sites DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Business need to be smaller, local and developed from the community

Response: Noted.

The RLP incorporates a range of policies designed to encourage small businesses and the DM DPD will provide detail and local context.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Object

There is no sign of an evidence based holistic view of the whole of the borough. Parts of the borough are not suitable for regeneration. Energy and cash may not be available for any regeneration.

Response: Not accepted.

The DM DPD is not responsible for a strategic overview of development in the Borough. It is specifically intended as a reactive tool to allow the assessment and ensure the quality of development not envisaged by the Development Strategy.

Outcome: No change.

Further information on the council's development strategy is available in the Development Strategy.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support

Emphasis needed on efficient use of each sites footprint (e.g. residential built above commercial)

Response: Noted.

The identification of major sites for mixed development is intended precisely to achieve the synergistic development of different uses.

Outcome: No change.

Further details are provided in the Development Sites DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 7

Nature of Comment: Support
No further comment
Response: Support welcomed.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 7
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 7
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 8

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
iii) Drop off points should be available for private cars. v) Cycling parking should not be located where it causes a hazard to pedestrians. 8.1 iv)vi) There is too much on-street parking causing congestion on bus routes. Off-street parking should be adequate to accommodate requirements so that commuters pay for the cost of congestion. Also there are many essential uses for cars. Elderly people may not qualify for a disabled parking badge but still need to use it. Families and prams are still difficult to manage on buses despite recent improvements. Visiting friends or the doctor may involve time consuming changes of buses.		
Response: Noted.		
Providing drop off points for private cars is not a favourable option, as this would lead to increased levels of congestion, particularly at stations. However this can be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, depending on level of space available on the site.		
By providing sites for taxi services, this will assist in reducing on street congestion, as taxis will have designated off street areas to park. The comment regarding general off street parking is valid but is not relevant to the proposal outlined above. All future developments will be required to provided appropriate levels of parking as part of the proposals.		
Problems regarding accessibility on buses is a an issue to be raised with Transport for London as Ealing Council is not responsible for the delivery of bus services or the adaptation of buses to meet accessibility requirements.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
We support the notion of having designated drop-off and pick-up points at stations, safe and well-regulated taxi and vehicle hire services and taking care not to impede local parking needs or bus operations. We support the sensible encouragement of low car housing with car club facilities but not a rigid system that completely ignores that some residents will need cars. We support Improved routes and facilities for cyclists.		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Dooba Investments VI Ltd	Business	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial proposal 8 - Transport Policies/S106 Contributions - From our client's perspective, there needs to be a balance between local requirements in the S106 Strategy, the London Plan requirements, and also ensuring that future development on key sites such as Exchange Plaza is not stifled or undermined through viability issues brought about by the requests for excessive contributions.		
Response: Noted.		
The intention is to allow for a balance between locally important infrastructure projects and other projects which are of more strategic importance to London as a whole. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will support the growth proposals as set out in the Development Strategy and supporting DPD's by identifying what, how, when and where necessary infrastructure will be required and delivered over the Plan period. The IDP will also help establish priorities for seeking and spending 106 monies.		
The draft SPD on Legal Agreements is currently being prepared and will be progressed to adoption in June 2012. The Local Planning Authority will consider whether to adopt CIL alongside s106 in due course.		
In addition, a draft SPD on Legal agreements etc is also in the pipeline and will be amended once the council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and considered its position in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy.		
Outcome: No change.		
More detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SPD on Legal Agreements		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Whereas the overall aims of the policy are supported, it is considered that greater flexibility is provided on a site by site basis, in particular, the actual S106 Obligations and how they will be calculated should be set out to provide applicants with a clear understanding and certainty as to the level of facilities and obligations required		
Response: Noted.		
The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will help establish priorities for seeking and spending 106 monies. The draft SPD on Legal Agreements is currently being prepared and will be progressed to adoption in June 2012. This will set out standards and formulae for calculating actual S106 Obligations in line with specific development and site circumstances. The Local Planning Authority will consider whether to adopt CIL alongside s106 in due course.		
Outcome: No change.		
More detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SPD on Legal Agreements		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	IP 8
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
While my client is generally supportive of policy, it is respectfully suggested that criterion ii should be amended to read, "...major development sites elsewhere in the borough to be more than 400m walking distance from a bus stop or underground station".		

Response: Accepted.

This level of policy will be addressed by the Development Strategy in the next draft. The error in wording of the DM DPD policy is not replicated there.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Object

Initial Proposal 8 - The LDF does not go far enough to address the high car use and lack of integrated transport in Ealing. I feel that the council has to have a far more draconian attitude to multiple car ownership and that public transport has to be vastly improved. Ealing on paper would seem to be well served by transport but many bus routes are unreliable, many stops don't have countdown systems, many of the shelters are inadequate and Ealing Broadway station is a disgrace. When the council agreed to developing what is termed the Arcadia site we lost the only opportunity to have a proper integrated transport hub. The council will not fight for a state of the art Crossrail station and will probably just accept the plans as drawn up over 2 years ago. I find the cycle references laughable given that the borough is not noted for its peddling public and now developments can get away without having parking provision because they provide cycle racks. And I have yet to see a Car Club car actually moving along the Uxbridge Road.

Response: Not accepted.

All public transport within London is integrated and has been so for many years. The Council and TfL are constantly looking for ways to improve this level of integration. In addition to the increased services and facilities which development contributions will secure, the Local Implementation Plan will access TfL funding to improve traffic flows, increase the consistency of bus routes, and improve public safety.

It is the Council's understanding that a completely new station at Ealing Broadway is not funded as part of the CrossRail scheme. We are therefore pursuing improvements both through the LIP and through an application for Majors Scheme funding.

Modal shift to public transport is only possible with behaviour change and increased cycling will play a part in Ealing as it will across London. It is difficult to see that any of the plan's proposed improvements could be achieved if the present baseline is regarded as absolute and incorrigible.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Comment

More safe off road, or separated from road cycle tracks and walkways, bridges etc.

Response: Noted.

It is proposed to utilize the large areas of parks and open spaces in the Borough by providing a network of greenways as a means of encouraging walking, cycling and running for recreation and to get to and from local destinations.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

There is no analysis of who travels in Ealing, why they travel and where to and from. We need a bus service from/to Perivale/West Middlesex Hospital. Include mini-cabs.

Response: Not accepted.

Traffic flows in Ealing are well documented by both the Council's transport team and TfL with which we co-operate closely. Proposals for new services are subject to cost-benefit analyses which will be favourably affected by development and regeneration in the Borough.

It is unclear how mini-cabs could be included in public transport proposals.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Transport for London	Statutory	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

TfL supports the principle of high-density development being situated in areas with high public transport accessibility level, but the capacity of the current available public transport network must also be considered. In particular, the capacity of the bus network, may be affected by additional users brought about by Crossrail. Therefore, applicant contributions will be sought for increased network development in the borough should high density development impact on the capacity. In this context the yellow policy wording in paragraph 4.5 (8(v)) in the Development Management document is welcomed, although it could be clearer that this will include bus service and bus infrastructure improvements, as well as Crossrail contributions (see below). Residential and business growth targets outlined should also take into consideration public transport capacity both in present and future terms.

Response: Noted.

We agree that contributions should be to any of these modes of transport as appropriate to the individual application. Further detail will be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the SPD on Legal Agreements.

Outcome: No change.

Further detail to be provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the SPD on Legal Agreements.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Transport for London	Statutory	IP 8

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Initial Proposal 8 (I) TfL welcomes Crossrail safeguarding but believes there may be an error in Map DM4d 'safeguarded Crossrail land'. The Council should contact Crossrail directly to clarify this.

Response: Noted.

This matter will be clarified with CrossRail.

Outcome:

This matter will be clarified with CrossRail.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 9

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
<p>There is a place for low car housing but there is no guarantee that residents go to work via the nearby station or do not use a car to get to work. Ealing's controlled parking zones are aimed at reducing commuter parking and are no deterrent to overnight street parking. Until we have "residents only 24 hour parking", controlling car ownership or use through a legal agreement with the developer is inadequate. In the area around the development, street parking becomes congested. Buses, refuse lorries and HGVs are delayed by the consequent increase in street parking.</p>		
<p>The policy needs some real research with residents of low car housing or the Council may be building up a stock of inadequate housing. Affordable housing is no guarantee that residents will not need a car. They may need parking for vehicles used for their work. Family housing may also attract groups of adults who do not want a garden but need the car parking available Eg streets designed for family housing with off street parking is now increasingly rented to 4+ adults sharing with numerous vehicles including white vans.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>These are problems with implementation rather than with the policy itself.</p>		
<p>Where low car housing developments generate pressures on surrounding streets then these streets should be subject to traffic control measures. If the respondent is aware of any specific example than these should be reported to the Parking team.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
<p>In Hillingdon where "low car housing" has been provided the side streets surrounding the development have quickly filled up with the parked cars from the residents of the low car housing.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>These are problems with implementation rather than with the policy itself.</p>		
<p>Where low car housing developments generate pressures on surrounding streets then these streets should be subject to traffic control measures. If the respondent is aware of any specific example than these should be reported to the Parking team.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Object

This can only be assessed on a site by site basis. All proposals, regardless of location should be assessed against adopted Car Parking Standards, reinforced by a detailed Transport Assessment where relevant i.e larger schemes

Response: Not accepted.

The idea of low car housing is to reduce the reliance on the use of the private car as the primary means of transport, so therefore adopted car-parking standards will not apply. A transport assessment and travel plan will need to be undertaken and submitted as part of low car housing development proposals.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

Initial Proposal 9 - I do support low car housing by the council seems to give parking permits to residents of low car housing schemes when in fact they are not allowed to have them.

Response: Noted.

These are problems with implementation rather than with the policy itself.

If the respondent is aware of any specific example than these should be reported to the Parking team.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Object

There is no analysis of who travels in Ealing, why they travel and where to and from. We need a bus service from/to Perivale/West Middlesex Hospital. Include mini-cabs.

Response: Noted.

Analysis of traffic flows in Ealing is carried out by numerous bodies including the Council and TfL, these will of necessity include mini-cabs.

The assignment of bus routes is not subject to planning policy.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Object

Don't want new residential tower blocks 200m of crossrail stations. No explicit CPZ Policy.

Response: Noted.

Development proposals that are appropriate within 200m of a CrossRail or other station will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The Development Sites DPD will set out specific policies for the development of key sites, areas and locations in the borough. It will outline in greater detail the suitability of individual sites for facilitating different uses and densities, based on individual merits, taking into account distances from public transport stations.

CPZ policy is articulated primarily through the application of road markings, there is no specific planning provision necessary for this.

Outcome: No change.

More detail to be provided in the Development Sites DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

'Within 200 metres of stations' far too limited. 800m would be consistent with strategic proposals

Response: Support welcomed

This is a consideration for the Development Strategy. Individual sites will be guided by the Development Sites DPD.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Object

No further comment

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 9

Nature of Comment: Support

Electric Solar should be encouraged as fuel for transport. Electric charging sockets in bay areas etc

Response: Support welcomed

PV generation is currently limited in its useful applications due to the relatively low efficiency of existing technologies. Low levels of solar irradiance in the UK relative to most comparable countries also restrict the usefulness of this technology at present.

RLP 5.8 and 6.13 support the provision of additional charging points.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 10

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 10 emphasise the needs of cyclists but pedestrians often have to share cluttered footpaths with cyclists and bikes add an extra danger. Pavements accommodate green boxes, parking posts, streetlights, A boards, pavement sales, adverts and telephone boxes. All developments should be required to contribute towards the declutter of existing pavements. The clutter is not only visually unattractive but is a safety hazard.		
Response: Noted.		
Pavement clutter is difficult to control through planning because much of it is not subject to planning applications. Amenity policies in the next draft DM DPD will seek to address problems of this sort. However decluttering, which seeks to alter existing development will have to be addressed in area specific initiatives and/or action plans.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposals 10(V). The cost of such facilities should be met by the users.		
Response: Not accepted.		
It is not considered appropriate that the users should meet the cost of providing such facilities. It will be necessary for the developers of such schemes to incorporate these facilities at the design stage so that they form an integral part of the overall layout and design of the completed proposal.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
My client is generally supportive of policy. In respect to criterion ii of policy, it should be made clear that major new development should only be required to contribute towards pedestrian and cycle route infrastructure where it accords with national guidance contained within planning circular 05/2005.		
Response: Noted. Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed. Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Object		
I support this but I doubt if it will happen given that already the time to use a pedestrian crossing has been reduced and there is not further progress on improving dangerous crossings for pedestrians such as the Lido and Church Road/Uxbridge Road.		
Response: Noted.		
The Council's Local Implementation Plan will seek to improve the safety and amenity of pedestrian crossings. Development contributions will also assist this objective.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Not sufficient		
Response: Noted.		
It is not clear why it is considered the proposal is not sufficient and no recommendation for how it could be improved has been given.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 10

Nature of Comment: Support
No further comment
Response: Support welcomed.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
Pedestrians should be at the top of the hierarchy, cyclists subordinate. Separation of footpaths and cycle routes should be default position.		
Response: Noted.		
Footpaths and cycle routes are currently separated, this remains the default position. Pedestrians have priority on footpaths.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 10
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 10

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 10

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 11

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
This policy is inadequate. Size of vehicles making home deliveries or using residential streets should be addressed. Home zones would reduce short cuts and improve the residential environment.		
Response: Noted.		
It is not practical to specifically assess the size of vehicles making home deliveries. Measures including homes zones are considered for streets based on the character of the surrounding uses and the volume of traffic. These are not dependent on planning policy.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Object		
The environmental impacts of goods delivery, especially for warehousing proposals should be required for full applications only/or once a named operator has been identified.		
Response: Not accepted.		
The environmental impacts will need to be assessed as part of the planning application process, so therefore a named operator will need to be identified at this stage.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 11

Nature of Comment: Comment
Needs to be early or late and kept to a minimum
Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 11
Nature of Comment: Object		
How to judge assertions of 'benefits of employment generated' vs 'environmental costs'. Need to qualify how these will be qualified on the basis of the weight to be given to/within each element.		
Response: Noted.		
This will be further developed in the initial options draft of the DM DPD.		
Outcome: No change.		
This will be further developed in the initial options draft of the DM DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 11

Nature of Comment: Object
No further comment
Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

| **Name** | **Organisation** | **Policy Reference** |
| Mr DW Hawkins | Resident | IP 11 |
| **Nature of Comment:** Support |
| No further comment |
| **Response:** Support welcomed. |
| **Outcome:** No change. |
| **Name** | **Organisation** | **Policy Reference** |
| Colin Emmins | Resident | IP 11 |
| **Nature of Comment:** Support |
| No further comment |
| **Response:** Support welcomed. |
| **Outcome:** No change. |
| **Name** | **Organisation** | **Policy Reference** |
| John Murray | Resident | IP 11 |
| **Nature of Comment:** Support |
| No further comment |
| **Response:** Support welcomed. |
| **Outcome:** No change. |

INITIAL PROPOSAL 12

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support/Object		
Network of centres is supported and changes to Northolt. Object to Ealing Broadway and West Ealing; Southall Town Centre and Southall gasworks retail centre boundaries because retail uses are not contiguous. They should be separate unless linked to other proposed town centre uses. But designated shopfronts need more help. Designated Frontages have empty shops or too many non retail uses. Dickens Yard retail mall will lead to more bars, restaurants, gambling and amusement arcades with associated problems of control of the night time economy. Decrease in the number of banks and building societies add to empty premises in all the town centres. Designated frontage policy should be supportive to shopping uses in town and neighbourhood centres with improvement schemes available for shopfronts, pavements, car parking and off street loading. They should be resurveyed.		
Response: Noted.		
Support for network of centres is welcomed.		
There is a surfeit of retail demand in the Borough but insufficient high quality retail units to meet it; in consequence much of this is currently exported.		
The uses mentioned as problematic are proposed to be controlled under the current DMDPD proposals. The forms of financial support suggested are already offered by the Council and policy support is intended to complement them.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial Proposal 12 (i) - The blanket proposal for no loss of Class A1 shopping floorspace in the designated frontages is unnecessarily restrictive and inflexible. It is at odds with the approach taken in PPS6 and the suitability identified for food and drink uses in certain locations with Ealing Town Centre (for example in the 'Ealing Metropolitan Centre Spatial Development Framework'). This proposal will serve to rule out some proposals which would genuinely enhance vitality and viability. For example, the benefits of food and drink uses to dwell-time and spending per head within centres are well documented. These benefits are recognised in the West London Retail Needs Study 2006, paragraphs 1.15 - 1.16 (prepared by GVA Grimley). A criteria-based approach is more suitable and appropriate with particular reference given to the effect on the vitality and viability of the centre as a whole. Proposals 12 and 14 should cross-refer.		

Response: Not accepted.

This will be replaced with a criteria-based policy in the draft DM DPD.

Outcome: No change.

More detail will follow in the initial options draft of the DM DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 12

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

This policy should include a presumption against retail development proposals outside of the designated retail centres, and include a policy reference to ensure that new retail development is appropriately linked to the scale and function of the centre. In addition, the Council is strongly encouraged to adopt an approach to affordable shops, as promoted by Policy 4.9 of the draft replacement London Plan. It is not clear what the purpose of section (ii) of this policy is, as this seems to relate to proposals outside of town centres, yet is within the town centres policy proposal. A policy should be developed in relation to retail provision outside of town centres, taking into account the requirements within Policy 4.8 of the draft replacement London Plan.

Response: Noted.

We are currently in the process of preparing a Retail Needs Study for the Borough, which will establish our future retail requirements and provide justification for proposed retail policies. All proposed retail developments will be subject to a sequential test to ensure that retail proposals which are located outside of the designated retail centres will not be permitted unless there is a justification to do so. An addition will be made to the policy to ensure that new development will be linked to the scale and function of the centre.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

A clearer distinction will also be made between retail provision both within and outside of designated retail centres. This will involve identifying separate and appropriate polices for each in order to be in conformity with the draft Replacement London Plan.

Outcome:

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 12

Nature of Comment: Object

We object. Ealing Broadway & West Ealing are 2 different areas and should no longer be treated as a Metropolitan Centre. There are already enough shops in Ealing Broadway so we should not be planning for more.

Response: Not accepted.

Ealing Broadway and West Ealing are not fully separate either spatially or functionally. Reinforcing the links between them will benefit both.

The Retail Need Assessment shows the Borough already to be exporting retail demand to other boroughs and that this demand will increase during the plan period.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Not green enough		
Response: Not accepted.		
Without further detail it is not possible to address the respondent's concerns.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 12
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 13

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
Open-air street markets are difficult in wet weather and they need to be held on hard surfaces not grass. (Ealing green French market was really muddy and difficult) They should only be held near public toilets with good washing facilities.		
Response: Noted.		
Where possible, hard surfaces will be identified and utilized for the purposes of Open-air street markets, however this will not always be feasible and will have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
This policy should provide support for street and farmers markets, in line with Policy 4.8 of the draft replacement London Plan, and Policy 3D.3 of the London Plan.		
Response: Noted.		
Street markets are already mentioned in the proposal. The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.		
Outcome:		
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Object		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 13

Nature of Comment: Support
No further comment
Response: Support welcomed.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 13
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 14

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Object		
Initial Proposal 14 Object to viii) ventilation equipment is damaging amenity of shopping parades. They are not always visible from the street but they frequently are because of their height above the roof and they are very obvious from adjoining flats.		
Response: Noted.		
This will be addressed in a general amenity policy in the next DM DPD draft.		
Outcome:		
More will appear in the next draft of the DM DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Last para is very important but rather vague. 'In what way will the council regard the differential impacts of businesses....'		
Response: Noted.		
The exact wording is only indicative at this stage. The draft policy will be criteria-based and should be less subject to ambiguity.		
Outcome: No change.		
More will appear in the next draft of the DM DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Object

Initial Proposal 14 - When considering proposals for eating, drinking and entertainment uses reference should also be given in Proposal 14 to consideration of the effect of proposals on the vitality and viability of the centre (for the reasons given under the comment under proposal 12(1)). Carefully considered and appropriately location eating, drinking and entertainment uses can create interest, add footfall, promote activity, 'eyes on the street' and encourage people to stay longer. The effects are not all necessarily negative. Proposals 12 and 14 should cross-refer. In addition, further amend Proposal 14 as follows (new text underlined): "The Council will have regard to the differential positive and negative impacts of businesses selling food and drink for consumption on and 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 use classes A3-5 of the Use Class Order".

Response: Noted.

The approach in Initial Proposal 12 is that they type of uses mentioned should not crowd out retail uses or sterilise and are by virtue of their different hours of operation. Uses which complement the retail offer of the area will be considered as appropriate.

The text in the consultation document is not intended to constitute that of the final policy, just the policy approach. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

E. Enjoying Ealing - Shopping, Culture, Sport and Tourism - With the sale of alcohol we strongly favour tighter restrictions on the issuing of alcohol licences for shops, especially 24/7 licences in what are primarily residential areas.

Response: Noted.

The issuing of alcohol licenses does not come under the remit of Planning. The Licensing department are responsible for regulating the issuing of alcohol licenses.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

This policy should be expanded to provide a more strategic approach to managing the night-time economy, in line with Policy 4.6 of the draft replacement London Plan and London Plan Policy 3D.4.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome:

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
------	--------------	------------------

Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
Initial Proposal 14 - Once again the council must have a more draconian attitude eating, drinking and entertainment uses. The council has to inform us of planning applications (I think the number of houses etc notified should be increased) but for the licences it just has to be displayed. I think nearby properties should also be informed by letter and also local residents' associations. There should also never be a concentration of one use in a street because it means local residents lose local shops and over concentration leads to various businesses closing.		
Response: Not accepted.		
The issuing of alcohol licenses does not come under the remit of Planning. The Licensing department are responsible for regulating the issuing of alcohol licenses.		
In relation to the concentration of one particular use on a street - 14 (i) states that each proposal will be considered in relation to a range of criteria, including the concentration of eating, drinking and entertainment uses and the preservation of the appearance and character of the area. By assessing proposals against these criteria, a situation where there is an over concentration of one use on a street should be prevented.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Overemphasised and not environmentally friendly		
Response: Not accepted.		
Eating, drinking and entertainment uses are an important element of vibrant and successful town centres, provided they are sensitively located and do not impact negatively on the surrounding area. It is not clear why this policy is considered over-emphasised and not environmentally friendly.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support

14(viii), p.34 should require commercial waste recycling in addition to 'refuse disposal'.

Response: Noted.

The text will be refined in the initial proposals draft of the DM DPD.

Outcome:

The text will be refined in the initial proposals draft of the DM DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 14

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 14
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 15

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 15 Supported except for artistic and cultural quarters centred on Bond Street/Ealing Green and Hanwell Broadway because there is inadequate space and they are conservation areas with a limited capacity for adaptation. The former should be split between Pitshanger Manor, the Town Hall and Uxbridge Rd. Where would such uses be fitted in at Hanwell Broadway?		
Response: Noted.		
Bond Street/Ealing Green is the main cultural quarter in Ealing Broadway, so promoting artistic cultural quarters in this area is justified and such proposals will be facilitated where possible. The conservation area designation will not be a limiting factor for appropriate and suitably designed cultural and artistic proposals.		
The policy approach proposed would also support similar forms of development in town centres across the Borough where these would be most accessible.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
We would welcome plans to develop cultural, sports and leisure activities in West Ealing, especially as part of the Green Man Lane Estate plans.		
Response: Noted.		
The redevelopment proposals for the Green Man Lane Estate include a range of sports and leisure related facilities including: a low cost gym, a community run café, a community centre that will be suitable for a range of uses (which may include cultural/leisure facilities), playgrounds, community gardens, public squares and a Multi Use Games Area which will serve the adjoining school.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

The reference to encouraging cultural, sports and leisure activity in town centres is supported, but should be expanded to include areas of new development or regeneration. This is suggested in reference to Southall, but should be made more specific. In addition, as required by draft replacement Plan Policy 3.20, the Council should assess the need for sports and recreation facilities, and secure sites where needed.

The proposal to direct new visitor accommodation within town centres and at public transport interchanges is supported and is in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 4.5 and London Plan Policy 3D.7. However this should be expanded to include the requirements within Policy 4.5. In addition, the reason behind the reference to 'subject to there being no loss of housing' is not clear.

Response: Accepted conditionally

Encouraging development, other than in the sense of being open to it is a task for the Development Strategy, which endorses each of these types of development.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Revision of text.

Further detail will be provided in the initial options draft of the DM DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support

My client is supportive of policy that encourages hotel development located at public transport interchanges.

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hovedean Properties	Business	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support

We support the view towards promoting Central Southall as an artistic and cultural quarter. We also support the view towards identifying specialist locations at GWR Southall and canalside development. We also support the use for hotel development in town centres and at public transport interchanges.

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment.

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support

Except we don't have anything about culture and tourism. Ealing is a metropolitan centre and, with the exception of the barely open Pitzhanger Manor and Gallery, we don't have any council run cultural facilities. Tourism. We don't even have an information bureau.

Response: Noted.

It is acknowledged that the provision of tourism and cultural facilities could be improved – this is the reason we have included an objective to promote artistic and cultural quarters in the mentioned areas.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Comment

It is very limited - involve the local people

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 15

Nature of Comment: Object

Inadequate scale, scope, content and geographic coverage

Response: Not accepted.

The proposal lists areas across the full breadth of the Borough including all of the main town centres. It is not considered that efforts would be well spent creating town centre activities outside of town centres.

Without further detail we are unable to provide further suggestions.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Object		
(I) 'artistic' and 'cultural' more widely in Ealing Town Centre, not confined to Bond Street/Ealing Green. (ii) hotel development encouraged as mixed use (incl. Housing).		
Response: Noted.		
Bond Street/Ealing Green is the centre of the proposed culture quarter in Ealing Broadway but development is not excluded outside of this core.		
The possibility of encouraging hotel development as part of mixed use schemes can only be assessed on a case by case basis taking into account a number of factors including site location, accessibility, size etc.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 15
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

INITIAL PROPOSAL 16

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16
Nature of Comment: Support/Object		
<p>The proposed text is supported fully. But we object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *lack of protection for the habitat of nature conservation sites; *changes in MOL boundaries at Glade lane and Norwood Hall; * the proposal for building a school on green belt land which is not recorded here. Protection of back gardens is welcomed large sheds built under PD can only be avoided with an Article 4 direction for areas of open spaces deficiency. We are concerned about para 5.15 which gives weight to improving existing open space rather than creating new. They are both important. But creating new space is essential for people who move to flats in an area of open space deficiency and did not get a chance to record their views in consultation processes. Nature Conservation Areas-Map DM5 is too small to comment in detail but using the GLA proposed revisions of 2006 We list the following points. 		
<p>Response: Noted.</p> <p>The consolidated London Plan and the draft Replacement London Plan contain a number of comprehensive policies which protect the habitat of nature conservation sites and which do not need to be replicated in this document. Policy 7.19 of the draft Replacement London Plan relates to bio-diversity and access to nature and states that development proposals should make a positive contribution to the protection, promotion and management of biodiversity, and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the conservation status of a protected species.</p> <p>In relation to changes to MOL boundaries at Glade Lane, these changes are no longer proposed to be taken forward. In respect of Norwood Hall MOL no changes were or are proposed.</p> <p>There is a policy presumption against built development on open space unless it directly supports its open space function. If the borough is to accommodate further growth, the need for open space as a central component of this built environment will inevitably grow. Accordingly, in this context, established open space will become an ever more valuable resource. The need to protect existing sites, and identify new sites for protection from irreversible development is therefore central to the Strategy. It is accepted however, that in some rare cases, built development may be deemed acceptable, either because exceptional circumstances exist to justify this development, or because a site no longer satisfies the tests for inclusion as open space. The later of the two scenarios will be identified through the open space strategy. It should be noted that this is seen as being very much an exception to the rule, and where such exceptions exist, these will already be identified through the LDF.</p> <p>It is recognised that creating new open space and protecting existing are both important, however in some instances, providing new open space is not a viable option due to constraints and competing pressures for existing space. In such cases, improving the quality of existing open spaces will be the preferred option.</p>		
<p>Outcome: No change.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Thomas Wrenn Homes Ltd	Business	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Object

It is inappropriate to suggest that all Community Open Space designations should remain as shown on the UDP Proposals Map. Designations should be reviewed in light of the proposed Council's Parks and Open Space Strategy (referred to on page 48 of the Development Strategy Initial Proposals) and completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will assess whether resources are available to ensure that specific sites are able to meet Community Open Space objectives. The final sentence of the proposal should recognise that an alternative form of development may be acceptable if it enables access or improvements to open space which would otherwise not be achievable.

Response: Accepted conditionally.

The open space designations as defined in the UDP map will be reviewed following completion of the Open Space strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan findings.

The proposal that alternative development may be acceptable where it improves access to open space is not accepted. Only ancillary development, which is directly related to the open space use of the site, will be permitted. Whilst the Council clearly supports the enhancement of existing open space, in most instances this can be achieved without any loss of space to development. The Open Space Strategy will explore options/actions for enhancing the existing network of open space in the borough. This will also be reflected through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Outcome: Review and update designations on UDP proposals map if necessary, taking into account the findings of the Open Space Strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Object

Twyford Abbey Properties consider that the designation of the Twyford Abbey Site as Metropolitan Open Land is no longer appropriate having regard to the fact that it serves no strategic purpose. It will be essential to keep some of the site open irrespective of the MOL designation to preserve the setting of the listed building.

Response: Not accepted.

The site is considered to satisfy the tests for inclusion as MOL as set out in London Plan policy 3D.10. In particular it is considered to contribute to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built-up area. Moreover, the site contains features or landscape (gardens) of historic value at a metropolitan level. This will be reviewed further however as part of the Open Space Strategy. The council are particularly keen to open up public access to this site.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

We strongly support any plans for a general presumption against inappropriate development of open/green space such as back gardens. Indeed, we would favour a much stronger policy on back gardens whereby no development, apart from legitimate garden sheds etc, would be allowed in gardens of less than an agreed size.

Response: Noted.

The General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) sets out the regulations relating to whether permission is needed for householder development, including development in back gardens. These standards are set nationally and each Council is required to be in conformity with them when applying locally specific development management policies and objectives.

Provided that the standards and criteria as set out in the GPDO are adhered to, a certain amount of development in back gardens will be permitted without the need to apply for planning permission. A complete ban on back garden development therefore cannot be brought into policy as suggested.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Havelock Estate Residents Steering Group	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Appendix 1 does not show any amendments to the designated network of open/green space in Havelock Estate. The initial proposal continues by stating that there will be a general presumption against built development on open space, unless it directly supports the open space use of the land. The council will also have regard to a buffer strip of 5m on land adjoining open space (10m in the case of a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation or a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation).

The residents Steering Group welcomes the promotion of the regeneration of their estate. They wish however, further consideration of the level of additional housing provision and the designation of open space within the site. As the site is outlined for redevelopment in the draft Development Strategy 2026, we seek that the Havelock Estate, the extent of which is outlined in the accompanying site plan, is designated within the emerging LDF proposals map.

We believe that a higher level of housing can be provided on the site than is currently proposed. The site could reasonably be described as being within a central location. This is because it is within 800m walking distance of Southall Town centre. This is described as a Major Town Centre within the London Plan. It should also be noted that the site is located on a main arterial route and is located within close proximity to Southall Overground Station.

Whilst currently at a PTAL of 1-3, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that the relevant indicative density in the London Plan should, as a starting point permit development up to 650 hrh for the whole site given that it meets the criteria of being within 800m of a major town centre and is located adjacent to a main vehicular route. We further believe that there is the potential to maximise development opportunities further as part of a major regeneration scheme. This is because there are clear opportunities to alter existing road connections and improve public transport connections through the redevelopment proposals, thus enhancing bus provision and improving opportunities to use alternative modes other than the car. We understand that Southall station is also proposed to be serviced by the Crossrail network which will provide rail services from Maidenhead to Abbey Wood and Shenfield.

Such improvements would increase the PTAL levels to 4-6 category where there would be a clear justification to provide densities within the 650-1100 hrh band and therefore has clear potential to increase the level of development through transport connections and good design to maximise the housing and other opportunities.

In relation to Open Space, we request similar flexibility as has been shown towards the proposed designation of Site S7 (Glade Lane Site) in the Development Management Policies DPD, which promotes the re-location and re-provision of open space as part of redevelopment proposals. An arbitrary 10 metre buffer adjacent to the canal and 5 metre buffer adjacent to other open spaces is also not necessarily the most flexible or imaginative approach which could limit regeneration in other areas.

Response: Noted.

The detailed proposals for the redevelopment of Havelock are not yet available and will be dealt with in due course as a planning application. The density of the development will need to relate to transport capacity and any departure from the density matrix in the Consolidated London Plan would need to be justified. Improved transport links will also form part of any development proposals. In relation to any landscaped buffer between the development and the green corridor this is likely to be at least 5m and it should be noted that the policy in the existing UDP only relates to Metropolitan Open Land.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 16
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Whilst this policy proposal is broadly supported, it should be strengthened to ensure that both Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land is given the strongest protection, as required by draft replacement Plan policies 7.16 and 7.17 and London Plan policies 3D.9 and 3D.10. In particular, reference to development being resisted "unless it is directly related to and supports the open space use of the land", should include a requirement for any development to maintain the openness of the land.		
Response: Noted.		
The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which brings it more closely into alignment with the RLP, this should eliminate the seeming disparity of these policies.		
Outcome: .		
More detail will be available with the initial options draft of the DM DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	IP 16
Nature of Comment: Object		
With the exception of the Green Belt designation, it is considered that there should not be a presumption against built development in these areas, irrespective of whether proposals are directly related to the site or not. Policy should seek only to prevent development which would cause harm to biodiversity or geology. National planning policy in the form of PPS9 'Biodiversity and Geology Conservation' recognizes that development can perform role in enhancing biodiversity and improving access. It is suggested that future policy should be drafted in accordance with national policy.		
Response: Not accepted.		
Only ancillary development which is directly related to the open space use of the site will be permitted on land formally protected as open space. Whilst the Council clearly supports the enhancement of existing open space, in most instances this can be achieved without any loss of space to development. The Open Space Strategy will explore options/actions for enhancing the existing network of open space in the borough. This will also be reflected through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
We support but additionally no tall buildings should be allowed to overshadow any green space.		
Response: Noted.		
The Development Sites policy document that will support the Development Strategy, will set out specific policies for the development of key sites, areas and locations in the borough. It will outline in greater detail the suitability of individual sites for facilitating different uses and densities, based on individual merits and on the potential impact of development on the surroundings.		

Outcome: No change.

Further detail to be provided in the Development Sites DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Comment

Not developmental - needs to increase

Response: Noted.

The DM DPD is a reactive document and is not intended to set out a strategy for change

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Object

Open green space may be needed to grow food; build Police Stations, Hospitals and Schools.

Response: Not accepted.

The forthcoming Open Space strategy will identify opportunities for growing food through the provision of allotments.

There is a policy presumption against built development on open space unless it directly supports its open space function. If the borough is to accommodate further growth, the need for open space as a central component of this built environment will inevitably grow. Accordingly, in this context, established open space will become an evermore valuable resource. The need to protect existing sites, and identify new sites for protection from irreversible development is therefore central to the Strategy. It is accepted however, that in some rare cases, built development may be deemed acceptable, either because exceptional circumstances exist to justify this development, or because a site no longer satisfies the tests for inclusion as open space. The later of the two scenarios will be identified through the open space strategy. It should be noted that this is seen as being very much an exception to the rule, and where such exceptions exist, these will already be identified through the LDF.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

'Buffer Strip of 5m' is insufficient - at least a 10m minimum to protect setting of open spaces

Response: Noted.

A 5m buffer is considered sufficient to protect the setting of open spaces.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 16

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
------	--------------	------------------

Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 16
--------------	----------	-------

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
------	--------------	------------------

John Murray	Resident	IP 16
-------------	----------	-------

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 17

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
The policy is supported but: in vi) it is the important habitats that need protection not just the areas; protection of floodplain areas is needed.		
Car parking space for allotments, district/metropolitan parks is essential where people travel some distance to use specialist facilities. Football teams can totally congest existing space at the weekend. eg Pitshanger Park		
Response: Noted.		
Areas of nature conservation value are mentioned for protection, which includes the protection of existing habitats. In relation to building on flood plains, it is generally accepted that built development will not be located within the floodplain, in line with PPS 25. PPS 25 defines uses in terms of their vulnerability to flooding, and based on this vulnerability identifies which uses would or wouldn't be appropriate within the flood zones. Development sites identified in the forthcoming Development Sites DPD will be the subject of sequential test as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process in accordance with the requirements of PPS 25. The sequential test will be used to locate new developments to the least risky areas relative to their vulnerability. Based on this approach, certain less vulnerable uses such as outdoor sports facilities may be an appropriate in areas at risk of flooding.		
The Open Space Strategy is currently being prepared, and this aims to improve accessibility to our network of open spaces. The preferred means of access will involve utilizing sustainable means of transport such as walking cycling and public transport and this will be reflected in the Strategy.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Object		
Object - Twyford Abbey Properties consider that the designation of the Twyford Abbey Site as Metropolitan Open Land is no longer appropriate having regard to the fact that it serves no strategic purpose. It will be essential to keep some of the site open irrespective of the MOL designation to preserve the setting of the listed building.		

Response: Not accepted

The site is considered to satisfy the tests for inclusion as MOL as set out in London Plan policy 3D.10. In particular it is considered to contribute to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built-up area. Moreover, the site contains features or landscape (gardens) of historic value at a metropolitan level. This will be reviewed further however as part of the Open Space Strategy. The council are particularly keen to open up public access to this site.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

This policy should be supported and developed by a borough-wide assessment of open space provision, in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 7.18 and London Plan policies 3D.11 and 3D.12.

Response: Noted.

The Council are currently preparing an open space strategy for the borough which will seek to ensure the right provision of open space in the borough relative to population growth. This strategy will inform the Development Strategy, revised Development Management DPD and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome:

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.**Outcome:** No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Comment

All areas need open space, even in shops, business, schools and housing

Response: Noted.

The Council are currently preparing an open space strategy for the borough which will seek to ensure the right provision of open space in the borough relative to population growth. This strategy will inform the Development Strategy, revised Development Management DPD and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Object		
Open green space may be needed to grow food; build Police Stations, Hospitals and Schools.		
Response: Noted.		
The forthcoming Open Space strategy will identify opportunities for growing food through the provision of allotments.		
There is a policy presumption against built development on open space unless it directly supports its open space function. If the borough is to accommodate further growth, the need for open space as a central component of this built environment will inevitably grow. Accordingly, in this context, established open space will become an evermore valuable resource. The need to protect existing sites, and identify new sites for protection from irreversible development is therefore central to the Strategy. It is accepted however, that in some rare cases, built development may be deemed acceptable, either because exceptional circumstances exist to justify this development, or because a site no longer satisfies the tests for inclusion as open space. The later of the two scenarios will be identified through the open space strategy. It should be noted that this is seen as being very much an exception to the rule, and where such exceptions exist, these will already be identified through the LDF.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 17
Nature of Comment: Support		
17 (iii) and 17 (v) are at cross purposes. 17 (iii) hard surfaced areas should be permeable wherever possible. 17 (iv) any form of lighting not just 'floodlighting'		
Response: Noted.		
All proposed hard surfaces will be expected to be permeable so that the risk of flooding will be minimised. It is not anticipated that normal lighting would have the same impact on adjoining residential amenity or biodiversity that floodlighting would have.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 17

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 18

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Comment		
The Acton-Horn Lane depot causes problems of dust and noise for local residents.		
Response: Noted.		
This is accepted, however the control of dust and noise is a management issue that is monitored through the pollution control framework. However, where there is evidence that planning conditions are not being complied enforcement action may be taken to remedy the situation. The revised Development Management DPD will also set out criteria by which such depots will be assessed and will require compliance with issues such as dust and noise.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Whilst the Council's support for encouraging the movement of aggregates via rail or canal, minimising movement by road, and the designation of new recycling depots, is welcomed in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 5.20, further discussions regarding the designation of new sites is required to ensure that the Council is contributing sufficiently to West London's aggregates requirement		
Response: Noted.		
Although Ealing is identified in the London Plan as a borough with remaining aggregate reserves in London, the location of these reserves in sensitive localities means that it is highly unlikely that Ealing will be able to contribute to meeting the supply of land won aggregates in West London. A number of sites in the Osterley area of the borough were identified as having un-worked reserves, although it is proposed that none of these sites be taken forward for mineral workings because of their existing open space status, their heritage value, and their strategic role for sports/recreation. It is understood that the Mayor is recommending further alterations to the RLP in respect of the aggregates policy, including removing reference to Ealing in relation to any targets.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 18

Nature of Comment: Comment
Needs to be more carefully and comprehensively considered
Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IP 18
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IP 18

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IP 18

Nature of Comment: Support

No further comment

Response: Support welcomed.

Outcome: No change.

INITIAL PROPOSAL 19

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>This proposal refers to development within Flood Zones, and in particular requires development within Flood Zone 3 to relocate to areas with a lower flooding probability. Whilst the MPA support the principle of this approach, it is pertinent to note that the draft policy proposal does not reflect emerging Government Guidance within the proposed amendments to Table D2 of PPS25 – Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification. This highlights that police facilities which are not required to be operational during flooding can be appropriately located in Zone 3 if required. Mindful of this context, and in order that the emerging Development Management Policies Document is consistent with Government Guidance, Initial Proposal 19 should be amended accordingly. Recommendation: We recommend Initial Proposal 19 is amended to include an additional criterion (additional wording underlined): (iii) allow 'Less Vulnerable' Uses, as defined within PPS25, where it can be demonstrated that such uses are not necessarily required to be operational during periods of flooding.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>PPS 25 states that police facilities that are not required to be operational during flooding are less vulnerable in terms of flood risk vulnerability classification. However whether or not this will be acceptable will be assessed on a case by case basis, depending on the type of police facility proposed, and there will be a requirement to demonstrate how the facility will be unaffected by a potential flood. Other factors will also need to be taken into account when assessing such an application including location and accessibility amongst others.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>Map does not show flood zone 1 in the key. There should be no development in the functional flood plain and policy should say this first, not as an add on extra.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>Any land not designated on the map as either a Functional Flood Plain, Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 represents Flood Zone 1. It states in the policy that the functional flood plain will be protected from development, and this will be applied regardless of whether it is mentioned at the beginning or the end of the policy.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Object		
Twyford Abbey Properties consider it unreasonable to expect all new development to be the subject of a sequential test when it is possible to develop sites without causing increased flood risk and to ensure the development from risk of flooding.		
Response: Not accepted.		
The requirement that new development be subject to a sequential test in areas at risk of flooding is a national requirement set out in PPS 25 Development and Flood Risk.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Support overall aims of the proposal, however do not support the requirement for a sequential test for all developments. Sequential tests should only apply to the highest flood zones... and not for the developments in the least risky areas. A floorspace threshold should also apply to this part of the policy.		
Response: Not accepted.		
The requirement that new development be subject to a sequential test in areas at risk of flooding is a national requirement set out in PPS 25 Development and Flood Risk.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Policy proposals relating to water and flooding should be expanded to include policies relating to sustainable drainage, water quality and sewerage infrastructure, and water use and supplies, as required in draft London Plan policies 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15.		
Response: Noted.		
The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.		
Outcome:		
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IP 19
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
Initial Proposal 19 - Support, but additionally do not allow development on flood plains. Also do not allow hard paving around buildings already on flood plains.		
Response: Noted.		
It states in the policy that the functional flood plain will be protected from development. All proposed hard surfaces will be expected to be permeable so that the risk of flooding will be minimised.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Needs to be more carefully and comprehensively considered		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	IIP 19

Nature of Comment: Support
No further comment
Response: Support welcomed.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	IIP 19
Nature of Comment: Support		
No further comment		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change.		

ISSUE 1

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Options 1C and 1D		
Issue 1 - Policy 5.6 should be amended and incorporated in policy 5.4 to ensure a range of sizes of dwellings is provided in shopping centres as well as on other sites. Small units may be designed for single use or couples but over time often accommodate families causing overcrowding. A mix of dwelling size avoids some of the problems resulting from concentrating one dwelling size but playspace/private amenity space is essential even in Town Centres. i) and ii) in the policy should be deleted. The range of sizes should be based on current need even in Town Centres. Extendable homes are no longer relevant and house sites are now rarely big enough to allow for future extensions.		
Response: Noted.		
The advantages of providing a mix of dwelling sizes are acknowledged and supported. The range of sizes will be identified based on need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It is considered that extendable homes are still relevant and it is important that new buildings are designed in a way that allows them to be adapted, altered and extended as necessary based on changing needs.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policies in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Option 1A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Business	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Option 1D		
We support the need for high quality homes; the careful matching of types of homes to location and transport facilities; the need to ensure the maximum possible level of sustainability for all new homes; respecting the character of each particular neighbourhood; ensuring sufficient garden space and not allowing front gardens to be paved over with impervious materials.		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1B

Issue 1 - Residential Choice - In terms of responding to the demand for smaller units whilst catering for the continuing need for affordable family housing, NGP prefer Option 1B as it is considered that applications should be dealt with on merit taking account of the identified housing need and market assessment at the time and having regard to site context. This would allow for an appropriate level of flexibility which is an essential requirement for ensuring that residential schemes are delivered.

Response: Noted.

Support for Option B is noted and these comments will be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised version of the Development Management DPD.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Option 1B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Option 1D		
Emerging Strategic policy seeks to address the provision of affordable housing as a strategic priority, and gives greater importance to the issues surrounding residential quality. Any policy relating to residential choice must therefore address these requirements, and ensure overall housing need is taken into account.		
Response: Noted		
Affordable housing and residential quality will be central to the refined policies as set out in the revised Development Management DPD		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 1
Nature of Comment: Option 1C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1A

The Council just needs to work out where the larger units are needed and not put families in tower blocks.

Response: Noted

Strategic location of different typologies of housing is directed by the Development Strategy according to the findings of the SHMA.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1D

This does not fit in with Sustainable Development, nor is it carbon neutral. How does it improve peoples quality of life?

Response: Not accepted.

There will be an increased demand for smaller units, in line with the proposed population increases, and this demand will need to be reflected in future housing allocation. By providing a mix of types and tenures, close to infrastructure and facilities, we are locating new development in sustainable locations. High quality design and layout of buildings, and the resistance of the sub-division of modest family homes will enhance the quality of life of future residents.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1A

Modest family houses - should not be split into flats.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Options 1A and 1C

Linkage between high density and tall buildings should be broken. Higher design standards, context of setting and the provision of on-site amenity space should guide design solutions

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name **Organisation** **Policy Reference**

Sarah Stanley Resident Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Options 1A and 1C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name **Organisation** **Policy Reference**

Mr DW Hawkins Resident Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name **Organisation** **Policy Reference**

Colin Emmins Resident Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name **Organisation** **Policy Reference**

John Murray Resident Issue 1

Nature of Comment: Option 1A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

ISSUE 2

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Option 2C		
<p>PPS1 para.38 states it is proper to seek to promote local distinctiveness particularly where this is supported by clear plan policies....We strongly support restriction on basement extensions where: 1)They are out of character especially in a conservation area; 2)They are likely to flood with surface water runoff especially where hard surfaces or climatic change would increase possibility; 3) adequate day light cannot be provided. UDP policy 5.5ix) on sustainability should be more specific. 5.5(x) public open space and public transport should be added to required provision after educational and other community provision. Contents of Tables 5C, 5D, 5F should be included in policy. EH comments on the draft PPS on Historic environment state that the historic environment should be at the heart of the planning system. It is the context and starting point and affects the type of development that is acceptable. Change should be developed from Conservation rather than destroying what has gone before. Many of Ealing's housing areas are also conservation areas. The policy on residential design should deal with this issue.</p>		
Response: Conservation Area Assessments guide all applications where they are relevant, conservation officers advise on all other buildings of conservation importance. Impact on flooding will be dealt with in a separate policy.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Option 2C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Option 2B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Options 2B and 2D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

Strengthening locally based policies to improve residential standards is strongly supported. The inclusion of a minimum requirement on Code for Sustainable Homes is supported, although this should not detract from the climate change requirements.

Response: Noted

CfSH standards are an integral part of Ealing's contribution to emissions reductions.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2A

There is actually nothing wrong with the UDP but if only architects and developers would stick to it. We have conservation documents that are ignored and nobody seems to realise that major developments are being built without any amenity space often in the same area e.g. if all the people in the new developments in West Ealing without amenity space stood in Dean Gardens (their supposed amenity space) you would not be able to see the grass.

Response: Noted.

The UDP approach will be updated in the Initial Options document to reflect the changed context of the Replacement London Plan.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Options 2D

Option 2C should be retained but add design guidance to avoid pressures to build high - creating sunless canyons between buildings. Specify minimum floorspace (ref. HCA) standards.

Response: Noted.

Design objectives for future development, including tall buildings, will ensure that the well being of residents is paramount, resulting in an enhanced quality of life for all.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Options 2A and 2C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 2

Nature of Comment: Option 2A

No further comment

Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Option 2C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 2
Nature of Comment: Option 2A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

ISSUE 3

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3C		
Section 2 is very specific about length of permission in relation to "short term planning problem" what does this mean? Adequate conversion to the proposed use is important to its impact on the neighbourhood. Short term or temporary use is likely to inhibit quality development and should not be part of the policy.		
Response: Noted		
A short term planning problem relates to a change of use to 'special housing', which is required to meet a specific local special housing need. Permission will be for a period of three years. Short term temporary use should not directly result in poor quality development and all change of use proposals will be expected to comply with high quality design standards that respects the character of the neighbourhoods that it is locating to.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comment to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
The West London Mental Health	Business	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3A		
The Trust consider that, where there is a recognised need, hostel accommodation should be provided, even when it competes for land with other general housing needs. The Trust supports Option 3A which would retain UDP Policy 5.7 which seeks to support the development of specialist housing. This policy appropriately covers consideration of local need, suitability, location and design. With respect to St Bernard's it is important to note that the redevelopment of buildings on the site could be used to provide specialist housing as part of its review of its clinical services.		
Response: Noted.		
Hostel accommodation will be assessed on merit, against specified criteria and where there is a demonstrated need. Other factors will be taken into account when assessing such applications, including the concentration of existing similar uses and competition from other uses.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Options 3B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3C

A stronger emphasis on design quality is supported. The need to ensure that supported housing needs, including the needs of the older population is addressed 'authoritatively' by boroughs, is both stressed in emerging policy 3.8 of the draft replacement plan and London Policy 3A.5. This should be linked to a needs based assessment.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3C

No further comment

Response: Noted

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3C

I have already mentioned key worker housing and there needs to be more rehabilitation/partial independent living accomodation provided in the borough.

Response: There is no inherent policy obstacle to this type of development. The pattern of provision will be determined by the responsible housing associations.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Option 3C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Options 3C		
Add requirements re elderly/sheltered/nursing home accommodation including parking and garden needs		
Response: Noted.		
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 3
Nature of Comment: Options 3A and 3C		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3A

No further comment

Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3C

No further comment

Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 3

Nature of Comment: Option 3A

No further comment

Response: Noted.
Outcome: No change.

ISSUE 4

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4C		
<p>Policy 5.9 could go in Urban design chapter but not linked to masts etc. These are both important because many residents suffer from the impact of neighbours' extensions and dishes. Separate policies would be clearer. Table 5c should be part of the policy. Habitable rooms should not have opaque glazing or fixed closed windows. No more than 50% of a front garden should be covered by hard standing. The impact of permitted development on gardens can reduce their value for open air recreation, children's play, nature conservation, and food production. The Council should seriously consider a blanket Article 4 direction that limits the scope of garden lost. Enforcement should be proactive using air photos and google street views to record unauthorised change. Housing policy should make it clear that private amenity space is not an optional extra that can be compensated for by small balconies and a Section 106 payment for the nearest park. Small children cannot play on balconies safely or go to the nearest park on their own. Safe play and exercise areas are essential for health. Table 5D should be part of the plan as an explicit policy. What has happened to Policy 5.3. relating to Lifetime homes and Wheelchair Housing and guidance on density of housing table 5A?</p>		
Response: <p>A more comprehensive general amenity policy is planned for the DM DPD initial proposals which should address problems of this sort.</p> <p>Hardstanding is already covered by the Consolidated London Plan.</p> <p>Street view is not considered sufficiently reliable for enforcement purposes.</p>		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Options 4B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4D

In developing policy proposals for gardens, the Council should take into account policies 3.5 and 5.10 of the draft replacement Plan in relation to protection of back gardens and urban greening. This is reflected in the feedback on the yellow policy wording in paragraph 5.14 (number 16) below, but should be at least cross-referenced here to ensure the document is transparent and usable.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comment to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Options 4C		
Restrictions on hard, non-permeable surfaces to both front and back gardens		
Response: Noted.		
Surfaces will be required to be permeable where possible. Where this is not possible, it must be demonstrated how alternative methods will be utilized to deal with potential run off		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Options 4A and 4C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 4
Nature of Comment: Option 4A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 4

Nature of Comment: Option 4C

Strong references need to be made to ensure good quality garden space, design and sustainability.

Response: Noted.

This is addressed through a range of different policies in the existing document and greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Outcome: No change.

ISSUE 5

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5D		
Mindful of the representations above (Initial Proposal 5), the MPA believe that an alternative approach through Option 5D should be provided within the Development Management Policies Document: Alternative wording for Option 5D (additional wording underlined): <u>Ensure either existing or replacement community facilities are upgraded or adequately provided to mitigate the impact of the future development.</u>		
Response: Noted. This is addressed by RLP Policy 3.1 and greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Options 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D		
Option 5D could provide criteria for choice of approaches 5A-5C and link to issues 4 and 7		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5A and 5C		
We believe that any perception that community facilities are underused or no longer required should be rigorously tested both with the users and the local residents before re-development or alternative uses are proposed or considered.		
We also believe that there should be an agreed sequence of future uses for community facilities when it is demonstrable that their existing use no longer exists. For example a redundant school should first be considered for other educational uses. Similarly a community centre should be considered for other community related uses.		
We believe that this sequential approach to alternative uses should apply equally to: privately owned, charitably owned and Council owned properties. So for example, where a privately owned school was to close due to economic pressures, we believe that the site should be offered to other educational users rather than housing developers. Clearly the planning uses permitted by the local planning framework will have a major bearing on the site value and the deliverability of this policy.		
Response: Noted. The Council will work in partnership with community groups to achieve the best use of existing community facilities. Discussions with such groups, and other key users will be essential in assessing whether or not a community facility needs to be retained. The sequential approach to alternative uses will also be central to any refined policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
The West London Mental Health Trust	Statutory	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5B

The Trust consider that the best approach to achieve greater capacity for community provision is outlined in Option 5B although we acknowledge due regard would need to be had to local amenity issues as is the case with all development proposals. This approach in Option 5B is vital to ensuring that the borough meets mental health needs which will increase due to the demands arising out of the existing population and future increases over the plan period. This Option will ensure that community facilities make the most efficient use of existing land and in the case of St Bernard's build on the significant clinical infrastructure that is already in place in Southall. We would also point out in relation to Option 5C that rehabilitation of existing premises at St Bernard's in many cases would not enable the necessary standards of patient care that is now required to be provided. Alternative uses therefore need to be explored alongside the provision of new buildings elsewhere on the site.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5D

As required in Policy 3.17 of the draft replacement Plan, boroughs should establish a framework for collaborative engagement with social infrastructure providers and community organisations to regularly assess the need for such infrastructure, including securing sites for future provision. This should also include a requirement for new facilities in new developments. This requirement is also underpinned by Policy 3A.17 and 3A.18 of the London Plan.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5C

Ensure projects respect the original character of the building

Response: Noted.

This is a general requirement when assessing planning applications for all types of development.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Options 5A, 5B and 5C		
Option 5A (encourage appropriate improvement of existing facilities) - Option 5B (additionally maximise the potential of existing facilities) - Option 5C (ensure projects respect the original character of the building)		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5D		
Work with local communities and help them develop their own		
Response: Noted.		
The Council will work in partnership with community groups to achieve the best use of existing community facilities. Discussions with such groups, and other key users will be essential in assessing whether or not a community facility needs to be retained and for identifying any deficits that may exist with existing provision.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5D		
TLP 3A.18 does not relate to anyone's definition of community facilities. UDP 8.1 is ok as far as it goes. What is missing here in any information or guidance on 'Greater capacity for social (facility) provision'. New housing developments should only gain approval if adequate new community and social facilities are planned to be contemporaneously co-located with the new homes.		

Response: Noted.

CLP is shortly to be replaced by RLP which offers improved wording on this issue.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Options 5C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Options 5A and 5C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 5
Nature of Comment: Option 5C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 5

Nature of Comment: Option 5A, 5C and 5D

Gothic Modern - Modern gothic for strength of buildings empire confidence

Response: Noted.

This would need to be assessed on an individual basis, taking into account local circumstances and the existing character of the area.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

ISSUE 6

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6B		
<p>The MPA generally support Option 6B which states that where it can be shown that there is no need to retain a community facility on a site, consideration of alternative development is an option. This allows greater flexibility for sites within the Borough. However it is recommended that it is altered to reflect our representations to Initial Proposal 5 above. This will ensure compliance with London Plan Policy 3A.18 which allows for the net loss of community facilities, i.e. a replacement facility should be provided in proximity to that which is disposed.</p>		
<p>Response: Noted.</p> <p>The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.</p>		
<p>Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Options 6C and 6D		
<p>This should be combined with proposals 4 and 5. Policy 8.3 – 2 on redundant community facilities is likely to encourage loss because the plan is housing led and there is no funding for most community facilities even if they are really needed. Schools seem to exclude adult uses with high fences and regulations but this is a waste of community investment. New school buildings should have their school hall designed for out of hours community use.</p>		
<p>Response: Noted.</p> <p>It is the intention that where community infrastructure deficits exist, and where new development is proposed, this development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of such infrastructure through S.106 and possibly through the CIL if it this has been put in place.</p> <p>Comments regarding the use of schools would be more appropriately included in the Development Strategy, however the use of such facilities for out of hours community use would be encouraged.</p>		
<p>Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Thomas Wrenn Homes Ltd	Business	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Options 6B		
<p>Consider Option 6A to be over-prescriptive. Alternative uses may be appropriate dependent on location, site characteristics and specific local needs. Would therefore support Option 6B (perhaps with a caveat that any alternative development should be compatible with objectives of the Development Strategy).</p>		
<p>Response: Noted.</p>		

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6A and 6C

We believe that any perception that community facilities are underused or no longer required should be rigorously tested both with the users and the local residents before re-development or alternative uses are proposed or considered.

We also believe that there should be an agreed sequence of future uses for community facilities when it is demonstrable that their existing use no longer exists. For example a redundant school should first be considered for other educational uses. Similarly a community centre should be considered for other community related uses.

We believe that this sequential approach to alternative uses should apply equally to: privately owned, charitably owned and Council owned properties. So for example, where a privately owned school was to close due to economic pressures, we believe that the site should be offered to other educational users rather than housing developers. Clearly the planning uses permitted by the local planning framework will have a major bearing on the site value and the deliverability of this policy. Insufficient information and maps have been included in the Development Management Issues and Options document to enable us to comment on these proposals. The consultation refers to a forthcoming Development Sites document and we would prefer to defer commenting until that is available.

Informed Decision Making - Reference is made to facilities that are no longer needed (Issue 6) and UDP 8.3.

The wording in the UDP is qualitative and it would be helpful if a methodology whereby need and use could/should be quantified, and was included in the successor document to the UDP.

Response: Noted

Where an existing community use closes down it requires no planning permission to be replaced with a facility of the same use type. However, this would depend on the new use being able to secure the site at a price acceptable to its current owners. Evidence of marketing for a like use will be considered in the initial proposals, however, no blanket restriction of the kind suggested would be enforceable.

The nature of the issues and options stage of proposals that they are less detailed and specific, their purpose being to determine the desired direction of travel for policy formulation.

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
The West London Mental Health Trust	Statutory	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6B

The Trust supports the recognition that there may be such times when community facilities are no longer required to be retained and an alternative form of development should be considered. The Trust considers that Option 6B provides greater opportunities to redevelop community facilities for appropriate alternative uses. With respect to Option 6A if the facility is no longer required there is no basis for imposing more onerous requirements with respect to affordable housing and some community provision than applies to all sites more generally. With respect to Option 6C the conversion of an existing building for a new use may be an option in some cases but not in others; there is no basis for specific policies in this regard relating to redundant community facilities. It is up to the market to decide the best way forward, within the context of general policies that apply to all sites. With respect to St Bernard's it is important to note that re-use or re-development of buildings no longer suitable for providing for mental health needs could form an important means by which to raise funds to provide new clinical facilities elsewhere on the site which otherwise could not be provided. It is important therefore that policy doesn't burden the Trust with unjustifiable additional policy requirements, such as those set out in Option 6A for example.

Response: Noted.

The nature of the issues and options stage of proposals that they are less detailed and specific, their purpose being to determine the desired direction of travel for policy formulation. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals

Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Options 6B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6D

Where a site is no longer required for community facilities, in the first instance the Council should require an alternative community related use, for example health care provision or education provision, before it is released for other purposes. In accordance with Policy 3.17 of the draft replacement Plan, if the facility is within an area of identified need, its loss should be resisted.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6B		
Ensure projects respect the original character of the building		
Response: Noted.		
This is a general requirement when assessing planning applications for all types of development.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6D		
We need all the community facilities that we have got and given that the borough is the size of a city we need more community facilities not less and the council should certainly not be selling off libraries for build flats.		
Response: Noted.		
Policy will be designed to ensure the greatest possible provision of community facilities.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6D		
A combination but repurposing the most important		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6B

The "merits" need to be strongly upheld - This could mean a more conservative approach than Option 6C.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Options 6C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Options 6C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 6

Nature of Comment: Option 6A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 6
Nature of Comment: Option 6C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

ISSUE 7

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Option 7A and 7D		
The MPA support option 7A for the provision of ward based Safer Neighbourhood Team Bases. The MPA also suggest under option 7D that reference to the provision of policing facilities is considered an acceptable use within employment areas, where their use is similar to B Class uses such as Patrol Bases doe example. This correlates with the recommendation below. Recommendation: The MPA recommend that an additional point be included within this section of the document which reads (additional wording underlined): v) consider alternative, non-employment designated uses such as social infrastructure, or where appropriate housing-led mixed-use development, within surplus employment land.		
Response: Noted.		
The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs also comply with regional guidance. However, these comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Options 7A and 7D		
These should be identified by the Council.		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Options 7A		
Good transport / road facilities are necessary for access to these centres.		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7A

Insufficient information and maps have been included in the Development Management Issues and Options document to enable us to comment on these proposals. The consultation refers to a forthcoming Development Sites document and we would prefer to defer commenting until that is available.

Response: Noted

More detailed information and maps will accompany the revised Development Management DPD and the Development Sites DPD, both of which will be made available for further comments in Autumn 2010.

Outcome: No change

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7A

NGP consider that it is appropriate to have a policy with regard to the suitable location of community facilities and that, as a broad principle, these should be located in town, neighbourhood and local centres. NGP therefore supports Option 7A.

Response: Noted

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Options 7B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7D

In accordance with Policy 3.17 of the draft replacement Plan, and Policy 3A.18 of the London Plan, community facilities and social infrastructure should be accessible to all, and be located within easy reach by walking, cycling and public transport. Wherever possible, the multiple use of premises should be encouraged, and facilities secured in areas of new development and regeneration.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hovedean Properties	Business	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Option 7B		
We support option 7B to dispense with local policy and allow the decision making process to be guided by the impact of the development on its surrounding area, and the principles of sustainable development		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Option 7A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		
Name Organisation Policy Reference Susan New Resident Issue 7 Nature of Comment: Option 7A We need all the community facilities that we have got and given that the borough is the size of a city we need more community facilities not less and the council should certainly not be selling off libraries for build flats. Response: Not accepted. As the policy approach indicates, the removal of community facilities is to be expressly linked to a specific lack of need for that facility. If this can be demonstrated then there is no need for the facility in question. Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Option 7D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 7
Nature of Comment: Option 7A		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7D

Locate community facilities where they are needed. Conduct annual social and community needs audits which will describe and measure these needs. UDP 8.4 says nothing about medium sized and small community facilities.

Response: Noted.

The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs also comply with regional guidance. The policy is intended to be neutral as to the size of a given community facility so that these may be provided/protected as necessary. The provision of new services is outside the scope of the planning process except where these would be funded through developer contributions. As such, the policy will be worded to facilitate and protect rather than to place the onus for the overall adequacy of facilities exclusively on the planning process.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7A

Presumption for community provision on site, not transferred to S106

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Options 7A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 6C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Primary Care Trust	Statutory	Issue 7

Nature of Comment: Option 7D

No further comment

Response: Noted

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

ISSUE 8

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Options 8A and 8D		
Policy 8.6 is important but the idea should be extended further. Toilet provision is important anywhere visited by families and elderly people including parks and outdoor leisure facilities.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Options 8A		
Good transport / road facilities are necessary for access to these centres.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
In principle, NGP would support option 8A but as an 'aspiration' to provide facilities for young children where appropriate rather than a formal requirement.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8D		
The provision of family friendly facilities should be coordinated with the wider assessment of community needs, and needs arising from new developments. The need for pre-school facilities should be assessed as part of a wider education needs assessment (Policy 3.19 of the draft replacement London Plan).		

Response:

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome:

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8D		
Build on existing and work with local people		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
Ealing Broadway Station - it is essential that a modern multi-transport interchange is built here. Not a hodge podge of bits and pieces		
Response: Noted.		
The Council is pursuing funding for this through the Local Implementation Plan and the Majors scheme.		
Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8D		
Supply facilities for young children. If these residential blocks last as long as the neighbouring Victorian houses, many different groups and ages of people will live in them. UDP 8.6 is ageist. A range of facilities for elderly people should also be provided. The future trend is more 65+ residents than under 16s.		
Response: Not accepted.		
Facilities for all ages are encouraged in development proposals. However, this policy rightly makes provisions for facilities for Young Children, as such facilities are often not appropriately provided for in development proposals.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
External garden/play areas with 'natural surveillance' should be prioritised within the text		
Response: Noted.		
The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs also comply with regional guidance. However, these comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Options 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 8
Nature of Comment: Option 8B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

ISSUE 9

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Options 9C		
Community Open Space designation is fully supported. Defined areas need careful consideration so that adequate space for games is protected taking into account the existing size of the school. Possible future expansion of the school should also be considered in defining COS for the LDF so that the community open space policy is not prejudiced. It is important if any extensions are proposed that on-site outdoor recreation areas are available for all pupils to encourage games and improve health. Children should also have access to areas for growing food.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents' Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 8A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9C		
School Playing fields should be protected by designating them as community open space		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 9

Nature of Comment: Option 9C

The dual-use of school facilities by the wider community is strongly encouraged, in accordance with Policy 3.19 of the draft replacement London Plan and 3A.24 of the London Plan. Loss of school playing fields should be strongly resisted.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 9

Nature of Comment: Option 9C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 9

Nature of Comment: Option 9C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 9

Nature of Comment: Option 9C

Stop schools selling their open green spaces

Response: Noted.

The disposal of land by schools is not subject to planning controls, however, the release of existing open space will be subject to the provisions of the open space strategy.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 9

Nature of Comment: Option 9C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9A		
Retain UDP 8.7 and apply it ie no building on playing fields as at Fielding. Add: Build more schools if demand exists for them		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Options 9A and 9C		
Review all such locations and promote biodiversity (e.g. wildflower, tree etc, planting in areas not needed for sport.		
Response: Noted.		
An Open Space Strategy is currently being prepared for the borough which will explore and set out opportunities for enhancing existing open space, including improving access to this space, and establishing new green space and protecting habitats and biodiversity.		
Outcome: This will be reviewed as part of our Open Space Strategy.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Options 9A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 9
Nature of Comment: Option 9C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

ISSUE 10

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Options 10A, 10C and 10D		
Option 10A, Option 10C and Option 10D. Option 10C seems a bit draconian. Perhaps there should be a requirement to provide small business premises in conjunction with large MEL applications in the way that affordable housing is a requirement of house builders		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Options 10B and 10D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10A		
It depends on the nature of the small business.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Options 10 and 10C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 10
Nature of Comment: Option 10A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD		

ISSUE 11

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11A and 11B		
Option 11 C Object to highly polluted areas being developed further until levels of pollution are significantly reduced by changes in vehicle emissions. Cutting flights from Heathrow over the borough would also help reduce pollution. Option 11C is unenforceable. All new building should be environmentally friendly.		
Response: Noted.		
Development may or may not be increased by a given development and may or may not be increased by a given development. Policy will address this matter but decisions will have to be made on with reference to the all of the considerations of the individual application.		
The regulation of over-flights from Heathrow is beyond the powers of the Ealing LDF.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11B		
The use of electric vehicles is worth considering but the overall cost of any scheme needs to be calculated. Particularly when it is well known that the pollution levels from conventional vehicles hybrids for instance continues to fall and their efficiency improves.		
Response: Noted		
Electric vehicles are encouraged by the RLP and by the Mayor's Strategy. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11B		
We support schemes to promote environmentally friendly cars including charging points at appropriate locations.		
Response: Noted.		
Electric vehicles are encouraged by the RLP and by the Mayor's Strategy. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11B and 11D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 11

Nature of Comment: Option 11D

It is considered that a wide range of borough-wide initiatives should be encouraged to tackle atmospheric pollution. Policy should recognize that the most sustainable sites (i.e those situated in close proximity to transportation interchanges) may experience relatively higher levels of atmospheric pollution compared to the surrounding areas. Given that the emphasis of national planning policy is to concentrate new development at locations in close proximity to public transport services, it is considered overly onerous that future policy should require only new development in these locations being required to incorporate the measures suggested.

Response: Noted.

A broad range of initiatives will be required to tackle atmospheric pollution. The Climate Change Strategy 2008-2011 for Ealing is currently in place and aims to reduce the borough's carbon dioxide emissions by 10% by 2010/2011 from a 2005 baseline while the current and Draft Replacement London Plans provide the policy context for the borough's emission reduction policies.

In addition to this strategy, recent national and regional planning policies require local authorities to take a strategic approach to planning sustainable energy measures. In particular Planning Policy Statement PPS1a for Climate Change calls for Development Plan Documents to expect that a proportion of the energy supply for all buildings to be delivered by decentralised and renewable or low carbon technologies. Ealing Council has fully committed to produce a robust evidence base that will assess the viability of energy efficiency measures and low carbon sources in both residential and non-residential sector. The evidence base will adopt the energy hierarchy as in the Mayor's London Plan which gives priority to the improvement of the energy efficiency measures first, then to develop and promote decentralised energy network(s) and finally encourage the use of renewable energy sources.

The evidence base assessment will help us to determine the targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction and therefore our policies. While all the current policies target major developments, the assessment will also examine what is achievable in smaller scale developments.

The most sustainable sites, as mentioned in this representation, are located close to public transport interchanges. It is therefore justified that a reduction in conventional private car usage should be encouraged in such locations as there are alternative means of transport available in close proximity. However, this policy is likely to be applied right across the borough in the years to come.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 11

Nature of Comment: Option 11B and 11C

Option 11B (promote a network of facilities for electric vehicles - Option 11C (permit environmentally friendly development in high pollution areas)

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11A, 11B and 11C		
Option 11A (include the content of UDP policy 9.1) - Option 11B (promote a network of facilities for electric vehicles) - Option 11C (permit environmentally friendly development in high pollution areas)		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11B and 11C		
Only disabled people allowed access areas - most areas cycling and pedestrianised		
Response: It is not clear what is being referred to here.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11B, 11C and 11D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11C		
No further comment.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11C		
Regarding the Uxbridge Road Corridor: The only way of reducing traffic congestion and getting motorists onto public transport is for the West London Tram to be built. The West London Orbital should be light rail as it would be too expensive to build an underground line. Also the congestion charge zone areas should be extended as per the RAC Foundation Report		
Response: Noted. The West London Tram project is beyond the control of Planning Policy, however the Local Improvement Plan and Majors Scheme will support the reduction of congestion on this corridor and would be complemented by WLT if and when the project were to be revised. Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Option 11B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 11
Nature of Comment: Options 11A, 11B, 11C and 11D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted. Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 12

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Options 12A, 12C and 12D		
Option 12C policy 7.7 relating to gaming establishments seems to be overturned on appeal repeatedly. It is essential to have a practical policy that government will support on appeal. Their appearance is awful but then so are many shopfronts especially where they are blanked out to provide extra space inside for selling food. An alternative should be researched by examining appeal decisions and PPS		
Response: Noted.		
This policy will be further developed as the provisions of changing national policy and the DRLP.		
Policy will be drafted as strongly as possible and supported at appeal to maximum extent possible.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Option 12C		
We suggest that consideration is also given to restricting amusement arcades on high volume routes between public transport nodes and secondary schools. For example, a large number of the pupils who attend Gunnersbury High School travel to Northfields by tube and then walk or catch a bus for their onward journey to the school. It would therefore seem consistent with Option 12C to discourage the opening of an amusement arcade along this and similar routes.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Option 12C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Options 12C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Option 12C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Option 12C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Options 12D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Option 12C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 12
Nature of Comment: Options 12A and 12C		
Factor in: concentration of similar uses, including licensed betting shops		
Response: Noted.		
Concentration of similar uses will be included in any amended text.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 12

Nature of Comment: Option 12C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 12

Nature of Comment: Option 12C

Regarding the Uxbridge Road Corridor: The only way of reducing traffic congestion and getting motorists onto public transport is for the West London Tram to be built. The West London Orbital should be light rail as it would be too expensive to build an underground line. Also the congestion charge zone areas should be extended as per the RAC Foundation Report

Response: Noted.

The West London Tram project is beyond the control of Planning Policy, however the Local Improvement Plan and Majors Scheme will support the reduction of congestion on this corridor and would be complemented by WLT if and when the project were to be revised.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 12

Nature of Comment: Option 12C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 12

Nature of Comment: Options 12A, 12B, 12C and 12D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 13

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A, 13B and 13C		
Option 13C is supported but if restricting gambling establishments opposite schools is very difficult. I do not see how you are going to stop hot food takeaways.		
Response: Not accepted.		
Similar policies have been successfully adopted at other councils and the approach is recommended by the Dept for Education.		
Outcome: Comment of support to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A and 13C		
If the objective is to improve the diet of pupils it would also seem appropriate to extend the Department of Education recommendation, Option 13C, to include the opening of additional fast food outlets on high volume routes to and from schools.		
This would also have the wider community benefit of containing the growth in the volume of discarded fast food wrappers in surrounding streets and open spaces.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A, 13B and 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
Option 13C (refuse permission for outlets near schools) Absolutely. Given that the fast food outlets take no responsibility for the amount of rubbish and detritus that issues from their premises they should only be in areas where the pavements and roads are swept more than once a day. Mind you given that children travel for nothing they will probably just bus to one further away from school. Waltham Forest did it so can Ealing.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13B and 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A and 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A and 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Option 13A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 13
Nature of Comment: Options 13A, 13B, 13C and 13D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 14

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 14
Nature of Comment: Option 14C		
Balconies do not contribute to amenity space but are extension to small flats Terraces are useful but create problems of noise and overlooking. Off site provision should not exclude basic private amenity space for children's play. I cannot find a species protection policy. UDP policy 3.9 seems OK but the Mayor has a Biodiversity and nature conservation policy 3D. 14 which provides a useful structure for protection for both sites and species at Ealing's level.		
Response: Noted.		
This policy is concerned with providing adequate levels of open space with new development – biodiversity and conservation issues are dealt with elsewhere.		
Balconies are not considered to constitute amenity space.		
CLP is in the process of being replaced. The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 14
Nature of Comment: Options 14A and 14C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 14
Nature of Comment: Options 14B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 14
Nature of Comment: Options 14B		
Issue 14 - Provision of Standards - NGP support the less prescriptive approach to provision standards as proposed in Option 14B. Whilst it is recognised that the provision of community and play spaces is important to any scheme, particularly for residential developments, it is considered that it is the quality and location of space which is critical rather than a specific area or quantum. Clearly, there is also the Mayor of London's SPG on children's play space which would need to be taken into account on any development proposals. A more flexible approach is most likely to provide an appropriate level and quality of open space/community space provision in the right locations.		

Response: Noted.

The quality and location of space are important considerations and these will be assessed as part of any planning application. So too is the extent of the space offered. The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available. This includes reference the appropriate SPG.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Options 14C

The principle of developing provision standards for open space and play space in new developments is strongly supported. Standards should be developed in accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 7.18 (particularly Table 7.2) and 3.6, and London Plan policies 3D.11, 3D.12 (and table 3D.1) and 3D.13, and the Mayor's SPG 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation'. With regards to the question on gardens and play space provision, the Council should note Paragraph 4.39 of the SPG.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Options 14A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14A

I am afraid 14C is a joke given that people will probably use cars to get to allotments. Basically what 14C also seems to be saying is that if you have a larger internal space you don't need amenity space. Well that will not work for families.

Response: Not accepted.

Allotments do not necessarily need to be located in areas that are only accessible by car. The Open Space Strategy will look at the potential for creating green networks, where walking and cycling will be encouraged as the primary means of movement between the areas. The policy is not saying that if there is a larger internal space that external amenity space will not be required. It is offering clarification as to the contribution that roof terraces/balconies can make. This will not be universally applied to all developments and achieving the appropriate provision for each development will be assessed on its merits.

Outcome: No change.

Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14D

See LCC Plans and adopt

Response: It is not clear which plans are being referred to.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14C

Open space has to be seen in the context of Ealing residents needs 2011-2026. All of us are trying to guess these needs. LBE is trying to give 309,000 - 350,000 people a good quality of life over the next 17 years. Let's hope we can find the energy, cash and space to do this. Open space is very valuable we need to stay flexible as we don't know now what are priorities might be in years to come.

Response: Noted.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is currently being prepared and this will identify the infrastructure required, including green infrastructure, in order to sustain future population demand. The Open Space Strategy, which is also being prepared, will compliment this the provisions of the IDP.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Options 14C and 14D

Additionally assist areas that are remote from amenity by creating green corridors to link outdoor amenity areas.

Response: Noted.

The Open Space Strategy will look at the potential for creating green networks, where walking and cycling will be encouraged as the primary means of movement between the areas.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14D

As 14C except: Amenity/Garden Space Provision - 'Roof terraces/balconies' are in no way comparable to, or a substitute for, the amenity value of open and/or garden space. Therefore, should only be recognised as part of the design treatment of the building(s) proposed and discounted in relation to proper provision of exterior garden/amenity/play space. Contributions to (often existing) off-site provision via Section 106 should be resisted in favour of 'standards on site' as a key requirement of development proposals.

Response: Noted.

Balconies are not considered to substitute for amenity space. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Outcome: No change.

Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Options 14A and 14C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 14

Nature of Comment: Option 14C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 14
Nature of Comment: Options 14A, 14B, 14C and 14D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 15

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15A		
We are very concerned about the low expectations of this policy. Building houses with low carbon emissions is cheaper than adapting them later. Initial target should be 20% which could be increased over the life of the plan as energy cost rise to ensure more renewable generation. More thought is needed.		
Response: Noted.		
The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs to also comply with regional guidance. However, these comments will need to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		
This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15C		
We support all attempts to lower carbon emission. We support a tough policy on requiring high standards of carbon efficiency, energy efficiency and sustainability on all new homes, including single and small developments.		
Response: Noted.		
Support welcomed.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15D		
<p>Carbon Emission Savings - NGP support the proposals put forward in the London Plan as it is considered to be the most appropriate way forward and provide consistency of policy and approach. A key objective should be the reduction in carbon emissions, rather than a specific target for renewable energy. It is also recognised that standards should be adjusted/varied by development and building type and relevant considerations of any particular application proposal. For this reason, it is not considered appropriate to set minimum standards as there may be good reasons why these are not met. NGP object to the requirement to hit Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes at this current time. The current requirement should be CSH3 with an 'aspiration' to achieve higher levels with the life of the plan. In principle, this is a Building Regulations matter.</p>		
<p>Response: Noted.</p> <p>The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.</p> <p>This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.</p> <p>Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Options 15B and 15D		
<p>This should be based on the London Plan requirements and should not exceed these requirements. In addition, flexibility should be built into any future policy to allow justification to support exceptional circumstances whereby viability issues may prevent the realisation of the policy in full.</p>		
<p>Response: Noted.</p> <p>The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.</p> <p>This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.</p> <p>Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15C		
<p>Whilst the principle of Option 15C, to adopt policies in line with the Mayor's energy hierarchy is strongly supported, the Council should also ensure that sufficient policy support is also afforded to the development of district heating networks (draft replacement Plan Policy 5.5), sustainable design and construction (draft replacement Plan Policy 5.3), retrofitting of existing buildings (draft replacement Plan Policy 5.4), innovative energy technologies (draft replacement Plan Policy 5.8), overheating and cooling (draft replacement Plan Policy 5.9), and urban greening (draft replacement Plan policies 5.10 and 5.11). In establishing targets for carbon dioxide emissions, the Council should take into account the targets within draft replacement Plan Policy 5.2, and note the shift in policy approach towards renewable energy within draft replacement Plan Policy 5.7 and Table 5.1.</p>		

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hovedean Properties	Business	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Option 15B

Achieving Carbon Emission Savings; While we support the approach to carbon emission savings as defined in the London Plan 4A.3-7, we would advocate other approaches which not only include carbon emission savings, but also include for embodied energy of construction materials, reduction of construction waste, and the specification of locally source products off-set against energy efficiency measures, CHP and on site renewables as defined in the London Plan SPG on Sustainable Design and Construction, section 2.3.3. We believe that prescriptions such as minimum standards of Code level 4 and BREEAM Excellent for new residential and commercial development respectively does not account for development use and management and combining these standards with emerging construction techniques, material specification and integrated design and management can have long term repercussions on carbon emissions from the construction phase that can account for as much carbon emissions of a development over the post construction phase of a development. On this basis we recommend that Option 15B, which adopts a less prescriptive approach, is the most suitable. In establishing targets for carbon dioxide emissions, the Council should take into account the targets within draft replacement Plan Policy 5.2, and note the shift in policy approach towards renewable energy within draft replacement Plan Policy 5.7 and Table 5.1.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Option 15C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Options 15A and 15C

No further comment

Response: Noted.
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15D		
Make all new developments carbon neutral		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 15
Nature of Comment: Option 15D		
No new developments. - Energy descent planning. - Produce more food locally. - Retrofit existing buildings with energy saving technology. - reduce car usage. - Create climate change jobs.		
Response: Accept conditionally.		
It is not reasonable to suggest that there should be no new developments. Development is inevitable in order to meet existing and future demand and in order to meet the requirements as set out in the London Plan.		
The additional comments are noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Options 15C and 15D

Support 15C but increase on site renewable for major projects to 50% "Where reasonably practicable"

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Option 15D

Qualified support for 15C, but: - 'future proofing' required, i.e. developments should be expected to meet already known standards/targets which will apply during the life of the plan and the occupancy of the development. Also, the boroughs many smaller developments cumulatively equate to the impact of 'larger' schemes and, consequently should meet the same standards.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Options 15A and 15C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Option 15C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Option 15C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 15

Nature of Comment: Options 15A, 15C and 15D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 16

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
We are very concerned about the low expectations of this policy. Building houses with low carbon emissions is cheaper than adapting them later. Initial target should be 20% which could be increased over the life of the plan as energy cost rise to ensure more renewable generation. More thought is needed.		
Response: Noted.		
The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.		
This policy will be greatly augmented by the energy evidence base report which is now in preparation.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16A		
'Include the content of UDP policy 4.1 relating to use of appropriate materials and adaptability of buildings/places, together with existing supplementary documents and guidance'.		
Response: Noted.		
The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs also comply with regional guidance. However, these comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16B		
Design Materials - NGP support Option 16B whereby applications are dealt with on merit in the context of the London Plan's general design policy. It is appropriate to provide 'guidance' as to the types of materials to be used, particularly with regard to the 'sustainability' of such materials. However, parts of the Borough will require different solutions for materials and it would not be appropriate to have a standardised set of materials for the whole of the Borough.		
Response: Noted.		
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16D		
The Council should adopt a series of urban design policies, including an appropriate approach to tall buildings (draft replacement Plan Policy 7.7), and where necessary identifying areas, and/or buildings, of local character (draft replacement Plan Policy 7.4).		
Response: Noted.		
The Development Sites Document will provide guidance on appropriate design and will also provide guidance about the local character of each area.		
Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.		
Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals. More information will be provided in the Development Sites Document.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16B		
Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plan's general design policies.		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 16
Nature of Comment: Options 16A		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 16

Nature of Comment: Option 16C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 16

Nature of Comment: Options 16A and 16C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 16

Nature of Comment: Option 16C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 16

Nature of Comment: Option 16A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 16

Nature of Comment: Options 16C and 16D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 17

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17C		
Access in the Arcadia application was unacceptable and the steps proposed should be excluded by strengthening this policy.		
Response: Noted.		
These comments relate to a specific planning application. The comments relating to strengthening the existing policy are noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17D		
The Council should adopt relevant policies to ensure that the physical environment meets the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 7.2.		

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17B

Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plan's general design policies.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Applications must always be dealt with on their own merits.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
------	--------------	------------------

Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 17
Nature of Comment: Option 17B		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Option 17A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 17

Nature of Comment: Options 17A, 17C and 17D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 18

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolitan Police Authority	Statutory	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18A		
Issue 18- Community Safety (Secured by Design) The MPA support option 18A and encourage the retention of UDP Policy 4.4 and supports the strengthening of 'Secured by Design' principles.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18B		
We are concerned that this is used to promote high rise buildings adjacent to public open space. Windows overlooking public space limit the use that space can be put to without creating noise and intrusion problems for occupants of the building. Security is one factor only in the design of any development. Security should be part of design not dominating the process.		
Response: Noted.		
The purpose of this policy is not to promote high rise buildings adjacent to public open space, but to ensure that all buildings, regardless of size or location are designed in a way that ensures maximum safety and security. It is generally recognised that from good design principles that passive surveillance, i.e windows over looking public spaces, significantly reduces the level of crime that otherwise may exist in that area.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
West Ealing Neighbours	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Option 18D

We are concerned about the over use or unnecessary use of Secured by Design principles where these lead to gating of public space which brings about a loss of community facilities for the wider public.

Response: Noted.

The gating of public spaces will not be supported, especially if this results in the loss of community facilities.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Option 18B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Option 18D

The Council should adopt relevant policies to ensure the creation of safe and secure environments in accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 7.3.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Option 18B

Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plans general design and safety policies.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Option 18C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
Strengthen local communities		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18D		
Planned new developments are on private land (which was once public) e.g. Dickens Yard and GMLE. So Public law and order management is not relevant in these gated communities.		
Response: Not accepted.		
New developments, regardless of size or location, will be subject to the same design criteria and will be required to be designed in a way that ensures maximum safety and security.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 18
Nature of Comment: Option 18A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 18

Nature of Comment: Options 18A, 18C and 18D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 19

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Options 19C and 19D		
Landscaping, tree protection and planting. Option 19C and Option 19D. Policy 4.5 (1) is very important and should be enhanced by mentioning Biodiversity Plan.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19D		
The promotion and protection of landscaping and urban greening is strongly supported in accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 5.10 and 5.11. In accordance with Policy 7.21 of the draft replacement London Plan, the Council should develop policies to implement its tree strategy.		

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 19

Nature of Comment: Option 18B

Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plan's general policies on open environment.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 19

Nature of Comment: Option 19C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 19

Nature of Comment: Option 19C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 19

Nature of Comment: Option 19A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 19

Nature of Comment: Option 19C and 19D

All areas should have trees and dead wood. Allow environmental play areas

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19D		
Plant more trees		
Response: Noted.		
The Council currently aims to plant 500-600 new trees each year along the highway.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
Delete 'where relevant' - specify distances required between existing trees and new structures/hard surfaces		
Response: Noted.		
The Biodiversity Action Plan will only need to be adhered to if it is likely that new development proposals will impact upon local biodiversity.		
The nature of the issues and options stage of proposals that they are less detailed and specific, their purpose being to determine the desired direction of travel for policy formulation. Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Options 19A, 19C and 19D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 19
Nature of Comment: Option 19D		
Input will be required from respected organisations that are involved in green issues, e.g. friends of the earth, the green party etc.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 20

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20C		
Current losses of Listed buildings to fire and neglect is most unfortunate. The Council should promote their history and value.		
Response: Noted.		
The Council, and the provisions of the DRLP aim to ensure the reuse of valuable historic buildings. Greater detail will be available in the initial options draft of the DM DPD.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20D		
In accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 7.8, 7.9 and 7.4, the Council should develop appropriate policies to ensure that heritage assets are identified and protected, and that the contribution to London's environmental quality and economy that its built heritage provides, is maintained and increased, while allowing London to accommodate change and regeneration.		

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

All areas should have trees and dead wood. Allow environmental play areas

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

Emphasise appropriate design solutions for other buildings forming streetscape and emphasis on shopfront design

Response: Noted.

All new proposals, regardless of location will be subject to high quality design criteria.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 20

Nature of Comment: Option 20C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Options 20A and 20C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 20
Nature of Comment: Option 20D		
The presumption against development should be rebutted and guidance sought from bodies relating to the preservation of the environment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 21

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
Information about Listed and locally listed buildings should be expanded and made available in council records so that mistakes are avoided and on the council web site so that residents who own them, value what they have got.		
Response: Noted.		
An inventory of all the Locally Listed Buildings is available on the Council website. We are also in the process of preparation a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD. This will provide greater detail and guidance for householders and developers about listed buildings. This will also be available on the Council's website once it is adopted.		
Outcome: Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	Issue 21

Nature of Comment: Option 21D

Locally Listed Buildings, etc, A policy-based approach similar to UDP policy 4.7 regarding the control of alterations to or redevelopment of Locally Listed Buildings is supported. However, UDP policy 4.7 provides only very limited circumstances where alteration or demolition would be permitted. The viability test relies on a significant level of subjectivity in terms of whether a development appraisal makes reasonable assumptions on cost and developer/landowner profit. This creates too much uncertainty. The second test concerning 'planning benefits for the community' is too narrow and again too subjective. It is suggested that a wider criteria-based policy is introduced which takes account of the following: - Whether the existing building still contributes to the local scene as a landmark, or in terms of urban design/townscape, or in terms of architectural interest. - The overall quality of the design and appearance of the proposed replacement building. - The contribution of the proposed building as a landmark, in terms of urban design/townscape, and terms of architectural interest.

Response: Noted.

We are currently in the process of preparation a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD. This will provide greater detail and guidance for householders and developers about listed buildings. The above comments will be taken into account in the formulation of this SPD.

Outcome: Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Issue 21

Nature of Comment: Option 21D

NGP are of the view that if a building is to be 'protected', it should meet the criteria for being a Listed Building. Where there are proposals to demolish locally listed buildings or buildings with façade value, such proposals need to be weighed in the balance with the benefits of redevelopment. It would not be acceptable to retain all locally listed buildings without these tests being applied.

Response: Noted.

Where a building is to be 'protected' it will have met the criteria for being designated a Listed Building. There will be a policy presumption in favour of retaining all listed buildings, their facades and any element that contributes to the character of the building. It will be up to the developer to demonstrate that any proposed demolition will be justified and that the benefits to be gained for the community outweigh any potential loss. More detail on this will be provided in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Outcome: Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 21

Nature of Comment: Option 21B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 21

Nature of Comment: Option 21D

In accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 7.8, 7.9 and 7.4, the Council should develop appropriate policies to ensure that heritage assets are identified and protected, and that the contribution to London's environmental quality and economy that its built heritage provides, is maintained and increased, while allowing London to accommodate change and regeneration.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available. We are also currently in the process of preparing a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals. Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
List 51 Drayton Green		
Response: Noted.		
This does not require any change to policy.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
Emphasise appropriate design solutions for other buildings forming streetscape and emphasis on shopfront design		
Response: Noted.		
All new proposals, regardless of location will be subject to high quality design criteria.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Options 21A and 21C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 21
Nature of Comment: Option 21D		
Buildings with façade values and other incidental features can be aided by strengthening criteria against which those applications affecting these features are assessed		
Response: Noted.		
We are currently in the process of preparation a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD. This will provide greater detail and guidance for householders and developers about listed buildings. The above comments will be taken into account in the formulation of this SPD.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD. Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.		

ISSUE 22

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 22
Nature of Comment: Option 22C		
Adaptation of this policy is needed to ensure it is in line with the new draft PPS. But the spirit of existing wording should not be lost including the policy that excludes tall buildings.		
Response: Noted.		
The policy in the revised Development Management DPD will be adapted to ensure conformity with PPS 5: Planning for the Historic Environment.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 22
Nature of Comment: Option 22A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 22
Nature of Comment: Option 22A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	Issue 22
Nature of Comment: Option 22A		
This largely remains the relevant policy approach to assessing proposals with Conservation Areas, particularly under PPG15. However, initial text in Table 4D should be amended to state (new text underlined): 'It is the Council's intention to create new and extended Conservation Areas in the Borough, provided that the following criteria are met. <u>Existing Conservation Areas will also be reviewed on a regular basis under the same criteria</u> ".		
Response: Noted.		
The consultation options are intended to guide the direction of policy development. The exact wording will not be carried through to the final policy as it needs also comply with regional guidance. However, these comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		
We are currently in the process of preparation a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD. The above comments will be taken into account in the formulation of this SPD.		

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD. Further information on Conservation Areas will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22D

In accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 7.8, 7.9 and 7.4, the Council should develop appropriate policies to ensure that heritage assets are identified and protected, and that the contribution to London's environmental quality and economy that its built heritage provides, is maintained and increased, while allowing London to accommodate change and regeneration.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available. We are also currently in the process of preparing a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals. Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

Ealing would not look such a mess if people abided by the Shopfront Guidance Leaflet as mentioned in every Conservation Management Plan.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22D

Increase areas and strengthen criteria

Response: Noted.

We are currently in the process of preparing a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD. Comments will be taken into account when preparing this SPD.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

Specify/emphasise assessment also in relation to views into and from adjoining CA's.
Activate 'dormant' list already known CA extension proposals.

Response: Noted.

Views into and out of conservation areas are already material to planning applications. It is not clear what is meant by the second comment.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22D

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Options 22A and 22C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 22

Nature of Comment: Option 22D

Strengthen the criteria against which planning applications are assessed

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 23

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23A		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23D		
In accordance with draft replacement Plan policies 7.8, 7.9 and 7.4, the Council should develop appropriate policies to ensure that heritage assets are identified and protected, and that the contribution to London's environmental quality and economy that its built heritage provides, is maintained and increased, while allowing London to accommodate change and regeneration.		

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available. We are also currently in the process of preparing a Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals. Further information on Listed Buildings will be available in the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings SPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 23

Nature of Comment: Option 23C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 23

Nature of Comment: Option 23A

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 23

Nature of Comment: Option 23C

No further comment.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 23

Nature of Comment: Option 23C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 23

Nature of Comment: Option 23C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Options 23A and 23C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 23
Nature of Comment: Option 23D		
Strengthen the criteria against which planning applications are assessed		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 24

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24C		
Table 4E is perhaps the most ignored policy in the UDP. The points need to be given more prominence. The frontage of Central Chambers opposite Ealing Broadway Station is an appalling example of lack of aesthetic control		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Shopping Centre Ltd Partnership	Business	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24D		
It is considered that a policy-based approach similar to UDP Policy 4.10 and Table 4E is appropriate. This should be reviewed, but in particular item 5 in Table 4E should be amended. At present it states that no new signs or advertisements will be allowed in Conservation Areas. This is inappropriate and unduly restrictive in light of the fact that many businesses and retail units are located within commercial areas (such as town centres) in Conservation Areas and require signage to advertise their presence. Other aspects of the policy are sufficient to ensure suitable and appropriate design.		
Response: Noted.		
Conservation Areas in this instance relates to natural conservation areas rather than Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA's). This conflict will be avoided in the initial options draft policy.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Outdoor Advertising Association	Business	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24B		
Existing UDP policy 4.10 is overly prescriptive, contrary to the advice on local plan policies in paragraph 17 of PPG19. Because the Advertisements Regulations require all applications to be determined on individual merit, we consider that the inclusion of existing policy 4.10 is unnecessary and, in its present form, contrary to the advice in PPG19.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24D		
Applications should be considered against national policy and the London Plan and should not be too prescriptive especially for proposals relating to industrial/business plans		
Response: Noted.		
Applications must be considered against these policies.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24B		
Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plan's general design policies.		
Response: Noted		
The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 24
Nature of Comment: Option 24C		
Other councils have very clear documents re frontages and signage. Ealing has none or if it has nobody follows it. It should be made very clear where neon can be used or not used. Conservation areas should have no neon and should abide by the Shopfront Guidance Leaflet and be distinctive from other areas.		

Response: Noted.

We are currently in the process of preparing a Shop Front Design SPD. These comments will be taken into account when this document is being finalised.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD and the forthcoming Shop Front Design DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C and 24D

Get rid of street clutter

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C and 24D

Assistance to businesses should be provided together with any tightening of regs to help improve appearance of shopfronts

Response: Noted.

A significant amount of urban realm improvements have been carried out around the borough to date. Included in this has been the improvement and upgrading of shop fronts at a number of locations. It is planned to continue this work and assistance will be provided to businesses where appropriate.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

Specify and expand the presently very limited shopfront design guidance and expand throughout the borough.

Response: Noted.

We are currently in the process of preparing a Shop Front Design SPD. These comments will be taken into account when this document is being finalised.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD and the forthcoming Shop Front Design DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Options 24A and 24C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 24

Nature of Comment: Option 24D

Strengthen the criteria against which planning applications are assessed

Response: Noted.

Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 25

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25C

Housing can be insulated against noise but as soon as a window is opened or the occupants go out into private amenity space they are subject to the stress of the noise. Noisy environments need buildings with air conditioning which uses energy. Vibration exclusion adds to the cost of building near sources.

Response: Noted.

New development which is vulnerable to noise will be directed away from noisy areas and required to order the layout of internal uses to lessen the impact of noise. Similarly, new development which is noisy will be required to ameliorate the impact of this noise on neighbouring uses.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Twyford Abbey Properties	Business	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25A

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25B

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25B

In accordance with draft replacement Plan Policy 7.15 the Council should identify and protect quiet areas, and reduce the adverse impact of noise through appropriate policies. The Council should also adopt relevant policies relating to improving air quality, in accordance with draft London Plan Policy 7.14.

Response: Noted.

The initial options draft of the DM DPD will adopt a structure which more directly references the RLP, now that its text is available.

Outcome: Greater detail will be available in the criteria-based policies of the DM DPD initial proposals.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hallmark Property Group	Business	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25B

Applications should be dealt with on own merits and within context of the London Plan's general policy for reducing noise.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 25

Nature of Comment: Option 25C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25D		
Apply the EU regulation - reduce all traffic speeds, moves and trains and planes		
Response: Noted.		
It is unclear which regulations are being referenced. Any binding regulations would be applied irrespective of local policy, similarly, the adoption of any non-binding regulations would be at the discretion of national government and beyond the remit of the Ealing LDF.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
Acoustic/sound proofing standards required for both new build and conversions		
Response: Noted.		
All new build and conversions will be required to at least meet the minimum building standards relating to sound proofing.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Option 25C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 25
Nature of Comment: Options 25A, 25C and 25D		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

ISSUE 26

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
Light pollution is a serious problem that wastes energy by providing light where it is not needed. This ranges from high-level street lighting to security lighting of buildings and dark outdoor spaces. This cuts Londoners off from the night sky and creates conditions for all wildlife that interrupt their 24hour cycle. Species such as moths are particularly affected. Where lighting is subject to planning control the policy should restrict hours of use and direct the minimum amount of light possible to the place it is needed		
Response: Noted.		
It is acknowledged that where lighting is used inappropriately it can waste energy and impact on people and wildlife. Revised policy will take account of the potential impact that lighting can have and will be amended to reflect this.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Susan New	Resident	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26D		
Decrease light from residential areas and exclude from parks		
Response: Not accepted.		
A certain amount of light will be required in residential areas and parks, essentially for safety and maintenance purposes. Where parks are used at night by pedestrians or cyclists travelling between areas in the borough it will also be essential that some level of lighting exists along the main pathways. However when revising the policy the impact of lighting on these areas will be taken account.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 26
Nature of Comment: Option 26C		
No further comment		

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 26

Nature of Comment: Option 26C

Add specific references to assess light pollution in relation to night time views. Also impacts on wildlife e.g. roosting birds.

Response: Noted.

It is acknowledged that where lighting is used inappropriately it can waste energy and impact on people and wildlife. Revised policy will take account of the potential impact that lighting can have and will be amended to reflect this.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 26

Nature of Comment: Option 26C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 26

Nature of Comment: Option 26C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 26

Nature of Comment: Option 26C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 26

Nature of Comment: Options 26A and 26C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ISSUE 27

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27A		
Location on high buildings provides very unattractive skylines eg The Grange off Castlebar Hill and Villiers House. Policy needs to be amended to reduce their visibility by locating them centrally.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Britel Fund Trustees	Business	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27B		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Friends of the Earth	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference

Susan New	Resident	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Community Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27D		
Disallow increase - make companies share masts		
Response: Noted.		
This is the approach outlined in Option 27C.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Peter L Flatau	Resident	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Eric Leach	Resident	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Issue 27
Nature of Comment: Option 27C		
No further comment.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Central Ealing Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Option 27C

No further comment.

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Sarah Stanley	Resident	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Option 27C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Option 27C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Colin Emmins	Resident	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Option 27C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Options 27A and 27C

No further comment

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
JK Gill	Resident	Issue 27

Nature of Comment: Options 27D

Ensure there is no proliferation of masts and where possible, existing masts are shared by operators and that the health impacts from these types of development are kept under review.

Response: Noted.

This is the approach outlined in Option 27C.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Chapter 2

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Comment

Quantum of Additional Housing - We have considerable concerns over the quantum of additional housing proposed and refer to this in more detail in our response to the Development Strategy consultation.

Occupancy of Developments and Conversions - An increasing number of developments and conversions are occupied by rental tenants. The recent collapse in the housing market has meant that a number of developers have been unable to sell their properties and have let them for social housing. A consequence of this has been an increase in the number of children in residence over that anticipated at the time when planning approval was granted. The provisions regarding internal and external space in the UDP should be strengthened to reflect a maximum 'worst case' occupancy by children of new developments and conversions.

Development in Residential Areas - We believe the current development controls within the UDP should be strengthened so that:

- Any infill developments, especially that on brownfield and former industrial land, should be consistent with that of the surrounding residential area. This requirement should also apply to sites adjoining tube and rail stations in residential areas outside the main town centres,
- Developments in back gardens should be discouraged,
- The conversion of terraced and semi-detached houses in residential areas into flats or bed-sits should be discouraged. The provision in UDP 5.6 (iii) should be strengthened, possibly by the removal of the word 'normally',

Development on Backland Sites - In general this should be discouraged in residential areas outside the town centres. The provisions in UDP 5.5.8 and 5.5.3 should be strengthened. Recent planning decisions in residential areas have revealed that the current provisions are insufficient to protect the interests of residents in adjoining properties. The guidance in UDP Table 5F, 'Infill Development on Backland Sites' should be strengthened, words such as 'unacceptable' and 'significant' have proved ambiguous and are unsatisfactory.

Lifetime Homes - With an aging population the requirement (UDP 5.3.3) that only 10% of new homes will be built to wheelchair accessible standards appears too low and should be substantially increased, especially in the larger developments.

Access for Emergency Vehicles - We have recently experienced a life threatening incident where fire engines were unable to access a house on fire. In an earlier incident in an adjoining road, an ambulance was unable to reach the house where the occupant was experiencing a heart attack. The patient subsequently died. We therefore ask that the successor to the UDP includes specific provisions requiring that all new developments, whether housing or non-housing, fully meet the access requirements of the emergency organisations. We also ask that this requirement be extended to apply to conversions and redevelopments in existing roads where the access provisions no longer meet the requirements of the emergency organisations.

Hostels - The existing provisions in the UDP have proved ineffectual for control purposes when commercial premises have been 'converted' to hostel use. In addition to poor quality facilities within the hostel, a number of social and behavioural problems have been experienced in the surrounding area. The surplus of commercial property, coupled with Ealing's good rail and tube connections, means that these 'conversions' are likely to reoccur. The provisions in the UDP should be strengthened so that applications for hostels, whether for tourists or migrant workers, can be better regulated and also ensure that hostels without the appropriate approvals can be closed.

Travel Implications - The statement in UDP Strategic Policy 1.8:

"..., and to ensure that these facilities are located where they reduce the need to travel ..." should be given even greater prominence in the LDF and should be major determinant when evaluating planning applications for large housing developments.

This is particularly important in the case of educational and health provision.

Response: Noted.

Development quanta are a matter for the Development Strategy.

Child yields are calculated on the size of flats and number of rooms which they contain, the change of occupancy described should not therefore alter the residency profile significantly beyond that originally envisaged.

Policy on infill is intended to assess development on the basis of its impact on the amenity of surrounding uses.

Development on back land residential sites is intended on the basis of its impact on the amenity of surrounding uses.

Policy on Lifetime Homes will be refined with reference to the RLP, now that this is available.

Road access requirements are a standard part of the planning process.

The development of hostels will be subject to the same amenity standards as all other development, this should reduce the risk of this form of development resulting in poor quality accommodation.

With regard to residential development quanta, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides an overview of housing need and demand and the findings are linked to regional and sub-regional targets. In addition to this, the Council has worked with the GLA to produce its London-wide Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The figures generated through the SHLAA process in terms of deliverable and developable sites will also inform the revised housing targets outlined in the revised London Plan. It is Ealing Council's obligation to conform to these targets.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
SEGRO	Business	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Comment

SEGRO do not propose detailed comments on development management policies at this stage as the priority lies with establishing area frameworks; although their broad views on the DM policies are that they:

- welcome the flexible approach to defining affordable housing provision.
- wish to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in terms of housing growth targets to allow consideration of potential windfall, or extended identified site based on their merits.
- consider that the LDF should ensure that the future provision of housing in terms of unit size is based upon a balanced response to needs for all units types and that the need for smaller units is not ignored.
- encourage flexibility on density, design and amenity standards to allow appropriate optimisation of sites based on their merits.

Response:

Comments welcomed.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Greater London Authority	Statutory	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Comment

GLA officers are keen to work with the Council in adopting their housing policies. Areas currently not included in either documents include those relating to affordable housing, mix of units, density, and children's play space. Further discussions regarding how these strategic requirements will be reflected in local policies is strongly encouraged.

Response: The Council welcomes the opportunity to work with the GLA on these policies in addition to the input that will come from the DRLP policies.

Outcome: Officers will engage with the GLA in revising these policies.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Association	Statutory	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Comment

Environmentally enhancing buildings and planning is not prioritised; Carbon Neutral approach lacking; green enhancement to increase biodiversity not present; cycleways and safe walking lacking; microgenerations not included

All communities have to be ground based, developed from existing communities, integrated and providing a wide variety of facilities. This can only be done by work with local people

Response: Not accepted

Ealing must follow the national lead on carbon neutrality, it is certainly unviable to proceed immediately to carbon neutral building. Policy does aim to enhance biodiversity and improve pedestrian and cycle provision. Microgeneration is a constituent part of the broader Code for Sustainable Homes policy.

All planning aims to develop policy and plans through work with local people.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
John Murray	Resident	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Comment

Council's governments are judged by how they treat the underprivileged in our midst. Putting the poor with the middle class in housing is the way to go to erase criminality. Lean towards middle class values for the poor.

Response: Noted.

Improving the quality and availability of housing for all Ealing residents is a central objective of the Development Strategy.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Mr DW Hawkins	Resident	Chapter 2

Nature of Comment: Support

Public houses should be regarded as community facilities

Response: Not accepted

Public houses are not considered to fall within the definition of a Community Facility as defined in the UDP.

Outcome: No change

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Primary Care Trust	Statutory	Para 2.15
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
PCT welcomes inclusion of point 2.15 page 16.		
Response: Support welcomed		
Outcome: No change		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Para 2.19
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
These issues reinforce the need for a good quality residential road system.		
Response: Noted.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Her Majesty's Court Service	Statutory	Para 2.20
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Taking account of our support for HMCS inclusion as a community infrastructure provider in the Development Strategy, we turn our attention to chapter 2 of the Development Management document that deals with options for the delivery of community infrastructure at pages 18 – 19. Flexibility is sought in the development of the policy to enable HMCS to adapt its court estate as required to ensure appropriate service delivery: whether this be for instance through court extension, application, additional sites, etc, to meet existing and future demand.		
Response: Noted.		
It is unnecessary to make specific policy provision for the type of development described. Extensions to existing uses are supported where they can be appropriately accommodated. Court buildings are a necessary public use and their development is supported in principle.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hovedean Properties	Business	Para 2.3
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Item 2.3 - We support the shift in terminology from special opportunity area to mixed business and residential area		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change		

CHAPTER 4

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 4
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>Business Parking in Residential Streets - We have experienced difficulties where a backland garage has rented out part of their premises and has taken to parking the cars they are servicing in the adjoining residential road. Obviously this pressure on residential parking wouldn't exist if the garage hadn't sub let part of their site.</p> <p>It would be beneficial if the UDP successor document could include provisions which would discourage the encroachment of business uses onto residential streets.</p> <p>We appreciate that many of the day-to-day transport issues which have a major impact on the quality of life of our residents are within the control of Transport for London (TfL) rather than the Local Planning Authority. We would ask that wherever possible the successor document to the UDP includes provisions that: Lifetime Friendly Street Design - Promote 'lifetime friendly' street design for pedestrians, with a special focus on the needs of the young and those with reduced mobility. We would suggest that this could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • islands on busy roads and at intersections, • the removal of obscuring street furniture, especially at junctions. • traffic calming, especially in residential roads which serve as commuter rat-runs. <p>Frequency of Bus Services - We would also ask that attention is given to the recent tendency of TfL to arbitrarily reduce the frequency of bus services, for example that of the E2 has been reduced by between 25% and 33%, and the implications this and future reductions must have on both the economic viability of our town centre and on Proposal 9 for low car housing in the consultation.</p> <p>Freedom Pass - There has been press coverage of a possible reduction in, or removal of, funding of the over 60's freedom pass. Were this to come about it would have implications for the location of housing, especially sheltered housing, and probably needs to be considered in planning guidance which will last to 2026.</p>		
Response: Noted.		
<p>The problem as described seems not to be susceptible to planning influence. Sub-letting of a site which is not also a change of use is difficult to control. Residential permit systems are designed to ensure on street parking for houses where this is necessary. If there are specific instances where the designation of permit areas would be helpful then this should be brought to the attention of the Transport team.</p> <p>Many of the measures that are described will be addressed in part by the current Local Implementation Plan. The functional design of roads and pedestrian crossings is a subject on which planners generally accept the advice of transport engineers and we will aim for best practice in the schemes which come forward.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Primary Care Trust	Statutory	Chapter 4

Nature of Comment: Comment

Car parking and transport for health centres:

Car parking is the single highest issue raised in any public consultation regarding health care provision.

There needs to be a review across London to agree a new formula for allocation of car parking spaces for health centres, which takes into consideration the specific mobility needs of sick and vulnerable patients and the requirement for GPs, community nursing and therapy staff to provide domiciliary care. The GP contract specifies an allocation of 1 parking space / GP, which is difficult to achieve under current planning regulations.

There needs to be an easier way of engaging TFL in the planning of bus routes to improve links to existing or planned health centre developments.

Response: Noted.

These ideas are best addressed to the GLA and TFL.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Chapter 4

Nature of Comment: Comment

Add support of office space in Acton High Street

Response: Noted.

Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Para 4.6

Nature of Comment: Comment

Para 4.6 Highway improvement projects are essential for both the business and private communities in the Borough.

Response: Noted.

Highway improvements are envisaged in the plan period and more immediately through the Local Implementation Plan. It is envisaged that development will contribute to these where appropriate.

Outcome:

Further information will be available in the more detailed policies of the DM DPD initial proposals draft.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingdon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Para 4.8

Nature of Comment: Comment

It is interesting to note that there was significant support for the encouragement of cycling and walking but the walkers were not willing to share their space with the cyclists, instead they expected road users ie motorists to provide the space for increased cycling. As a first option cycling facilities should be provided "off road" this would reduce traffic congestion caused by the loss of carriageway and improve road safety.

Response: Noted.

Space is limited on both roads and pavements across the Borough. The aim is to accommodate cycle lanes where they are needed with the minimum loss of space to other modes.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Highways Agency	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Para 4.11

Nature of Comment: Comment

It is recommended that this document should set out requirements for new developers to produce detailed Travel Plans. These should include targets, measures and monitoring arrangements and should be produced by all developments that exceed the thresholds defined in guidance on Workplace Travel Planning and Residential Travel Planning. In response to the impact of heavy goods vehicles mentioned at point 11 of Chapter 4, as well as the environmental considerations as outlined earlier, the HA would encourage proposals which seek to promote the use of rail and water for the transport of freight. This has the potential to reduce HGV levels on the SRN.

Response: Noted.

The RLP includes guidance on the use of Travel Plans and this will be refined where necessary to meet the local Ealing context.

Outcome:

Further information will be available in the more detailed policies of the DM DPD initial proposals draft.

CHAPTER 5

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Civic Society	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 5
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>The following are included incorrectly: Car parks/roads/unsuitable temporary uses.</p> <p>1) Eal25-Warwick Rd across the Common and the area used by temporary uses 2) EaB 104 includes Osterley Sports club Car park</p> <p>New buildings, 1) Norwood hall- a school and car park</p> <p>Strange boundaries 1)EaB110C Glade Lane a strange triangle omitted. 2)Churchill gardens Acton part of the</p> <p>Possible omissions 1) Kingsbridge Crescent, Southall. The green area was a lovely little spinney being encroached by car parking has it gone. 2) Boundary Nature Reserve. 3) EaB113- Green bit is part of a block of flats open space that is supposed to be managed for nature conservation.</p> <p>Allotments being dug up, 1) EaL12 Northfield Ave 2) EaB 114A Part of Pitshanger Allotments are shown as a Nature Conservation Area. It has been dug up for allotments. We are trying to promote it round the edges especially the southern one. 3) EaL 42 Carberry Avenue Allotments 4) EaL34 Popefield playing field –I thought this was going to be used for allotments</p> <p>Possible Additions 1) Northala fields 2) Clitheroe Ave. Nature Conservation area just south of Haslemere Wildlife Reserve.</p> <p>There are other points as well.</p> <p>I cannot find a species protection policy. UDP policy 3.9 seems OK but the Mayor has a Biodiversity and nature conservation policy 3D. 14 which provides a useful structure for protection for both sites and species at Ealing's level.</p>		
Response: Noted		
<p>The proposed amendments to the network of nature conservation sites in the borough will be considered as part of the review of sites in the borough. The final changes will be published as part of the Atlas of Maps and an Open Space Background Report. Policy 7.19 of the RLP provides for adequate protection of protected or priority species.</p>		
Outcome: Change		
<p>A definitive map of nature conservation sites in the borough will be published as part of the Atlas of Maps and Open Space Background Report.</p>		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 5
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>Shopping Centres - We have considerable reservations over the designation of Ealing Town Centre as one of the eleven largest shopping centres in Greater London. While the town centre might have fulfilled the criteria set out in UDP Table 7A many years ago, it no longer does. Our concerns are set out in our response to the Development Strategy consultation. The continued viability of neighbourhood shopping centres, such as Northfield Avenue and South Ealing Road, is essential. We hope that the next draft of the LDF will include specific references that will build on those in the UDP and set out how the planning process can assist with this aspiration.</p> <p>Nature Conservation - The small scale map DM5 on page 66 of the consultation document seems to suggest that the sidings and engine sheds of Northfields Tube Depot might be designated a nature conservation area. We are not sure if this is the Council's intention.</p> <p>The map also suggests the same for the open space south of the Piccadilly tube line and between the north circular, Baronsmeade and Aspen Close. At the Arcadia Planning Inquiry, the Inspector was advised that this land was designated for allotments and its conversion would be funded out of the Arcadia S106 agreement. Neil Bleakley should be able to provide further information.</p>		
Response: Not accepted.		
<p>The designation of the Metropolitan Centre does not undermine neighbourhood shopping centres and these latter will continue to be protected under the draft policies.</p> <p>Ealing as a whole continues to export shopping demand to the West End and other competing centres in London. This is not sustainable where demand is for services which could be provided locally, and provision for additional floorspace in the Metropolitan Centre will be made to accommodate it.</p>		
Outcome: No change.		
Further detail is available in the retail study.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Wildberry Nature Reserve	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 5
Nature of Comment: Support		
<p>The Community Association supports the proposal to designate and manage the Wildberry Nature Reserve (near Boston Manor tube station alongside Wildberry Close ((off Cawdon Crescent)) between Boston Parade and the Gardens of Clitherow Avenue) as a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation</p>		
Response: Noted		

Outcome: Change

The site is to be designated as a Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation. A definitive map of nature conservation sites in the borough will be published as part of the Atlas of Maps and Open Space Background Report.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 5

Nature of Comment: Support

Environmental Play Areas - as in Germany need to be developed and recycling needs to be addressed

Sustainability requires a far greater commitment to open green areas - on top of buildings that exist and ensure nothing is lost

Response: Noted.

Environmental Play Areas in major cities in Germany tend to be concentrated on the outskirts of cities as there is seldom capacity nearer the city centre. The character of Ealing is a hybrid between inner and outer London but we are nevertheless fortunate to be one of the greenest boroughs in London. The plan is intended to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of this green space.

The DRLP encourages the use of green roofs.

Outcome: No change.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Gary Chamberlain	Resident	Chapter 5

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

Acton Town Hall re-development should include creative space in addition to the proposed hotel use.

Response: Noted.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
National Grid Property Holdings	Business	Para 5.3

Nature of Comment: Support with conditions

NGP support the proposal for a reconfiguration of Southall town centre to include a new retail element on the Southall Gas Works site. As such, they support the proposal set out in Map DM2, which shows a revised town centre boundary to include part of the Southall Gas Works site. NGP also support the proposal to incorporate the remainder of the Southall Gas Works site in Southall's residential area.

Response: Support welcomed.**Outcome: No change.**

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Metropolis Planning and Design	Business	Para 5.13
Nature of Comment: Support with conditions		
A representation is made in relation to Site Allocation No 96 in the Glade Lane area. It is sought to remove the Metropolitan Open Land designation from the land.		
Response: This proposal will be addressed in the Sites DPD.		
Outcome: No change.		

CHAPTER 6

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 6
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Ensure micro-generation with ALL development. Insist on the numbers of bio-sustainable materials throughout and have a positive green ambiance to all developments		
Response: Not Accepted.		
Efficiency and sustainability measures in new development will be guided by the Council's energy study (currently in preparation) however it is positive for the development of sustainable technologies and for carbon reduction in general that developments are allowed to implement whatever strategy they consider best fit within this guidance so long as this also reduces emissions by the required amount.		
Outcome:		
Further information will be available in the more detailed policies of the DM DPD initial proposals draft.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Thames Water	Statutory	Para 6.10
Nature of Comment: Comment		
It is unclear from the document whether LB of Ealing are stating that there is adequate water conservation policies within existing LB of Ealing planning policy documents or an adequate policy at a strategic level in the London Plan. It is of Thames Water's opinion that a specific policy supporting water conservation in new developments should be set out at a local level so that local monitoring of developments that incorporate water conservation can be assessed.		
Response: Noted		
Outcome: No Change		
Policy 5.15 of the RLP is considered to be adequate in this regard.		

CHAPTER 7

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 7
Nature of Comment: Comment		
<p>Design in Residential Hinterlands - We believe that the external design of new and replacement buildings in the residential hinterlands should reflect that of the Edwardian and inter-war buildings which make up the overwhelming majority of the buildings in these areas.</p> <p>New buildings should not exceed the height of nearby buildings or those that they replace.</p> <p>Recent examples in our local area of where this approach has been followed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devonshire House on the former garage site at the junction of Northfield Avenue and Devonshire Road, and • the infill development at the western end of Bramley Road behind the Pharmacy at the corner of Northfield Avenue. <p>We ask that the provisions in the planning framework which facilitated the exterior design of these developments are retained and strengthened.</p>		
<p>Recreational Space on New Developments - With much of the new construction taking the form of flats, we believe that it is essential that each development includes on site open air play and recreation areas for its residents, so that parents/carers can supervise their children and residents with mobility needs will have direct access to the open air.</p> <p>Ageing Population - With an aging population, we believe that the provisions of the existing UDP, including those in 4.3 Inclusive Design – Access for All, should be significantly strengthened so that all public and private buildings are constructed to provide 100% internal and external access for those with mobility requirements including wheelchair users.</p> <p>Commercial Frontages in Conservation Areas – Issues 22 & 24 - We believe that the provisions 4.8 and 4.10 of the existing UDP should be strengthened so that commercial signage and advertising of premises in conservation areas should require the occupant to install signs which respect the character of the area in which they are located.</p> <p>Branches of multiple retailers and service businesses located in conservation areas should be discouraged from installing generic national signage and should be encouraged to use variants which respect historic buildings and frontages, as required in the historic quarters of other town centres.</p>		
<p>Response: Not accepted.</p> <p>It is unclear what is intended by the use of the word 'reflect'. If the intention is that development should be appropriate to its context then this is precisely the aim of policy. However, planning does not dictate appropriate 'style' for development, to do so would be to deny the possibility for change; through which process the areas in question came to be developed.</p> <p>It is not always practical to provide amenity space on site and where this is so, contributions will be accepted towards provision off site.</p> <p>We are currently investigating the best way to make the maximum possible provision for inclusive access. This approach will be refined based on the final provisions of the RLP.</p> <p>Commercial frontages in conservation areas are encouraged to adopt signage which is appropriate to the area, however, national regulations permit certain forms of development whatever the provisions of local policy.</p>		

Outcome:

Further information will be available in the more detailed policies of the DM DPD initial proposals draft.

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hanwell Village Green Association	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Chapter 7
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Reduce light pollution, noise pollution, vibrations and electro magnetic pollution. Do not allow an increase and reduce what is present		
Response: Noted.		
Policy will be designed to achieve precisely this outcome.		
Outcome: Comments to be taken into account when refining the policy in the revised Development Management DPD.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Michael Simmons	Resident	Chapter 7
Nature of Comment: Option 16C		
The policy outlined in point 7.4 on page 48 is wholly unacceptable - eco-credentials are no excuse for poor or inappropriate design.		
Response: Not accepted.		
The policy does not propose that sustainability is allowed to substitute for good design.		
Outcome: No change.		

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Hillingon Motorist Forum	Community/Voluntary Organisation	Para 7.5
Nature of Comment: Comment		
Para 7.5 This is not a transport issue but it has been pointed out that tower blocks were built in the 60's & 70's as an answer to the housing shortage. In the 80's and 90's a considerable number of blocks were demolished as not being suitable developments. We do not want to make the same mistake again.		
Response: Noted.		
The flaws of large housing schemes in the 1960s and 1970s are well documented and revolve chiefly around poor materials and design and monocultural forms of tenure; problems which the DM DPD is specifically designed to avoid. There is no inherent link between high density development and social problems either historically or geographically. In addition, high density does not necessarily mean high-rise; much of Ealing's Victorian housing stock is built at medium-rise and high density.		
Outcome: No change.		

CHAPTER 8

Name	Organisation	Policy Reference
Transport for London	Statutory	Chapter 8
Nature of Comment: Comment		
The principle of using the Grand Union Canal for more freight transport is welcome.		
Response: Support welcomed.		
Outcome: No change		