

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: In order for policies to be deliverable and therefore sound, they must have regard to viability. This is particularly important given the current economic climate, and policies set out within the Development Sites DPD should seek sufficient flexibility to both stimulate development whilst responding to varying social and economic conditions. Whilst it is noted that the Borough has advanced several scenarios it is not considered that these fully represent the development parameters of any scheme that might come forward. In this regard we consider that the evidence base supporting the policy lacks the flexibility and realism required for soundness under PPS12. In particular we express concern that the scenarios suggested are unlikely to be delivered in the market. We agree with the Council's view that the development of the Arcadia site has a key role to play in delivering its vision for Ealing Town Centre over the life of the LDF. It is therefore imperative that such potential restrictions to a timely development of the site are removed.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: We are supportive of the Council's designation of the Arcadia site for high density mixed use development in line with its identity as a Metropolitan Centre within Greater London as set out within the London Plan.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Support noted.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: We do not consider the site specific scenarios explored in Appendix 1 [of the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre Spatial Development Framework 2010 Update] to be fully representative of the potential of the Arcadia site. In particular, we consider that a greater quantum of development could be accommodated on the site in a manner appropriate to its</p> | | |

townscape context that also responds to comments made by th Secretary of State in 2009 and better optimise its planning potential. No evidence is provided to demonstrate the viability of the scenarios that have been advanced, and the viability of the scenarios is therefore questioned.

Response:

The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

We support the conclusion that residential uses will almost certainly be more viable above retail uses than commercial floorspace and support the acknowledgement that the mix of unit types will need to respond to the character of each particular site.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

It is noted that the study identified precise quanta of development that might be accommodated under each scenario. In practice, until sites have been the subject of detailed design it is very difficult to be accurate when assessing the capacity of a particular site. Rather than identifying a precise number of units of square metres of floorspace it is suggested that the document identifies ranges of accommodation that might be delivered. This approach will create greater scope for development parcels to be optimised.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to clarify appropriate residential density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD rather than identifying specific quanta of development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Policy should clarify that where infrastructure, environmental and townscape analysis demonstrates that additional capacity can be brought forward without causing planning harm, that the identified range should be treated as a guide and can be exceeded. | | |
| Response: Proposals outside London Plan 2011 density ranges can only be considered at the planning application stage when detailed designs have been put forward for consideration. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: We support the principle of mixed use development on the Arcadia site but consider that this mix of uses can be established through a combination of residential with retail, commercial with retail or residential and commercial with retail. We consider that the framework plan should allow for each of these combinations and that to prescribe one in preference to another without good reason will only serve to delay delivery if the prescribed mix is not one that the market will support at the point of delivery. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| GVA Grimley | Glenkerrin Ltd | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Reference is made to consistency of scale, particularly on frontages. Whilst in some parts of the Metropolitan Centre such an approach might be appropriate, in other parts of the centre there is greater opportunity for scale as identified by Tibbalds in their urban framework diagram in which they specifically identify landmark opportunities and location where taller buildings may be appropriate. For completeness, and conclusions on scale should recognise that there is an opportunity for taller buildings and landmark structures on key sites in the town centre. | | |

Response:

The Development Management DPD will contain guidance on tall buildings. In particular, it will distinguish between tall buildings and landmark buildings, which are considered distinct in that there is no presumption that a landmark building is also a tall building. Should a site be considered as providing an opportunity for a tall building or landmark structure, this will be detailed in the allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

No decisions on this site should be taken without an Area Action Plan for the Town Centre as a whole. In particular, no other options should be contemplated until two other town centre issues have been resolved as these could require space on the Arcadia site: A long-term location for an integrated transport interchange at Ealing Broadway that moves the bus stops/stands away from Haven Green and has the required capacity to deal with post-Crossrail passenger numbers; and improvements to the overall traffic flow in the town centre and especially improvements to north-south flows.

Response:

Objection noted. The Council does not plan to produce an Area Action Plan for Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre. The Development Strategy, Development Sites and Development Management DPD together provide the required statutory planning framework. Plans relating to provision of improved interchange arrangements at Ealing Broadway Station do not require land take on the Arcadia site, however the final allocation will reflect the site's relationship to adjacent transport infrastructure.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Remain unconvinced that the case has been made for redeveloping this site in its entirety and this should have been examined. While recognise the importance of improving it and welcome the opportunity to comment on ideas for the future, the fact that only four options are presented means there is a strong risk that other possibilities will be ruled out before there has been any chance to raise them.

Response:

Objection noted. The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations,

and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Concern that there is no summation of the views of the Inspector or the Secretary of State. It seems essential that some attempt should be made to draw lessons from this process which can feed into any future scheme. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. In reviewing site options as part of the DPD production process, all information relating to the planning history and context of the site has been reviewed. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Would welcome the presence of retail and other town centre uses at ground and first floor levels and think there is a strong case for the higher floors to be predominantly commercial use with no more than a relatively small proportion of residential uses. Other uses such as a bus station on the site should also be considered. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The possibility of a bus station on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Do not think any of the four options offered could be implemented until it is clarified what the key parameters in respect to the wider priorities for the town centre are. Option A2 comes closest to an acceptable solution, the bulk of the development and the layout seem to be the most compatible within our views and the SoS, and most in keeping with the character of the existing town centre and various Conservation Areas. Support layout that offers improved pedestrian route through the site. | | |

Response:

Support noted. The final allocation will reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Suggest amending Option A2 by incorporating a bus station at the north of the site, similiar to Halcrow's Option 9 or Urban Studio's Option 8, centred over the Network Rail tracks. Note that the Interchange Study ruled out options that would involve extensive agreement with other parties, but Tibbalds options take a wider view for example through the way that they countenance the demolition of Central Chambers which spans the Network Rail tracks.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The possibility of a bus station on the site, centred over Network Rail tracks, was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable due to financial, technical and operational constraints.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Do not think the viability assessment is material for a consultation about a site not within the Council's ownership. Option A1 is indicated as being the most viable option and think there is a risk this opinion will bias decisions against other options that deliver less floor space.

Response:

Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. This approach will ensure that a range of options may be considered by those bringing forward proposals on the site, as suggested.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Site requires development of very high quality in terms of design, compatible with nearby listed buildings and with nearby conservation areas in terms of height and mass. It must also complement and enhance them in terms of surface materials, fenestration and detailed architectural features. Suggest moving the access to the site further to the north and widening Springbridge Road to 2-way down to the Broadway where left-turn only. Covered areas need to be considered for walkways between the shops, particularly on the east-west thoroughfare which is aligned with the prevailing wind.

Response:

Agreed. The final allocation will provide further detail on built form and design details to a level appropriate within a DPD, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. It would be inappropriate for the allocation to require a set access location in the absence of a full transport assessment for the site, and final design details such as covered walkways are most appropriately considered via the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Support around 100 flats, but do not consider a good location for family housing as there are inadequate play space and community schools, and pollution levels in the area are significantly higher than EU recommended levels

Response:

Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including requirements for play space and amenity considerations.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Over-provision of retail floorspace is likely to result in vacancies elsewhere in the town centre. It is important that any retail component is based on the very latest assessment of demand at the time of application. It would therefore be advisable to amend the ground and first floor uses to 'town centre and retail uses' so as not to harm the town centre. Should also include a shopmobility scheme.

Response:

Retail is the preferred use within designated shopping frontages, otherwise within the town centre boundary town centre

uses are considered appropriate.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Support the use of upper floors of the development for office purposes. Use for offices should reduce the need for so many parking spaces as has been proposed in the rejected sche,and have the benefit of reducing congestion and traffic pollution in the town centre | | |
| Response: Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The traffic generation of a proposed use can only be determined at the planning application stage. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: We do not support redevelopment of this locally listed development within the Town Centre Conservation Area. Redevelopment of such a recently constructed building would be grossly unsustainable and would increase the blight in the town centre to possibly terminal dimensions. There is no indication where new residential uses would be located on the site, but they certainly should not displace the existing uses. This is not a very useful site for office uses - the Arcadia across the road looks more appropriate. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, and reflect the locally listed status of the building. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

The prospect of locating an integrated public transport interchange on the site needs to be kept open, perhaps with mixed retail and other town centre uses at street level and offices above. They do this sort of thing very well on the continent and Ealing could earn some huge plaudits if it were to work up the options seriously. Suggest a proper site brief should be carried out for the site. Whatever solutions are arrived at access into the site from the A406 needs to be considered. In addition, pedestrian access into the station from the Mall would be convenient and it would reduce congestion on Haven Green. Site looks to be more appropriate as a prestige office location.

Response:

The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station, in line with Option 1A. The approach does not preclude further future improvements coming forward as part of development proposals. The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Guidance on building heights and massing will be provided in the final allocation, in particular the opportunity for air rights development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL08 |

Nature of Comment:

This site lies within a Conservation Area and while the architecture is not greatly distinguished it provides, particularly in the southern section an attractive row of units that are in keeping with the area. The case therefore for their demolition needs to be properly made and it has not been. The site proposals do offer no guidance as to height or massing but it is important that these must not detract from the Church across the road. A full site brief for the site would therefore be warranted. It is difficult to see how 200 units could be accommodated satisfactorily.

Response:

Comments noted. The final allocation will reflect the requirement preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, and the setting of Listed Buildings, however it is not the role of the DPD to prejudice the statutory process of Conservation Area Consent for demolition. The final allocation will offer guidance on height and massing.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Will French | Save Ealing's Centre (SEC) | EAL17 |

Nature of Comment:

The site already has a planning consent for a multi screen cinema to replace the facility that Ealing has now lost. We would be extremely concerned about any proposals to water down such a development, particularly with residential rather than town centre uses. It is not at all clear that this is an good site for office uses unless perhaps it is ancillary to the cinema. It is important that what is left of the facade is not lost, and an imaginative use made of the arch in Mattock Lane. A modest retail use as proposed would probably be OK.

Response:

59-63 New Broadway currently has planning permission for a 20 screen cinema and seven A3/A4 units. The final allocation will reflect this permission as well as providing guidance for the remainder of the site at 14-20 Bond Street and land to rear. 26-42 Bond Street will be removed from the allocation to reflect the completed hotel development at this address.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Vlod Barchuk | SHLAP (Stop Horn Lane Pollution) | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Request that land adjoining and between ACT07 and ACT09, also known as “The Horn Lane Industrial Estate”/Network Rail Goods Yards & Land, currently occupied for the most part by Yeomans Aggregates (ref W3 9EH and W3 0BP) be added to the Development Sites DPD. This part of Horn Lane is proven to be one of the most highly polluted areas of London and me and most local residents want the removal of the polluters to make way for non-polluting residential dwellings, shops & offices, school/s, primary care surgery/ies, dentist/s and green open space. This “mini” industrial estate is a relic of Acton’s industrial past. Whilst retention of the existing industrial uses is possible, there is no overriding reason why planning policy should in any way fetter a development to support the coming of Crossrail.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The final allocation will be enlarged to include ACT07, ACT08, ACT09 and land between to support consolidation of existing industrial uses while responding to the opportunities afforded by Crossrail. The waste transfer facility and aggregates depot are safeguarded essential services, appropriately located adjacent to the railway line, and removal of these facilities is not considered appropriate.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Vlod Barchuk | SHLAP (Stop Horn Lane Pollution) | ACT03 |

Nature of Comment:

It is proposed to put at least 333 units per hectare (200 units/0.6 hectares) on this site (the density is probably even greater as not all the site will be used for housing (500m² is for industrial floor space). This is far in excess of current planning policy limits and far more than would be allowed under current planning policy. This is completely inappropriate for the site. It is not possible to see how one could preserve the privacy of Birkbeck Rd residents with this scale of development. The existing playing fields should be retained; there is enough brownfield land for development.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Vlod Barchuk | SHLAP (Stop Horn Lane Pollution) | ACT09 |

Nature of Comment:

This site is owned by Network Rail, not Gowing and Pursey.

Response:

The Council has confirmed that Gowing and Pursey own the waste transfer facility.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT03 |

Nature of Comment:

It is proposed to put at least 333 units per hectare (200 units/0.6 hectares) on this site (the density is probably even greater as not all the site will be used for housing (500m² is for industrial floor space). This is far in excess of current planning policy. This is completely inappropriate for this site. It is not possible to see how one could preserve the privacy of Birbeck Road residents with this scale of development.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The Development Management DPD will contain policies regarding residential amenity.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|----------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT09 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: This site is owned by Network Rail not Gowing and Pursey (the latter have a lease from NR, details not known). This site also includes Shamrock Social Club and Derlins, both are also on the land leased by Network Rail. Residents would be in favour of re-zoning this site to residential to overcome the current issues of noise and particulate (PM10) pollution.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The Council has confirmed that Gowing and Pursey own the waste transfer facility. Rezoning of the site is not possible due to the safeguarding of the waste transfer facility and aggregates depot. The final allocation will support consolidation of existing industrial uses.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|----------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT10 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Reference to these sites should include the provision for the Green Corridor as defined in SPG22. Do not believe there is adequate space for 500 residential units if the bunds, footpath and cycle path with tree and shrub planting are to be accommodated in the green corridor, together with a development that reflects the local character and takes into account the high levels of pollution from passing vehicles. Green Corridor should cover 25m adjacent to the road frontage; limit should be stipulated on the height of buildings, to complement adjoining properties. Noise Impact Assessments associated with recent Planning Applications for sites ACT10A-D have rated the noise in Category D, which states that 'planning permission should normally be refused'.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Final allocation will include reference to the Green Corridor as defined in the Development Strategy DPD, confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Mitigation measures required in relation to noise issues are considered through the planning application process, and the Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to this and other residential amenity considerations.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT10 E |
| Nature of Comment: Would seem too small for a development of any kind | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT10 F |
| Nature of Comment: Would seem too small for a development of any kind | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT10 M |
| Nature of Comment: Would seem too small for a development of any kind | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | ACT11 |

Nature of Comment:

It is proposed that a school could be built on this site. Whilst school places are in desperate need this would be in an area where there are other schools nearby. It would be also removing a community facility

Response:

Suggestion noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | PAR01G |

Nature of Comment:

This is included in the list of sites for development at the Southern Gateway. It must be pointed out that this is a locally listed building.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Alan Cartwright | WARA (West Acton Residents Association) | General |

Nature of Comment:

Commentary on site proposals is difficult as no explicit information is provided on site density or building heights. No scale drawings are provided, making informed comment even more difficult.

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD; scale drawings will not be included.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Indigo (Helen Greenhalgh) | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) | EAL09 |

Nature of Comment:

This site includes Exchange Plaza (Bilton House) and other sites to the north not in the control of CEG (Crowborough

Court and Craven Road) therefore policy needs to state an incremental approach to developing the site is acceptable

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site as a whole to ensure incremental development contributes to the key objectives for this area of the town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Indigo (Helen Greenhalgh) | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) | EAL09 |

Nature of Comment:

The stated options for redevelopments include 'residential or office with ground floor retail and/or community uses'. Although it is not clear in the draft policy, we understand that the frontage site is identified for offices and the rear site for housing. This needs to be clarified although our client is of the view that residential should be acceptable if an office scheme is not viable.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Indigo (Helen Greenhalgh) | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) | EAL09 |

Nature of Comment:

If the frontage site is identified for office use, CEG is of the view that there needs to be flexibility in the policy so that it does not stifle further redevelopment options. EAL09 should acknowledge that it might be appropriate to allow alternative uses appropriate to a town centre (such as housing) where it would not be viable to progress an office scheme. We note the ELR suggests that the area should keep its current employment use, but this is not always a viable option especially as with EAL09 where redevelopment potential has been compromised by previous decisions of the Council on neighbouring sites.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review to maintain a critical mass of office floorspace, and Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) which identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace to 2026 in the town centre. The Development Management DPD will contain a criteria based policy for the change of use or loss or employment floorspace.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Indigo (Helen Greenhalgh) | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) | EAL09 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The Options section notes that development should relate well to the residential area to the north and east and the locally listed fire station. If the Council is serious about supporting and office development on these site then they need to be flexible in terms of the level of development otherwise the development might not be viable. Should be recognition that the site is a gateway to the town centre and that a taller building would be appropriate in this location. There should be flexibility when assessing the relationship with nearby buildings because of previous decision to allow habitable room windows facing the site with a limiting effect on its potential.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The site is on the western end of the Business Quarter, however it is located within the wider Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre and therefore is not considered a gateway to the town centre. The evidence base for the design principles included within the options is the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre Spatial Development Framework (2008, updated September 2010). This document does not identify the site as an appropriate location for a tall building, however the suggestion has been noted and will be taken into consideration when determining the final allocation.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Indigo (Helen Greenhalgh) | Commercial Estates Group (CEG) | EAL09 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Document refers to potential new office floor space of 16,500sqm and net retail floor space of 350sqm implying that a mixed use with retail at ground floor and office above is appropriate on the frontage site. This site needs to be considered as a single use site, be it office or residential, to ensure it is viable to develop. The floor area referred to is not sufficient to bring forward the site for an office use. It should be at least 20,000sqm and a comment added that a design-led approach to the sit could lead to a much higher density being achieved. The policy should recognise that mixed use is not always deliverable and that a single use is also acceptable on this site.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will be contain sufficient flexibility so that vertical mixing of uses is an option rather than a requirement, confirm the setting and PTAL range in regards to appropriate residential densities, and clarify that office developments are not constrained by a floorspace cap. It is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to</p> | | |

support the inclusion of of the comment that a design-led approach could lead to much higher densities being achieved.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | EAL16 |
| Nature of Comment: This is a well established and successful office block suited to its location close to major transport links. The site is totally unsuitable for residents use being adjacent to busy railway tracks. The site also has poor access for the level of residential traffic possibly generated. A previous residential application has already been refused | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HAN05 |
| Nature of Comment: Its important to retain useful things like garages and existing small houses in Westminster Rd. Leave as is. Contains sufficient floor space for continued use as at present. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HAN04 |
| Nature of Comment: Leave frontage as is and flats above. Possibly restore garage to traditional shop/flat. Residential overcrowding is a issue. Retain shops. Too much bulked office space. Just have a few above shops. Not suitable for industrial - poor access etc. | | |
| Response: Objections noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

Leave frontage as is and develop rear yard only. Retain shops. Too much bulked office space, just have a few above shops. Not suitable for industrial - poor access etc.

Response:

The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HANX01 |

Nature of Comment:

We need local facilities such as these. Keep Wickes/Garage at all costs. No re-development.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HANX02 |

Nature of Comment:

We need local facilities such as these. Keep Storage at all costs. No re-development.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| M W Jordan | M W Jordan | HANX04 |

Nature of Comment:

We need local spaces for small businesses such as these. No re-development.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Patrick Blake | Highways Agency | General |

Nature of Comment:

The HA is supportive of the location of high trip generating development in town centres with good access to public transport in order to help reduce dependence on the private car and encourage sustainable travel. Further to this the HA would recommend reducing the maximum parking standards, where appropriate, in order to ensure that levels of traffic on the road network do not increase.

Response:

Support noted. The next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will consider the potential of individual sites for reduced parking standards.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Patrick Blake | Highways Agency | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

As a proposed Crossrail site, the HA recommends that Ealing Broadway Station parking levels are carefully planned and managed to discourage high level of private car trips to and from the station.

Response:

Funding has been secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station, with parking levels planned and managed to discourage car use.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Patrick Blake | Highways Agency | General |

Nature of Comment:

The HA generally recommends that high trip generating developments are located near public transport hubs; this will minimise the impact of increased trips on the SRN and assist in maintaining enhanced levels of accessibility. Several sites in the document have been identified as having poor access to public transport, These sites will require definite improvements in access to public transport if they are to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel and minimise impact upon the road network. It is essential that improvements to public transport are implemented before the occupation of the proposed sites. This will ensure unsustainable travel patterns are not adopted in the interim.

Response:

Where sufficient evidence is available, individual allocations will identify specific public transport improvements required.

Otherwise, required public transport improvements will be negotiated through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | General |
| Nature of Comment: Commentary on site proposals is difficult as no explicit information is provided on site density or building heights. No scale drawings are provided, making informed comment even more difficult. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD; scale drawings will not be included. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT03 |
| Nature of Comment: It is proposed to put at least 333 units per hectare (200 units/0.6 hectares) on this site (the density is probably even greater as not all the site will be used for housing (500m ² is for industrial floor space). This is far in excess of current planning policy limits and far more than would be allowed under current planning policy. This is completely inappropriate for the site. It is not possible to see how one could preserve the privacy of Birkbeck Rd residents with this scale of development. I object to its impact on the setting of conservation areas, the green corridor and on the amenity of existing and proposed residents | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The impact of any future development proposals for the site on the setting of conservation area, the green corridor and the amenity of existing and proposed residents can only be determined at the planning application stage when detailed proposals have been submitted to the Council for assessment. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT09 |

Nature of Comment:

This site is owned by Network Rail, not Gowing and Pursey (the latter have a lease from NR, details not known). The site also includes Shamrock Social Club and Derlins, both are also on the land leased by Network Rail.

Response:

The Council has confirmed that Gowing and Pursey own the waste transfer facility. Rezoning of the site is not possible due to the safeguarding of the waste transfer facility and aggregates depot. The final allocation will support consolidation of existing industrial uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT09 |
| Nature of Comment: I would be in favour of re-zoning this site to residential to overcome the current issues of noise and particulate (PM10) pollution. | | |
| Response: Rezoning of the site is not possible due to the safeguarding of the waste transfer facility and aggregates depot, however the final allocation will support consolidation of existing industrial uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 |
| Nature of Comment: Reference to these sites should include the provision for the Green Corridor as defined in SPG22. | | |
| Response: Reference to the Green Corridor, as defined by the Development Strategy DPD, will be included in the final allocation. The Acton Green Corridor policy area is defined in the Development Strategy. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

We do not believe there is adequate space for 500 residential units if the bunds, footpath and cycleway with tree and shrub planting are to be accommodated in the Green Corridor, together with a development that reflects the local character and takes into account the high levels of pollution from passing vehicles (Category D, so planning is normally refused). Object to any reduction in width of this 25m Green Corridor and request that the overall width of the corridor is retained. Continuity of bunds, footpath and cycle way is essential. A limit should be stipulated on the height of buildings, so that they will complement existing properties and residential totals amended to accommodate this.

Response:

Objection noted. The Development Sites DPD does not propose reduction in the width of the Green Corridor as defined on the Proposals Map. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Mitigation measures required in relation to noise issues are considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 |

Nature of Comment:

This land was purchased for highway use, and therefore priority should be given to other forms of transport, such as cycle lanes, before totals for housing schemes are agreed. The Green Corridor should therefore cover 25m adjacent to the road frontage and should be excluded from the site area. We request that the existing overall width of the corridor is retained.

Response:

Transport for London has confirmed that the land identified is not required for transport purposes. The Development Sites DPD does not propose reduction in the width of the Green Corridor as defined on the Proposals Map.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 E |

Nature of Comment:

Would seem too small for a development of any kind

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 F |
| Nature of Comment: Would seem too small for a development of any kind | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT10 M |
| Nature of Comment: Would seem too small for a development of any kind | | |
| Response: Comments noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACT11 |
| Nature of Comment: It is proposed that a school could be built on this site. Whilst school places are in desperate need, this would be in an area where there are other schools nearby. It would also be removing a much needed community facility. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | ACTX06 |
| Nature of Comment: No plan or area provided but this is an active Catholic Church visibly in use and it is used by a school. Sister Mary Joy Langdon SIJ, RDA Senior Instructor, ABRS Principal Dip, BHSAl from the church continues to run the Riding for the | | |

Disabled at Wormwood Scrubs. This is a registered charity which celebrated its 20th Anniversary last year at an event attended by Princess Anne who originally opened it.

I object to the inclusion of this site and ask for it to be removed from Ealing's 2026 LDF on the basis that the Catholic Church is a long standing active place of worship and does a lot of good work in the wider community.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: Sources quoted include Park Royal Southern Gateway Position Statement April 2008 and Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework Feb. 2008. These documents were not subject to adequate consultation. | | |
| Response: The Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework was subject to a rigorous preparation process (refer to section 1.3 of the OAPF) including public consultation by the Mayor, and formally adopted by the Mayor of London in January 2011. It does not create policy but clarifies existing policy, and is in conformance with the London Plan. It is used as a material consideration when assessing strategic planning applications. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: I object to the extension of the Southern Gateway Special Opportunity Site (SOS) for any more built development or redevelopment. In particular I object to the Changes to the Proposals map 11 showing loss of Green Corridor to SOS which would destroy the amenity for residents, cyclists and pedestrians; the application of SOS policies across the Western Avenue where the existing local character of the west side is totally unrelated to the present Southern Gateway which is a potential nightmare of closely packed high rise buildings; and the loss of MEL and historic buildings east of Wales Farm Rd. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Development Strategy DPD does not carry forward the designation of Special Opportunity Site. The final allocation will therefore reflect the boundary of the Southern Gateway as set out in the Park Royal OAPF. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01A |
| Nature of Comment: Residential led mixed use is proposed for this site. I object because this is a site surrounded on 3 sides by tube and major access roads to the industrial estate . | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01B |
| Nature of Comment: If there is to be a Station Square instead of the petrol station there is no room for a residential mixed use development | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect the proposals within the Park Royal OAPF, and clarify the approach to the proposed North Acton Station Square. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: This vacant site should be POS not Residential led mixed use. Which were grounds for the appeal to be dismissed. Any buildings would shade Trentham and Poulton Court to the north | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF. The Development Management DPD will contain policies on the provision of amenity space. The appeal was dismissed on several grounds, including inadequate provision of amenity space. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01D |

Nature of Comment:

This is proposed for commercial led mixed use with residential including 17000 sqm of office space. These buildings were redeveloped in the last 20 years with a satisfactory office development. Overshadow of the open cemetery should not be increased by raising the height of these modern buildings. The site is unsuitable for residential use as it lies at the junction of two Park Royal access roads and there is no POS or community facilities.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to residential amenity and the provision of open space.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01D |

Nature of Comment:

The document states that there is no relevant planning history, but planning application P/2008/3774 was submitted for a 2 x 20-26 storey residential/office development which residents objected to. Myself and a number of other residents who objected have to date not received written confirmation from Ealing Planning as to the outcome of this application and as of today's date there is no registered decision on Ealing's Planning Website either.

Response:

Planning application P/2008/3774 is a Screening Opinion application, not an application seeking outline or full planning permission. A Screening Opinion seeks to confirm if an Environmental Impact Assessment is required should an application for planning permission be sought. There are currently no outstanding planning applications on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01E |

Nature of Comment:

The site is unsuitable for residential use as it lies at the junction of two Park Royal access roads adjacent to a third one Portal Way and there is no POS or community facilities.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Development Management

DPD will contain policies relating to residential amenity and the provision of open space.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01F |
| Nature of Comment: The advertisements on this building which is used as a vast advertisement hoarding set an unacceptable level of environmental degradation for Western Ave. | | |
| Response: The control of advertisements is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01G |
| Nature of Comment: This locally listed building was threatened by an application-P/2005/1647 for 228 dwelling units 3792sqm of B1/B2 retail 685sqm and 65sqm community use. But the site was sold. It is adjacent to the Council estate and Victoria Industrial estate at the rear. The architects for this building are Wallis Gilbert & Partners who also designed the Hoover Building. I object to this building being listed for redevelopment as I believe that the architecture of this locally listed building should be preserved and this building should be made a focal point of any the regeneration of the Southern Gateway. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building at 140 Wales Farm Road that covers part of the site, and the Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Siobhan Martin | Siobhan Martin | PAR01H |
| Nature of Comment: Has planning permission for student accommodation for 718 bedrooms- P/2009/4065 | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect recent planning permission on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| George Twyman | Dormers Well Residents Association | SOU17 |
| Nature of Comment: Fly tipped area adjacent to Canal side Park. Legal action should be taken by the Council. Propose use for sports/leisure. | | |
| Response: The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. The small triangle to the west of Glade Lane is allocated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| George Twyman | Dormers Well Residents Association | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Over the years 3NO chemical factories were on this site as well as the Gas Works and during WWII aircraft fuel was stored on the area adjacent to the railway. The whole land is contaminated. Complete decontamination is necessary before anything is done. | | |
| Response: Planning permission P/2008/3891, granted 2010, includes complete decontamination of the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) | St Bernard's Hospital - West London Mental Health Trust | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Propose St Bernard's Hospital, Southall for inclusion in the Development Sites DPD. The West London Mental Health Trust is undertaking a comprehensive review of its estate at St Bernard's Hospital with a view to providing improved and new mental health accommodation. These essential improvements can only be funded through a phased approach to the release of redundant land and buildings for development and disposal. Without releasing this identified land for disposal the ability of the Trust to deliver and sustain an improved mental health service for the Borough and the wider West London community may be compromised. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. St Bernard's Hospital was included (without a site boundary) in the Initial Proposals as HANX05. The | | |

site will be included in the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) | St Bernard's Hospital - West London Mental Health Trust | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: The plan at Annex 1 of the submission identifies the broad extent of land available for housing development and projected delivery over the short term (2010-2015; approximately 210 units), medium term (2015-2025; approximately 160 units) and long term (2025 onwards; approximately 150 units). Given the availability of this site and its significant development potential, particularly taking account of its location within the Uxbridge Road/Crossrail growth corridor, the land at St Bernard's should be identified as capable of delivering a significant quantum of new housing in the Development Sites DPD. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. St Bernard's Hospital was included (without a site boundary) in the Initial Proposals as HANX05. The site will be included in the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| CGMS Consulting | Twyford Abbey Properties | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Proposed inclusion of Twyford Abbey, Ealing for residential development. Twyford Abbey is a listed building, currently vacant. The proposed development site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and a Site of Local Nature Conservation Interest. Seeking residential conversion of the Abbey, restoration of separately listed walled garden and grounds of Abbey and additional residential developed required to make scheme viable. The current feasibility appraisal shows that approximately 200 units would need to be provided for the conversion and enabling development. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD. The Green Space Strategy does not recommend the removal of the existing MOL and SINC designations, and these designations preclude the possibility of enabling development. Conversion of the Abbey to residential use is most appropriately dealt with through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | General |
| Nature of Comment: The options described are premature since they should follow on from the adoption of the Development Strategy. CERA does not accept a good number of the Strategy proposals. Consequently the Development Sites Document is unsound. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The borough's Development Strategy was found sound in January 2012, and the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will be subject to consultation following adoption of the Development Strategy. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: None of the four options presented furthers the delivery of an improved public transport interchange for the town centre. On the contrary, incorporation of the car park to the south of Haven Green into any of the schemes would remove the most viable location for bus stops and lay-over provision. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The possibility of a bus station on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Refers to the need to protect views to the Church of Christ the Saviour spire, when views to entire elevations are intrinsic to its Grade II designation. | | |
| Response: | | |

The final allocation will reflect the listed status of the adjacent building.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: All four options assume complete demolition of all buildings south of the railway. There is no justification given for this approach nor examination of more sustainable options involving the retention/restoration of at least some buildings/facades of merit. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Comprehensive redevelopment does not preclude the retention/restoration of buildings within the site as a whole. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: The statement in Option A2 that 'building heights are generally around 6-8 stories in keeping with existing Ealing' is a wholly inaccurate reflection of both the wider context and the immediate Haven Green and Conservation Area setting. The height of Haven Green Court and its well set-back footprint which defines the Green to the north should provide a blueprint for height and setting of development south of the railway. No evidence is provided to demonstrate that development over the railway is actively or in practice sought by Network Rail. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide further detail on built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation to accommodate proposals which may or may not propose development over the railway. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: No evidence is given to suggest suppressed demand for access to the site from Haven Green, nor are there any natural 'desire lines' across the Green, | | |
| Response: The evidence base for the design principles included within the options is the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre Spatial Development Framework (2008, updated September 2010). This document identifies desire lines across Haven Green. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: The centre has shown that with improved marketing and reconfiguration of units, its retail occupancy and footfall have risen. Remaining mostly smaller units could be offered to a selection of independent shops on favourable terms to maximise occupancy and increase the diversity of the retail offer. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, with a focus on reconfiguration of units to provide improved integration with the town centre. The terms offered to leaseholders are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: Some increase in community and/or leisure functions should be desirable. The integrity of form and function inherent to the design should preclude residential development. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered acceptable in principle within a town | | |

centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: The redevelopment of the station is only sketchily presented. It is highly questionable whether residential units should or could be satisfactorily accommodated. Office, retail plus leisure/community/hotel use may be optimum. Building heights and massing should be limited in order to protect Conservation Area setting and existing residential amenity, including Ealing Village. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered appropriate within the town centre. Guidance on building heights and massing will be provided in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Of the three options presented for the Interchange, 1A would be both beneficial and benign. Options 3C and 4 are resisted since either would cause unacceptable harm both the Haven Green and also its wider Conservation Area setting. CERAs strong preference is for 1A to be combined with the BBC car park element of 3C. This would significantly expand the scope of the interchange whilst protecting, indeed enhancing, the Green. | | |
| Response: The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station, in line with Option 1A. The possibility of a bus station on the Arcadia site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL08 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: There seems no objective reason why office floor space should not form part of the options. Hotel use is listed as an option (permission previously granted) but seems to have been supplemented by 200 residential units which suggests highly unsatisfactory density and massing on a site much constrained and poorly laid out for this purpose.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL09 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The site is almost entirely made up of office and warehouse buildings. The 110 residential units proposed would mark another significant departure from the 'Office Quarter' characterisation and also dominate established residential streets to the north and west.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace within the town centre, and Policy 2.5(b) defines the character of Uxbridge Road between Ealing Broadway and West Ealing as having high quality offices and ancillary functions, which does not preclude introduction of other uses. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review that a critical mass of floorspace office floorspace be retained. The ELR does not recommend against introduction of complementary uses.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association | EAL14 |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| | (CERA) | |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The Westel House site is presently being treated separately, with the Council deviating entirely from the options described here, i.e. entertaining total demolition, removal of office function, replacement with high rise residential plus hotel. The documented option is more appropriate, subject to restraints on height and massing to protect residential amenity and views into/from adjacent Conservation Areas. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will include revised site boundaries to reflect recent permissions. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL17 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The options described and not really options as all since they only reflect a post-hoc situation of permissions granted and piecemeal developments underway. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The final allocation will reflect recent permissions and set out a comprehensive vision for the site as a whole. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| Julian Edmonds | Central Ealing Residents Association (CERA) | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| A poor location for residential and quantum should be constrained by the need to avoid dominating the cohesive Edwardian character of Craven Avenue (proposed for inclusion in Conservation Area) and low traffic capacity. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and include guidance on layout, built form | | |

and design to a level appropriate within a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN |
| Nature of Comment: All lack the infrastructure to support the development regarding road congestion, community services, schools, safe routes for pedestrians or cycles. Too many houses to be packed into area - high density development. No regard for good town planning, greening and softening. No impact assessment of effect of increased population in areas. Loss of character of area. Need lower density development. Consider some sites for community facilities. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Provision of infrastructure is considered in the borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the Development Management DPD will include policies related to the assessment of planning applications. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN01 |
| Nature of Comment: Infrastructure lack - no consideration of biodiversity or climate change implications. Problem of movement of transport changing the nature of the whole area. | | |
| Response: The site is under construction and will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

121 units is over development. Transport problems. Schools already over subscribed. No facilities for addressing loss of biodiversity with the developments of the site.

Response:

Objection noted. The site is under construction, with scheduled completion in 2012/13, and will be removed from future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN03 |

Nature of Comment:

Too many houses in space. Loss of character of area. Safety of movement of traffic and people.

Response:

The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:

Loss of character. Not in line with economic projections.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN05 |

Nature of Comment:

This has not been carefully considered.

Response:

Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will detailed guidance on those sites considered to contribute to achieving the objectives of the Development Strategy.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|----------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HAN |
| Nature of Comment: Hanwell needs a proper centre with opportunities for boutique shops and open space. The green character of Hanwell needs to be addressed and included in all site developments. Infrastructure has to be met and this passed on sound research of needs in the future. | | |
| Response: | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|----------------|
| B L Pankhurst | Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Residents Association | HANX |
| Nature of Comment: The extra sites need to be excluded from plan as they are all ill-considered. No regard for overall plan. No regard for improvements of ambience or heritage. Over-development. No infrastructure developments. Road congestion disregarded. Public transport ignored. No safe cycling or waling. No impact assessment of increase in population. No regard for biodiversity, sustainability or climate change. Research based on local needs of improvements of quality of life. Hanwell town centre areas with greens and trees. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will include detailed guidance on those sites considered to contribute to achieving the objectives of the Development Strategy. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Rosco White | SHLAP (Stop Horn lane Pollution) | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Request that the entire Horn Lane Industrial Estate/Network Rail Yards and Land (west of Horn Lane, W3 9EH and W3 0BP) be added to the Development Sites DPD. This part of Horn Lane is proven to be one of the most highly polluted areas of London and most local residents want the removal of the polluters to make way for non-polluting residential dwellings, shops and offices, schools, doctors surgeries, dentists and green open space. This 'mini' industrial estate is in the wrong place now and the lands needs development befitting an area adjacent to the last Crossrail station before Paddington. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Suggestion noted. The final allocation will be enlarged to include ACT07, ACT08, ACT09 and land between to support consolidation of existing industrial uses while responding to the opportunities afforded by Crossrail. The waste transfer facility and aggregates depot are safeguarded essential services, appropriately located adjacent to the railway line, and removal of these facilities is not considered appropriate. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CGMS Consulting | Metropolitan Police Authority/Service | EAL22 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| This site includes allocation for a police station at 67-69 Uxbridge Road W5 5SJ. However the MPA/S Estate requests that the policing facilities be removed from the redevelopment proposals at this location on the basis that it will be provided elsewhere in the locality. Site is 0.196ha and will be available within 5 years. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will remove the requirement to reprovide the policing facility as requested. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CGMS Consulting | Metropolitan Police Authority/Service | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The MPA/S no longer require a police station facility at 190 Norwood Road UB2 4JT. The MPA/S therefore request that the site is brought forward within the document for full redevelopment. Site is 0.142ha, will be available in 5-10 years and | | |

suggested for residential and B1 (office/research and development/light industrial) use.

Response:

Suggestion noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as it does not contribute to the purpose of the Development Sites DPD and any change of use is most appropriately established through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CGMS Consulting | Metropolitan Police Authority/Service | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Motor Repair Depot, Rodwell Road UB5 5QP (2.05ha). Currently accommodates the MPA/S motor repair depot. Site to be redeveloped to provide a modern B use and retained as police facility.

Response:

Suggestion noted, The principle of a B use is already established on the site, therefore it not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as it does not contribute to the purpose of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CGMS Consulting | Metropolitan Police Authority/Service | SOU06 |

Nature of Comment:

MPA/S currently has a neighbourhood policing facility within the Arches Business Centre. The site is currently designated for a mix of retail, office and residential use. Therefore recommend that development options for the Arches Business Centre includes appropriate provision for continued policing facilities.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the requirement to maintain provision of policing facilities at this location.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| John Rowan & Partners | A2 Dominion | HANX03 |

Nature of Comment:

Site identified as HANX03 actually covers two sites in separate ownership. The western parcel, Tennyson House, is in the ownership of A2Dominion and a regeneration scheme to return this vacant two storey office building to housing is currently being progressed. There is no guarantee that the Tennyson House site will come forward at the same time or as

a single development opportunity with the eastern parcel of land under different ownership. The designation should identify residential development as acceptable in principle on both sites individually or through comprehensive regeneration.

Response:

It is not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of residential development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| John Rowan & Partners | A2 Dominion | HANX03 |

Nature of Comment:

The allocation indicates that the two land parcels could provide 'residential with ecological buffer for adjacent Green Corridor and provision of amenity space on site and with potential for amenity space to site further east on Tennyson Road'. Such an approach represents a significant underutilisation of scarce urban land and the placing of potentially onerous constraints on the delivery of viable housing schemes. The layout and design considerations for the site should reflect only planning considerations relevant to the development of the two land parcels either independently or jointly. Viability should not be compromised by introducing additional policy constraints on the site.

Response:

It is not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of residential development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| John Rowan & Partners | A2 Dominion | HANX03 |

Nature of Comment:

Schematic layout demonstrates how 30 homes can be provided on the eastern parcel of land, therefore the quantum of 10 residential units across the two land parcels proposed in the allocation represents an inadequate response to the potential of the site and conflicts with policy to optimise the used of previously developed land. Such an approach potentially jeopardises the delivery of a viable housing scheme on the sites. The schematic layout in combination with the emerging proposals for Tennyson House demonstrates the potential to deliver at least 40 new homes across the two land parcels, and the allocation should be amended to reflect this.

Response:

It is not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of residential development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| DP9 (Ralph Lewis) | Genesis Housing Group | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Recommend allocation of 81,83,85 Madeley Road & 58,60,62 Hanger Lane W5 4LP to provide 50 residential units (site area 0.55ha). Consists of six residential properties containing 35 flats, all vacant and in a poor state of repair. Available immediately. Application for 64 flats withdrawn in 2009; currently in pre-application discussions.

Response:

This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the current use of the site is residential, therefore the principle of residential use is established allowing the site to be brought forward through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |

Nature of Comment:

The following comments represent the views of officers in TfL Corporate Finance Property Development in its capacity as a significant landowner only and do not form part of the TfL corporate response. CFPD is responsible for TfL's Property Development Strategy which aims to maximise the use and value of existing and future property assets.

Response:

Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |

Nature of Comment:

Overall, CFPD welcome and support the Initial Proposals, in particular the inclusion of the 13 TfL owned sites along the

A40 Corridor. TfL does not have the necessary funds to carry out landscaping improvements and any 'greening' improvements can only be delivered as part of a scheme or funded by the development proposals brought forward. Therefore CFPD welcomes the promotion of these sites for development and thus assist in delivery of the green corridor objectives.

Response:
Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |

Nature of Comment:
Development on these sites will present a number of benefits to the residents in the area, including reduction in noise levels experienced by adjoining residents due to buffer provided by development; greening improvements to provide a high quality landscaped environment and improved amenity value for existing properties; and delivery of new homes to contribute to the borough's housing targets.

Response:
Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |

Nature of Comment:
Reference to SPG22 A40 Acton Green Corridor should be removed as this will eventually be superseded by the emerging LDF documents.

Response:
Amendment noted. Final allocation will include reference to the Green Corridor as defined in the Development Strategy DPD,

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate | ACT10 |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| | Finance Property Development | |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| CFPD advise that any landscaping improvements will be dependent on the viability of any scheme brought forward, and therefore suggest inclusion of test to reiterate the importance of the need to balance the provision of the green corridor with the delivery of a sustainable and viable mixed use development scheme. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify the requirements for the provision of a landscaped buffer and contribution to the Green Corridor. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The total area of the 13 sites in 4.8ha | | |
| Response: | | |
| Amendment noted. Final allocation will reflect correct site area. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Site area is 4.79ha, aspiration for mixed use scheme. DPD needs to consider and reflect that any landscaping improvements will be dependent on the viability of any scheme brought forward. Suggested text is: 'Should include provision for the identified Green Corridor (understanding the balance between delivering a viable development and the green corridor/landscaping zone objectives) and mitigate environment impacts such as noise...' | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify the requirements for the provision of a landscaped buffer and contribution to the Green Corridor. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 A |
| Nature of Comment: 0.324ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. Should also make reference to appeal decision (ref 05/1177791) and 2007 planning application (P/2007/3456). | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 B |
| Nature of Comment: 0.294ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. Should also make reference to appeal decision (ref 05/1177791) and 2007 planning application (P/2007/3456). | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 C |
| Nature of Comment: 0.227ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 D |
| Nature of Comment: 0.89ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. This site falls within the Park Royal Southern Gateway boundary, so a mix of residential and commercial would be appropriate. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 E |
| Nature of Comment: 0.07ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: This site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD as it is considered too small to represent a substantial development opportunity. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 F |
| Nature of Comment: 0.08ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: This site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD as it is considered too small to represent a substantial development opportunity. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 G |
| Nature of Comment: 0.347ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development other than commercial is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 H |
| Nature of Comment: 0.133ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development other than commercial is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 I |
| Nature of Comment: 0.193ha, aspiration for a mixed use scheme including residential and commercial. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 J |
| Nature of Comment: 0.704ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 K |
| Nature of Comment: 0.633ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 L |
| Nature of Comment: 0.779ha, aspiration for a residential-led mixed use scheme. A landscaping zone will form part of any proposal brought forward. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. Development other than residential is unlikely to be supported on this site due to the nature of surrounding uses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Ruth Cunningham | Transport for London Corporate Finance Property Development | ACT10 M |
| Nature of Comment: 0.11ha, aspiration for enhancement of the landscaping zone. | | |
| Response: This site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD as it is not proposed for built development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| London Planning Practice (Alex Graham) | Victoria Square Property Co Ltd | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Propose inclusion of new site at 1-10 (inclusive) Green Man Gardens and 30-32 Green Man Lane, with a minimum potential of 70 residential units, within a density range of 500-700 hr/ha representing the mid/upper range of LPDM for an urban location of PTAL4. Site area is 0.38ha, with 26 two-bed flats within 13 two-storey semi-detached houses providing a total of 78 habitable rooms at 185hr/ha. Ealing Magistrates Court to the south of the site is a locally listed building. Proposed layout suggests buildings of 3 to 6 storeys. Delivery within 2 years. Feasibility Study submitted with proposals. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the current use of the site is residential, therefore the principle of residential use is established allowing the site to be brought forward through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Susan New | Susan New | EAL33 |
| Nature of Comment: Correct spelling is King Fahad Academy. The facility is used on the weekend and is a Grade II listed building. Primary school option is irrelevant since the expansion of numerous primary schools in the area. Suggests option of a small retirement village for the active elderly given that there are extensive grounds and the design of the building would be sympathetic to the creation of flats. Ealing does not contain such a facility. It has a high PTAL score and given the | | |

demographic of the residents car ownership would be low. It would make an attractive alternative to many people who currently live in under occupied homes in Ealing.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process. The suggestion of a retirement village would be acceptable in principle within a residential area.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Susan New | Susan New | EAL10 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Unclear exactly where the 70 residential units are going to be, assume proposed to put them on the car park. Strongly object as this will put more strain on the small Dean Gardens Park, already serving as amenity space for 9-13 Broadway, Lido Flats, Kirchen Road, Luminosity, Sinclair House and numerous others. 19-35 Broadway is locally listed. Development would spoil the setting of the Salvation Army Hall (this building, built in 1909, should be locally listed). The feeling of open space should be retained in this area.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The Salvation Army Hall is listed as a being of facade value in Schedule 10.11 of the UDP. The part of the site which includes listed buildings and buildings of heritage value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. Any site allocation will take into account the listed status of buildings close to the site as well as the fact that it is located in an area of open space deficiency.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Susan New | Susan New | EAL17 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Area should be extended to include 14-16 Bond Street. YMCA building is mentioned but not included within the site, assume that some of the potential residential units are on that site. Shouldn't have hotel one is already being built on Bond Street. Suggest 14-16 Bond Street as ideal place for an Arts Centre. It is preferable to the Town Hall as people can enter at street level, and alterations would be minimal. The centre could be a public/private partnership and could include a ground floor cafe and rooftop bar. Attached photos from auction showing suitability for Arts Centre.</p> | | |

Response:

Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will include revised site boundaries to include the YMCA building and remove 26-42 Bond Street to reflect the completed hotel development at this address. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The use of 14-16 Bond Street as an Arts Centre is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however this use is considered appropriate within a town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Cluttons LLP | The Methodist Church | SOU15 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Object to the proposals set out in SOU15. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The representation is unclear as to the nature of the objection. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Cluttons LLP | The Methodist Church | SOU15 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| While the Methodist Church is keen to remain in the area, the existing Kings Hall building (locally listed) is in a very poor state of repair and is too large for the congregation that uses it. The costs required to repair and refurbish the Hall to allow it to continue to be occupied for faith purposes are in excess of £1 million, and are completely unaffordable given the small congregation. While the preference is to remain on the existing site in a redeveloped building, would not object to a location within the wider SOU15 allocated site provided any new building met their requirements. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will reflect the the opportunity for the Church to relocate within the wider site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Cluttons LLP | The Methodist Church | SOU15 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Provided that evidence were to be provided to fully justify the demolition of the majority of the existing Methodist Church building, i.e. the façade facing South Road would be retained, would suggest that new development could be built behind | | |

the retained facade to a similar bulk as existing.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the status of the local listing and the requirements this places on redevelopment proposals. Proposals for demolition of a locally listed buildings can only be considered through the planning application process..

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Cluttons LLP | The Methodist Church | SOU15 |
| Nature of Comment: The indicative capacity for the wider site at 21 units is substantially below that which is capable of being provided across all the site within the proposed SOU15 allocation. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: Over-development & access problems. Don't need to increase office space | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HAN04 |
| Nature of Comment: Needs careful development as front and height must be maintained to be in keeping with Victorian nature of street. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a | | |

DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HAN05 |
| Nature of Comment: We have 2 thriving businesses there - let them be and the cottages are part of our heritage. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HANX01 |
| Nature of Comment: Wickes serves the needs of the community. Nissan brings business into Hanwell - we need them so do not develop the site. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HANX02 |
| Nature of Comment: Serves the needs of the community and brings business into Hanwell. Do not develop the site. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HAN |
| Nature of Comment: If all these sites (HAN03, HAN04, HAN05, HANX01) were made residential and retail as proposed, we would have too many people in Hanwell and business would be driven out. We need balance. We need to keep our garages for car maintenance and all the businesses that serve the community. What is being proposed is gross overdevelopment. Lower | | |

density development and more green space is the character of Hanwell. Absolutely do not need so much office space.

Response:

Objection noted. Hanwell is designated as a district centre by the London Plan 2011, providing convenience goods and services for a local catchment, with moderate levels of demand for retail, leisure and office floorspace, and the physical and public transport capacity to accommodate this growth. The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site to achieve balanced development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HANX03 |
| Nature of Comment: Do not build on it - make it into a usable green space with play space for children. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of built development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HANX04 |
| Nature of Comment: Leave it as small shops. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | HANX05 |
| Nature of Comment: This site was developed recently so not sure what is meant here. Surely not getting rid of the mental hospital? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the | | |

principle of residential development on the site has been established through recent planning permissions.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | General |
| Nature of Comment: There is bad road congestion already with a large increase in households, it will be unbearable. Where are the extra spaces in schools, in doctors surgeries. We cannot build piecemeal without an overall plan and a serious consideration of infrastructure and services to the local community. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan considers the infrastructure requirements associated with the projected growth in the borough's population. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Sacks | Janet Sacks | General |
| Nature of Comment: Renovate rather than pull down and build something out of character. Please think of green space. Please abandon overdevelopment. We all need quality of life, and this is provided by space, infrastructure, lack of crowding, good design, low density of building and no road congestion. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site. Final allocations will include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, and the Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to residential amenity. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| D. Pratt | D. Pratt | HAN |
| Nature of Comment: All that has been proposed for the sites in Hanwell are residential plus a bit more office space. What will happen to local | | |

services and businesses such as garages, Wickes, etc. We need local services and businesses, we do not need more residential space at the density proposed.

Response:

Objection noted. Hanwell is designated as a district centre by the London Plan 2011, providing convenience goods and services for a local catchment, with moderate levels of demand for retail, leisure and office floorspace, and the physical and public transport capacity to accommodate this growth. The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site to achieve balanced development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|
| Anthony Lewis | Ealing Cricket Ground Conservation Area Panel | General |

Nature of Comment:

The details of each development site should include information about whether or not some or all of the site is within a Conservation Area, and any statutorily or locally listed buildings.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The final allocation will include information on the heritage environment both within and adjacent to the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Option A2 is closest to an acceptable option because it has no buildings taller than 9 storeys, more open space and is the most in keeping with the existing town centre.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

See no reason why the existing Arcadia Centre should be demolished. Has only been there 20 years and the design fits with Edwardian Ealing. If there are shortcomings to the building for retail purposes please retain the exterior and make internal modifications. To demolish everything is environmentally unsound, many buildings are attractive. Those that are good can be kept.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Comprehensive redevelopment does not preclude the retention/restoration of buildings within the site as a whole.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Please retain the car park on this building | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the parking requirement on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: In any spare space would like cultural, indoor sport, or other community use included. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered acceptable in principle within a town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: The site is very near the station and the incorporation of a bus station would be good. This would remove the clutter of | | |

stationary buses from Haven Green.

Response:

The possibility of a bus station on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Oppose the densification of Ealing Broadway and would like a low-rise plan with the existing retail capacity retained and cultural/community/indoor sport/bus station/open space for the rest of the space with a modest amount of residential and/or office space is appropriate.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered acceptable in principle within a town centre. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

The Shopping Centre is a locally listed building. Do not support demolition or interfering with the architecture, like as it.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

Not an appropriate place for housing, no need to use Ealing Broadway Centre for housing. No explanation of how 150 residential units are to be put in the Centre without spoiling the existing building.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and reflect the locally listed status of the building.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

Retain existing retail and take initiatives to see all the shops filled. Perhaps if rents were lower the shopkeepers would be able to come. Bring back the smaller shops that used to be there, now boarded up.

Response:

The Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies potential for provision of up to 50,000 square metres gross of retail floorspace to 2026, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). The terms offered to leaseholders are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. London Plan 2011 Policy 4.9 allows local authorities to seek the provision of small shop units within major retail developments.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

There is no explanation of how 2500 sqm of new office space are to be put into the centre. Please just keep the existing office space. Do not want the car park removed. There is no need for extras offices as much office space is already empty in Ealing Broadway.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for provision of up to 90,000 square metres net office space to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL10 |

Nature of Comment:

There is no explanation of what is proposed here. The parade of shops/bank with Leeland Mansion flats above, contains the most attractive set of shop frontages in West Ealing. It is complete architecturally, with matching features. It should be locally listed.

The Salvation Army Hall is another attractive building that should be locally listed and not demolished.

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years, and not to present detailed proposals. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site and take into account the listed status of buildings close to the site. The mentioned parade is locally listed as per schedule 10.10 of the UDP and the Salvation Army Hall is considered to have facade value in Schedule 10.11 of the UDP. The part of the site which includes listed buildings and buildings of heritage value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL10 |

Nature of Comment:

There are other small and useful shops and the Post Office in Leeland Road. Some facades are attractive too. Need property that is affordable for local shopkeepers, why should they be pushed out?

Response:

The part of the site which includes frontage on Leeland road will be removed from the next iteration of the sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL10 |

Nature of Comment:

Guess the car park is the suggested location for 70 flats. The car park is of huge value, do not want it built over. This will be even more important when all the car parks north of Uxbridge Road are built on (as is planned). Where can people park in West Ealing is this car park is also removed. There is a Genesis development of 25 housing units almost complete. This is enough. There is no place for 70 more flats.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The figure for residential units presented in Initial Proposals arose from the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and looks at potential capacity for the site if it were redeveloped in entirety.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: Do not like the huge and ugly building near Waitrose and the ugly Sinclair House by the beautiful Drayton Court Hotel. Sinclair House seem partly empty. This seems to be another proposal to build a similar and probably ugly tall block of 120 flats. More high-rise residential units are unacceptable. | | |
| Response: It will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: The existing shops are fine. Resent small businessmen being pushed out of business. New shop buildings would probably price them out if they wanted to return. Please leave them alone. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. Rental rates and lease arrangements are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. When assessing development proposals, the Council will seek to enable the provision of smaller and affordable retail units in larger retail developments as per policy 4.9 of the London Plan 2011. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL11 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: There is an oversupply of office space in Ealing now. A lot is empty. |
| Response: Objection noted. Policy 2.5(a) of the Development Strategy identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010). |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: There is a functioning repair garage and it is providing a service to residents. Disagree that the garage be removed. Removing garages and workshops seems a feature of Ealing policy. Why? We need our services. What should these workers and the services they provide be pushed out? | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Where are the Perceval House and Town Hall staff with essential car use to park if you remove this car park? Car park is used by residents in evenings and weekends. Few will attend Town Hall evening meetings or events if you take away the only free car park. This is madness! It is not necessary to cram more and more housing into central Ealing. The Car Park is essential and important. Don't replace it with housing. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL26 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

These properties are relatively new, of two storeys and have flats to the rear. It is hard to see what is wrong with them. There is no space behind to build on. Why knock down perfectly good buildings? ECS advise that if, to produce 40 unit increase, would require the height to be raised taking light from the courtyard development for old people behind (Hugh Clark House). This would be quite wrong.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, and reflect the potential for development proposals to undertake refurbishment and/or redevelopment.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL28 |

Nature of Comment:

There is no proper explanation of what is proposed here but concerned at any threat to Sainsbury Supermarket and car park. Shop facades facing Uxbridge Rd particularly no. 85 to 97 are in Edwardian and attractive brickwork and should not be demolished. No 103 has an interesting 30s façade that matches the building on the other side of the St James' Avenue. All should be preserved.

Response:

Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years, not to provide detailed proposals for the site. The final allocation will reflect the facade value of the mentioned buildings remove them from the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL29 |

Nature of Comment:

The façade of no 105 is an interesting 30s style, matches no 103 in EAL 28 and should be preserved. Other buildings (at least up to 117) are also of interesting brickwork and should be preserved. Could support residential subject to preservation of facades.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The heritage value of the existing facades will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: Why should Quick Fix be targeted for removal? This provides a service. What has the Council got against services to do with vehicles? We need these services. Grosvenor Surgery is an attractive Edwardian building, should be locally listed and not demolished. Could support residential subject to stated concerns being addressed. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. The heritage status of Grosvenor Surgery will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: There are sufficient shops in West Ealing. Many are closed. There needs to be a strategy to support traders in West Ealing so the shops can be filled. | | |
| Response: Policy 2.5(a) of the Development Strategy identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in the town centre to 2026, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). The need for the support of businesses is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: There are some useful small shops here and some distinctive buildings - why should they be demolished? There is a lot of empty retail space in West Ealing, so don't see more is needed. Could support residential with reservations. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will consider the locally listed status of 130 and 132 the Broadway. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final | | |

allocation. Policy 2.5(a) of the Development Strategy identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in the town centre to 2026, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Query why allocations states no relevant planning history when a new and large mosque with community facilities is to be built in this rear space. | | |
| Response: No planning application has ben submitted to the Council for the building of a new mosque. The final allocation will support existing uses on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: BHS should not be outlined for demolition, do not want to lose it as the only large store in West Ealing. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. BHS will be removed from the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Not happy that once again small shops seem destined for removal. These businesses are useful and possibility the premises valued for their low rental costs. Small shops are also an important part of the ethnic diversity of West Ealing, and represent an intermediate between market stalls and commercial retail. They are a useful part of the retail mix. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. Rental rates and lease arrangements are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. When assessing development proposals, the Council will seek to enable the provision of smaller and affordable retail units in larger retail developments as per policy 4.9 of the London Plan 2011. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Can there really be room for 78 units here? Looks like over development | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The figure of 78 units represents the potential residential gain for this site as highlighted by the Ealing Metropolitan Centre Spatial Framework, however all development proposals must go through the planning application process. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Can there really be room for offices here? There is a lot of empty office space in Ealing and don't see that more is needed. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Policy 2.5(a) of the Development Strategy identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EALX01 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no explanation for what is proposed here except that 149 residential units are suggested. Without appropriate infrastructure we cannot have more and more housing. The Job Centre is here and this is an important building. Important local business suppliers are here (e.g. Priority Plumbing). Where are the 149 housing units to be placed and what is to be removed? | | |
| Response: | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EALX02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| There is no explanation for what is proposed here except that 182 residential units are suggested. Without appropriate infrastructure we cannot have more and more housing. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years, not to make detailed proposals for the site. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The role of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is to assess the levels of infrastructure needed in relation to development in the borough in order to facilitate the alignment of the delivery strategies of statutory providers with the Development Strategy. The provision of infrastructure is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix." | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Very concerned about this proposal. There is no clue as to what is planned but Wickes & Wickes car park are Co-Op are important to residents, and object very strongly if the proposals mean that any of these facilities are lost. Question why only 59 residential units are proposed for such a large site. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The potential net residential units was determined in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, based on the midpoint capacity of the appropriate density range from the London Plan for a suburban setting, if the entire site was developed for residential. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EALX06 |

Nature of Comment:

Object to services such as a garage being removed. We have no explanation as to what is proposed except that 14 residential units are proposed. It is deeply worrying that once again vehicle repair appears to be under threat. What has Ealing Council got against vehicle services? Object very strongly if the proposals mean we lose another industrial service. Residents need their services. We cannot have only housing units in Ealing.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

Object to the proposed over development of West Ealing centre due to the lack of evidence for the need to provide so much new housing in Ealing, the lack of a plan for appropriate infrastructure for so much housing, and the lack of community involvement in selecting the site for demolition and/or development.

Response:

Objection noted. Ealing is designated as a Metropolitan Centre by the London Plan 2011, serving a wide catchment and with demand for retail, leisure and office floorspace, and the physical and public transport capacity to accommodate this growth. The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site to achieve balanced development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Judy Breen | Kingsdown Residents Association | General |

Nature of Comment:

Determining the future of these sites is premature. The Development Strategy should be finalised first. Lower housing targets are needed.

Response:

The Development Strategy will be adopted prior to the consultation on the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Ashley Para | Ashley Para | HAN05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Site backs directly onto property in George Street so height of proposed buildings and exact use of the site is of major concern. Object to residential units being built at the rear of property. Do not wish the rear of property to be overlooked. Supports retail use as long as proposed buildings are not taller than the existing garage that backs onto George Street, and the privacy and security to the rear of George Street properties is not compromised. Object to office buildings being built directly backing on to and overlooking the rear of George Street. Suggests resident parking for George Street/Wilmot Place residents could be put in place.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide further detail on built form and design details to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including amenity of neighbouring properties. Development Strategy Policy 1.2(b) sets out a sequential approach to new office development within the borough, and Hanwell Town Centre is not identified as an area suitable for an overall net increase in office floorspace over the plan period therefore the site will not be identified to deliver a specific quantum of office development. The provision of parking for nearby residents is outside the scope of the DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | EAL04 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The proposed development proposals for Dickens Yard reflect the extant planning permission which St George has started implementing.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the principle of development on the site has been established through recent planning permission.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | EAL05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment:</p> | | |

Support is given for Option C which has residential use proposals for 577 units and 19,440 m2 of retail floor space as this will provide the greatest contribution to the regeneration of the town centre. Preference should be for nil office floor space.

Response:

Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: Proposed allocation supported as this is a large area of currently designated employment land which is significantly underused. Proximity to town centre and Crossrail provides substantial opportunity for a major redevelopment scheme, mixed use development could provide significantly more jobs than the current use. | | |
| Response: Support noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: Opportunity for relatively high density due to proximity to railway. Level of residential units on site represents a clear acknowledgement of the potential scale of delivery which is an appropriate response for an underused site in this location. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: In addition to the uses mentioned in the draft DPD, there is potential for a modest amount of retail floorspace to provide a local shopping facility within the site. This would not undermine the vitality and viability of the main Southall centre. There is also an opportunity to consider uses such as hotel and banqueting suites on site. | | |

Response:
Suggestion noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | SOU04 |

Nature of Comment:
Support the recognition that potential net office floor space needs further consideration as potential demand is not clear. However it is not expected that this will be a major use on site.

Response:
Support noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate nature and scale of employment uses on site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Barton Willmore (Les West) | St George | SOU04 |

Nature of Comment:
Support the recognition that the quantum of floor space for industrial use needs further consideration. However given the site history and the scope of the new proposals for the site any industrial use should be limited and in any event restricted to B1.

Response:
Support noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate nature and scale of employment uses on site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |

Nature of Comment:
The allocation does not offer enough flexibility in of land use and residential density issues in particular. However the overall principle of redeveloping the site is supported, as it the potential mix of retail, residential and leisure uses, including the provision of a food store. As a main town centre use, it is clear that there may be some potential for office (B1) floorspace, and teh potential inclusion of commercial space should be included within its allocation.

Response:
Support noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals

reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The Development Strategy does not identify Acton Town Centre as a location for speculative office development, however office development within the town centre to meet local needs would be considered appropriate.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Given the town centre location of the site and its likely residential density, a tall building could be accommodated on the site. It is acknowledged that the height of any building will have to be carefully considered in light of its impact on surrounding properties, the neighbouring churchyard and the neighbouring Acton Town Centre CA in particular. A sentence should be added that development could include a well designed tall building.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The final allocation will reflect the requirement preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, and provide guidance on height and massing, including if the site is considered an appropriate location for a tall building.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Access into the site for service vehicles and cars should remain from Churchfield Road. Car parking provision should reflect any increase in retail floor space provision as well as for the potential residential and commercial elements, in line with the Council's car parking standard. Replacement town centre car parking should also be provided.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Car parking levels on the site will be governed by London Plan 2011 standards as this document supersedes the Council's car parking standards.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Rogers) | | |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| View that the PTAL rating of the site is 4/5 (based on pg. 76 of the Development Strategy). Therefore given the area of the site and its location within Acton Town Centre (District Centre), in accordance with the LPDM up to 260 units per hectare (up to 700 hr/h) could be provided on the site. Based on the site area of 1.1ha, the potential net residential units should be amended to 286. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The WLRNA (update 2010) and Policy 2.2 of the Development Strategy make it clear that there is scope for between 10-12,000 sqm gross of additional retail floor space within the town centre. Given the existing level of retail floor space within the shopping centre of approximately 5,500 sqm it is likely that the redevelopment of the site will be able to accommodate a significant amount of additional floor space. The wording of the document is unclear as to whether the 6,300 sqm net figure quoted is for additional floor space, or whether it is for the overall level of floor space provision. If this figure relates to the letters, it is proposed to increase this figure to 11,800 sqm gross of additional floor space. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify potential for additional retail provision on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Maddox & Associates Ltd (Ben Rogers) | Express Park Investments Ltd | ACT02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| In order to encourage greater land use flexibility, the redevelopment of the site has the potential to include up to 2,000 sqm gross of commercial B1 office floor space. | | |
| Response: | | |

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. However Development Strategy Policy 1.2(b) sets out a sequential approach to new office development within the borough, and Acton Town Centre is not identified as an area suitable for an overall net increase in office floorspace over the plan period therefore the site will not be identified to deliver a specific quantum of office development.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|----------------|
| James Guest | Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA) | EAL33 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Object to the premature inclusion of residential use as an option. No design studies have been placed in the public domain to demonstrate the viability and sustainability of such a use.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|----------------|
| James Guest | Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA) | EAL33 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The site is constrained by extremely poor vehicle access. The entrance on Little Ealing Lane opens onto a heavily congested distributor road. The safety of this road is exacerbated by its location on a blind corner for eastbound traffic, and inadequate width in the road for a central holding zone for eastbound vehicles wishing to enter the site. An additional problem is the tailbacks of westbound traffic in Little Ealing Lane from the plough junction that can stretch back to, and block, the site entrance. Extremely narrow residential side roads to the west of the site are incapable of absorbing the increase in vehicle movements that would result from the proposed use. On-street car parking in the surrounding residential side roads is at capacity following recent planning approvals. Any construction on this site should be designed to minimise vehicle movements.</p> | | |
| <p>Response:</p> | | |

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| James Guest | Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA) | EAL33 |
| Nature of Comment: Recommend that the site be retained for educational uses and that parents/carers of pupils should be required to sign an agreement that will require them to complete the last few hundred metres of their journey on foot. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| James Guest | Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA) | EAL33 |
| Nature of Comment: The buildings on the site are Grade II listed. It is therefore essential that the allocation includes the explicitly requirement that any additional building construction on the site must be sympathetic to the architecture of the listed buildings, and the retention and reinstatement of the historic grounds. The mature trees on site should also be retained, and the diseased/dead ones replaced. | | |
| Response: The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|
| James Guest | Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA) | EAL33 |

| |
|---|
| <p>Nature of Comment: Should require that any construction on the site is sympathetic to the architecture, height and density of the adjoining residential roads.</p> |
| <p>Response: The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Cllr Colm Costello | LBE | HAN03 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: None of the shop frontages have any heritage value and should not be given any special protection. Given that the St Mellitus church is Grade II listed, any new construction on this site should take that into account.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Support the allocation for mixed use development. The Council should take into account the opportunities and constraints that are presented by the location of existing infrastructure, and the proximity of sites to existing public transport interchanges (e.g. Greenford Station) when considering appropriate land uses. Some locations within the site will be more suitable and sustainable than others for specific uses, with the railway station providing an opportunity to focus those activities that rely on good public transport accessibility.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Support noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |

| |
|---|
| <p>Nature of Comment: The layout and design of the site needs to be developed following detailed consultation with all relevant stakeholders, SEGRO has some ideas about how it would like to see the site develop, and is willing to work with the Council to shape the future of the site.</p> |
| <p>Response: Noted</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Further detail is required on how the potential net residential units figure was arrived at. A full assessment and analysis of the site's capacity would ensure that the site delivers to meet the area's housing needs.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The final allocation will not include potential net residential units as it is not the purpose of the Sites DPD to undertake detailed assessments of capacity.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: No retail development in proposed. A small amount of retail development would not necessarily be inappropriate within a mixed use scheme, to serve the immediate needs of the site itself.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: SERGO welcomes the flexibility that the potential net office floor space is yet to be confirmed, and the fact that it will allow developers to respond to market conditions.</p> | | |
| <p>Response:</p> | | |

Support noted. The final allocation will not detail specific quantum of development to ensure policies are flexible.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Andrew Burns | SEGRO | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: SERGO welcomes the flexibility that net industrial floor space is yet to be confirmed and the fact that it recognises the need to respond to market conditions. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The final allocation will not detail specific quantum of development to ensure policies are flexible. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jane Judge & Eric Seward | Jane Judge & Eric Seward | EAL33 |
| Nature of Comment: Preservation and sympathetic redevelopment of a notable historic building. Concerns regarding the potential development of the site, including access to the site via the small residential streets of Gumleigh, Hollies and Convent; potentially inadequate provision of parking spaces on the site which would impact on the surrounding area; any additional building construction to be sympathetic to the architecture and height in the area. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kieran Rushe | Kieran Rushe | EAL33 |
| Nature of Comment: The site has been as educational use. These land uses are extremely difficult to replace once lost and therefore I would resist the addition of residential use on this site even as enabling development at this stage. There is a need to undertake a full assessment of educational needs within the borough in this part of the boundary for the life time of the LDF. This may have been undertaken but it is not clear that it has, and given the projected quantum of new residential development existing education sites should not be opened up to potential other uses at this stage of the DPD process. | | |

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Nicola Smith | Nicola Smith | EAL33 |

Nature of Comment:

Access to the site needs to remain on Little Ealing Lane. No access should be granted through Hollies Road, Gumleigh Road or Convent Gardens. These are narrow residential streets and could not cope with any more traffic. Parking potential on the site needs to be considered as there is limited parking now available due to the overdevelopment of Pickering House.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Nicola Smith | Nicola Smith | EAL33 |

Nature of Comment:

This is a notable historic building and needs to be maintained and kept as such. All building should be sympathetic to the area and the building as it currently stands. Would support the development of the property remaining a school.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Nicola Smith | Nicola Smith | EAL33 |

Nature of Comment:

There has been no consultation with local residents. I found this out through the grapevine and this directly affects my

property and would expect to be kept fully informed, this clearly has not happened.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Amend description to retail, office and residential-led mixed use with cafes/restaurants and leisure.

Response:

Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

A layout which enables and supports creation of a pedestrian circuit in the town centre to ensure linkage to existing and committed developments must form a key feature of any scheme on the site.

Response:

Support noted. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

Delete 'replacement' and allocate site for retail-led mixed use with retail/café/restaurant, residential, offices, community and leisure. Some potential may exist for residential development/conversion in the future.

Response:

Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered acceptable in principle within a town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

Please note Hilden Properties and Marks and Spencer also have ownership interest in parts of the site, and Legal & General additionally own connected land to the south not shown on the plan. The PTAL for the location is understood to be 6.

Response:

Ownership clarification noted. The final allocation will confirm the PTAL of the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

Some potential may exist for residential development/conversion in the future

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

It is considered that a review of the merits of the Ealing Broadway Centre being included both as a locally listed building and in its entirety (including internal malls) are justified as part of the LDF process. These matters will influence layout and design of future proposals.

Response:

The review of the locally listed status of the Ealing Broadway Centre is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. The Council is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of the local list as part of the wider LDF process, and this will be consulted on alongside the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

The stated 0 sqm potential net retail floor space should be amended to 2,300 sqm to reflect potential opportunities for additional retail floor space to be created at the centre.

Response:

Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). The proposed amendment to potential for retail floorspace is not supported by evidence submitted with the allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Support redevelopment of site and retail at ground and first floor levels. Believe higher floors should be predominantly commercial with a relatively small proportion of residential.

Response:

Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Need incorporation of a bus station at the north of the site, roughly like Halcrow Option 9/Urban Studios Option 8. Details of the design basically the same as the Ealing Broadway interchange Study Option 3c, just located further south and

centred over Network Rail tracks. A bus station in this location would remove the stops/stands from Haven Green and strike a good balance between the half of bus users transferring to trains and the half going to the town centre. Note with amusement and concern that the Interchange Study dismisses anything that requires much agreement with other parties, which the Tibbalds options take a much wider view (and all demolish Central Chambers and span the Network Rail tracks in one way or another).

Response:

The possibility of a bus station on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation to accommodate proposals which may or may not propose development over the railway.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Rest of the design for the site could be similar to Tibbalds Option A2. May be possible to have a building spanning the eastern entrance to the bus station, and low-rise buildings facing Haven Green may also be possible, depending on the design and space needed.

Response:

Support noted. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Design needs to fit in with the conservation areas in terms of height and mass, and to complement them in terms of surface materials, fenestration and detailed architectural features.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the requirement preserve and enhance Conservation Areas

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Suggest moving the entrance/exit to the site further to the north and widen Springbridge Road to be 2-way down to The Broadway, where it would be left-turn only. This would also push back the western frontage of the development so there was less of an overshadowing and canyon effect on Springbridge Road. | | |
| Response: It would be inappropriate for the allocation to require a set access location in the absence of a full transport assessment for the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Covered areas need to be considered for walkways between the shops, particularly on the east-west thoroughfare which is aligned to the prevailing wind. | | |
| Response: Design details such as covered walkways are most appropriately considered via the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Support around 100 flats to increase the value of the development and provide attractive homes for people who would find this a convenient location. Do not consider this to be a place for many children to live as there is a local shortage of play space and community schools, as well as higher than average pollution levels in the area. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including requirements for play space and amenity considerations. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL05 |

| |
|--|
| <p>Nature of Comment: Support at least 2,000 sqm of office space. This site is extremely convenient for offices as it has minimal walking distance from bus stops and the rail station.</p> |
| <p>Response: Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|----------------|
| Burnett Planning & Development Ltd | Ealing Shopping Centre Limited Partnership | EAL06 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Some potential may exist for office development/conversion in the future</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Support noted.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL06 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Object to any significant change to the Ealing Broadway Centre. This is a locally listed building and the 20th century architectural jewel in the crown of Ealing. Over the years it has proved adaptable to changes in shopping demands through internal reconfigurations. There is no obvious way that a large amount of residential accommodation could be added to it without very significant change, and there is no obvious way that amenity space could be provided for the residential element. Any additional would adversely affect the look of the building.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building. The Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

The northern part of the site around the squash courts should be safeguarded for a station for the West London Orbital tube proposal. This tube would provide such massive benefits to Ealing that nothing should be done that would inhibit its implementation.

Response:

Transport for London do not require safeguarding of the northern part of the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

The key development on the site should be a bus station as per options 5 or 7 of the Interchange Study, unless the bus station is alternatively located on the Arcadia site. A bus station here would cater for an expansion of bus services following the implementation of Crossrail, would substantially improve the interchange facilities, and noticeably improve the environment around Haven Green.

Response:

The Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) ruled out options 5 and 7 as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

No quantum is specified so it is not possible to agree to it. A substantial office development would be appropriate for this site given its excellent public transport accessibility. The minimal walking distance would make it very attractive for people community into Ealing. The offices should include replacement of Villers House, whose height and general design make it a real blot on the landscape.

Response:

Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office space in the town centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2026). The Council agrees that Villers House is of poor design quality and supports its replacement.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: No quantum is specified so it is not possible to agree to it. Some retail would be appropriate on this site, especially convenience shops to serve both the offices and the station. Public toilets and rest facilities for bus/taxi drivers should also be provided. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in the town centre to 2026, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). The provision of public toilets/rest facilities are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Some community facilities would also be appropriate in this very central location. | | |
| Response: The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Community facilities are considered appropriate in a town centre location. | | |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: This site is probably inappropriate for residential development, given the difficulty in providing amenity space and the high levels of noise and pollution from traffic and trains. An air-conditioned hotel may be a possibility. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to the provision of amenity space. Mitigation measures required in relation to noise issues are considered through the planning application process. Hotels are considered appropriate in a town centre location. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: The design needs to be of high quality in this very visible and central location, though the buildings must not be so high as to detract from the surrounding conservation areas. A series of design options should be drawn up and put to public consultation, as has been done for the Arcadia site. | | |
| Response: The Council agrees that development proposals must be of high quality. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Especially for large developments, there is the opportunity to provide new access road to The Mall past Carmelita House and to the North Circular Road through EALX05. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will include guidance on transport and public realm issues associated with the site. There are no proposals to provide a new access road to the station from the North Circular. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL08 |
| Nature of Comment: Any re-development needs to maintain much the same volume as present to respect the conservation areas and locally listed buildings. Replacement of mid/late 20th century buildings with ones matching the Edwardian ones would achieve this. Potential for a hotel or offices to bring all parts back into full active use. Should be simple replacement of inappropriate buildings on the site. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within | | |

a DPD, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. Pastiche design approaches are not supported. The Council considers that the mix of uses can be established through various combinations, with potential for refurbishment and/or redevelopment, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Hotels and offices are considered appropriate in town centres.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL08 |
| Nature of Comment: Object to residential. The location has noise and pollution problems and there would be difficulty in providing enough amenity space. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to the provision of amenity space. Mitigation measures required in relation to noise issues are considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL08 |
| Nature of Comment: Some extra retail may be possible (e.g. on first floors) without increasing building volumes. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in the town centre to 2026, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL08 |
| Nature of Comment: Use as offices may be an appropriate way of bringing some of this site into full use. Convenient for the station. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace in the town | | |

centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL15 |
| Nature of Comment: The proposals would represent an overdevelopment of this predominantly back land site. The current approved planning application P/2009/3436 is of a sympathetic design which just fits into most of this site. The remaining part of the site facing Warwick Road should be left as is to retain the small existing office space in the local area. Do not support residential, would be substantial overdevelopment of this back land site. Support no retail as there is no demand for extra retail in the area. The proposed reduction of office space is not supported, as it would mean there was no local small office space. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL17 |
| Nature of Comment: Support the approved planning applications for the cinema, 14-16 Bond Street and 26-42 Bond Street. Believe any net expansion of the remaining parts of the site would be an over-development in the Ealing Green CA. Any additional residential units would represent an overdevelopment that would lack amenity space. It is not clear how much of the retail quantum comes from approved developments; any additional beyond approved would be difficult to fit within the space available. Not clear how office quantum would be achieved, but no objection to expansion so long as it fits within the existing scheme. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. The Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to the provision of amenity space. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: There is a credibility problem here, as the description provided suggests that the Council doesn't know who owns its own car park or the electricity substation on the site. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will provide information on ownership. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Part of the site is an electricity substation, almost certainly serving neighbouring buildings. It seems unlikely that it could be safely built over and there is no obvious place to re-locate it. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect the presence of the electricity substation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: The other part of the site is a car park for Council workers in Perceval House. It is inadequately sized for the volume of use and there are reports of Council employees using their business parking permits in neighbouring CPZs. Closure of this car park would make key Council workers inefficient as they would have to park further away, and put unacceptable pressure on other town centre car parks and neighbouring streets. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: A residential development in this area would suffer from railway noise, overshadowing from Perceval House and Longfield Avenue, and lack of amenity space if it was anything like the density proposed. | | |

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and include guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Development Management DPD will contain policies relating to amenity space and noise, which are assessed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:

A far better use of the site would be a multi-storey car park for Council workers. This would take the current pressure off other car parks and parking spaces in the surrounding streets.

Response:

The Council does not require a multi-storey car park for its workers.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EALX02 |

Nature of Comment:

Current use and the practicalities (and costs) of any change of use need to be checked with BT. Telephone exchanges normally have a lot of cables going into them and the cost of re-routing these to another location has historically been prohibitive. There are also physical security issues if any cables and associated equipment remain. It is not clear whether residential is practical, and there is no figure specified for retail or office. Any loss of current office space would be disadvantageous to local BT employees.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect the feasibility of providing certain uses on this site and clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EALX03 |

Nature of Comment:

Wickes, in particular, should be left as it is. It is the only major DIY store in the area serving a huge number of households. It is within walking distance of these households (for small items) and only a short drive for larger ones. Loss of this store would mean greater travel distances, generally by car, to procure such items. This goes against all concepts of sustainability. Object to residential as there are more important uses for this site, and object to any reduction in retail floor space for a key local facility.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EALX04 |

Nature of Comment:

The site is currently a BT Fleet motor transport workshop. It services and repairs vehicles from BT's own liveried and company car fleet, plus those of other company fleets including Thames Water. It also services and repairs vehicles of local residents and deals with some MOT failure appeals. It is well located for vehicle drop-off and pick-up as it is very near a tube station and two bus routes. Loss of this garage would mean local people would take longer and have to travel further to have their vehicles serviced and repaired. This goes against sustainability objectives and the convenience of having local facilities for local people. Do not support any change.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EALX05 |

Nature of Comment:

This location is inappropriate for housing given the noise (from traffic and trains) and the pollution (from traffic and diesel powered trains). The best use for the site would be to provide a link road from the North Circular to a large development on the Ealing Broadway Station (EAL07) site. Alternatively, it could be used for a vehicle rental depot (its most recent use).

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Chilton | The Park Community Group | EALX06 |
| Nature of Comment: Garages are a key local facility and serve a large number of local households. This one is within walking distance of many households. Loss of this garage would mean greater travel distances for car repairs and servicing. This goes against all concepts of sustainability. Object to any change of use. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Robert Gurd | Hanger Hill East Residents Association | ACT11 |
| Nature of Comment: The Social Infrastructure report identifies site ACT 11 for redevelopment for a 2 form entry Catholic Primary School. HHERA objects to this proposed loss of the West Acton Community Centre and the location of two separate schools on adjoining sites which does not appear to make best use of the available land. This latter site is unsuitable for a school given its impact upon neighbouring residential roads which are already very adversely affected in rush hours by rat-running traffic. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. The Council notes that while the response form stated ACTX01 as site reference, ACTX01 refers to 40-48 High Street not the West Acton Community Centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | General |
| Nature of Comment: The GLA considers that it would be helpful to provide signposting within this introductory section to the joint West London Waste DPD where detail on waste sites is intended to reside. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The DPD will include signposting to the WLWP | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | ACT01 |
| Nature of Comment: TFL advises, as a point of clarity that Acton Town Underground station has recently been upgraded including step-free access | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | ACT08 |
| Nature of Comment: TFL wishes to state that these developments are not necessarily reliant on Crossrail, but would benefit from the improved public transport accessibility that Crossrail would bring | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect the suggested revised wording. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | ACT09 |
| Nature of Comment: TFL wishes to state that these developments are not necessarily reliant on Crossrail, but would benefit from the improved public transport accessibility that Crossrail would bring | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect the suggested revised wording. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: TFL is aware of the need to improve interchange as part of the Crossrail works at Ealing Broadway station. Contributions are also likely to be sought from developers to address other issues such as the need for step free access to the station. | | |

Response:
Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:
The GLA has some concerns with regard to this proposal. The proposed release of part or all of the Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) in this location for mixed use development appears contrary to SIL policy, and is likely to have a detrimental impact on the cost of employment land in this location in the meantime. It is also likely to represent most, if not all, all of the councils intended 14a benchmark release of employment land for the 15 yr plan period. The GLA would therefore welcome further detailed discussion on this proposal

Response:
Concern noted. The Council will undertake further discussion with the GLA to ensure that employment land is safeguarded.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:
The council should be aware that given the proposed intensification of the Greenford Green site, London Underground will be seeking contributions towards the provision of step-free access at Greenford station.

Response:
The final allocation will reflect the need for step free access at Greenford Station with intensification.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | General |

Nature of Comment:
Referencing to the Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework under this section is welcomed. However the Council should update the reference from the February 2008 draft, to the current December 2010 version

Response:
References throughout the document will be updated to reflect the adoption of the Park Royal OAPF in January 2011 by

the Mayor.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: Supporting text for this site proposes an option of 52,000sqm "B1/B2/B8/retail". The GLA advises that it is inappropriate to combine retail in this group of uses due to the potential for out of scale and out of centre retail development in this location. It is suggested the council delete the reference to "retail" in this grouping, instead opting for "ancillary retail". The GLA would welcome further discussions on this issues as required. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will be revised to refer to "ancillary retail" rather than "retail" as appropriate to the site's location outside of a town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: The Council are advised that at present there are capacity issues at North Acton Station with respect to the ticket hall and gatelines. The station will be unlikely to cope with the extra demand generated by this proposal therefore capacity improvements will be necessary along with a new station entrance and square. Any works to the station must be Council/developer funded. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will include reference to the required improvements to North Acton Station and the proposed new station square, and the requirements for Council and developer contributions to achieve these improvements. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | PAR01G |
| Nature of Comment: The GLA would welcome further discussion with the Council in relation to proposals for this site with regard to and implications for SIL release | | |

Response:
 The Council welcomes further discussion with the GLA on this matter. The Park Royal OAPF identifies the Perfume Factory as having potential for redevelopment to provide a mixture of uses including residential and employment, subject to the detail of any scheme brought forward and its relationship with surrounding industrial uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: The GLA would welcome further discussion with the Council in relation to proposals for this site with regard to and implications for SIL release | | |
| Response: The Council would welcome further discussion with the GLA. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | SOU06 |
| Nature of Comment: Options for these sites propose smaller scale industrial land releases. The GLA considers these proposals acceptable in principle but would welcome further discussions to determine overall cumulative releases and the relationship to the 14 ha borough-wide benchmark | | |
| Response: The Council will undertake further discussions with the GLA. It should be clarified that the land is designated as an Employment Site under the UDP, not a local industrial site and are therefore not considered to contribute to the borough's industrial land supply. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | SOU07 |
| Nature of Comment: Options for these sites propose smaller scale industrial land releases. The GLA considers these proposals acceptable in principle but would welcome further discussions to determine overall cumulative releases and the relationship to the 14 ha borough-wide benchmark | | |

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site, including the safeguarding of the existing Locally Significant Industrial Estate.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Greater London Authority | Greater London Authority | SOU08 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Options for these sites propose smaller scale industrial land releases. The GLA considers these proposals acceptable in principle but would welcome further discussions to determine overall cumulative releases and the relationship to the 14 ha borough-wide benchmark | | |
| Response: | | |
| SOU08 (Former Featherstone Primary School), currently under construction for a residential development, does not contribute to the borough's industrial land supply. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL01 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Despite a proposed increase in child population there is no addition to the adjacent school site which is already inadequate in area. The permitted redevelopment removes West Ealing parking spaces despite proposals to expand a mosque without its own parking on a site opposite. ECS proposes that part of this site should be used to expand the St John's school site. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The masterplan for the Green Man Lane estate has been approved and construction started on site, with the first occupants scheduled to move in mid-2012. The site will therefore be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| It is a difficult site, already high density and forms a long narrow strip between the eastern boundary of the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area and west of a railway line part of which is in a tunnel. Increasing densities through high rise | | |

redevelopment or loss of amenity space would have an undesirable impact on both CA and residents in the Copley Estate. This is proposed for redevelopment in 2011 but no plans are available. We assume due to lack of finance. ECS propose that rebuilding or renovating this estate should eliminate sub-basement parking unless it can be made secure with access only to those with cars or if the parking is not needed supervised space for youth games. Dwellings should be provided with adequate private amenity space. This estate will lose rail access to Ealing Broadway by opening of Crossrail. Bus access to Ealing Broadway suffers from traffic congestion in Argyll Rd.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix and reflect the requirement preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including requirements for parking, play space and amenity considerations.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL03 |

Nature of Comment:

This is proposed for a 2013 start yet no specific proposals are available so it is difficult to see how the timetable can go ahead.

ECS objects to an increase in units on this high rise estate that does not increase private amenity space available to residents. The hedge with nature conservation value should be restored and gaps restricted to official footpaths. If the estate is redeveloped the adjacent allotment gardens should be purchased to supplement the limited public open space in Dean Gardens by establishing community gardens for all the high rise dwellings built in West Ealing. The open space use of Northfield Ave allotments is essential.

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years.

Allocation will be updated to reflect progress on the Masterplan for the site. The selected development partner will carry out extensive consultation on proposals as these become available. Comments are noted and will be supplied to the Major Projects Team.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|----------------------|---------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | General |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| At the RLP examination in public earlier this year CABE expressed concern at the ubiquitous use of the term 'landmark building'. 'Gateways' seem to be a redundant term in a town centre with a periphery marked by its important MOL/public parks/common land and historic gardens Ealing Common, Walpole Park, and public parks at Haven Green and Dean Gardens. We would like to see the term removed as not being in keeping with the local character and residents' perception of gateways as unattractive groups of buildings as already allowed in the Southern Gateway to Park Royal. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The Development Management DPD will contain guidance on tall buildings. In particular, it will distinguish between tall buildings and landmark buildings, which are considered distinct in that there is no presumption that a landmark building is also a tall building. Should a site be considered as providing an opportunity for a tall building or landmark structure, this will be detailed in the allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL04 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Already started but we are still very concerned that no agreements have been made on: 1) Improving the interface between the Town Hall and the St George development. 2) Establishing any public leisure centre, arts centre and health centre. 3) Using the section 106 funding for transport on the improvement of the links between the proposed new Town Square and the Ealing Broadway Centre/cinema site. During the consultation exercise great play was made of the ways that pedestrian and vehicle traffic could be managed on the lines of Kensington High Street. | | |
| Response: | | |
| This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the principle of development on the site has been established through recent planning permission. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| ECS supports none of the options without adaptation to the lowest floor space option, flexibility in land use to provide a mix of town centre uses, and the safeguarding of an acceptable transport interchange. A1 and A2 have certain acceptable | | |

features of their designs but improvement would be essential.

Response:

The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The possibility of a bus station on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Option A2 has the advantage of minimising building over the railway so that the heights of buildings can be more in keeping with the town centre and creating two small L-shaped spaces. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Any residential units north of the railway would be difficult to service and building so close to Haven Green would damage the fine row of places and limes which is one of the few surviving amenities of the common land. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: The railway is in a cutting and its width increases the apparent space of the park so that bridging the tracks gives only limited advantage for the costs. This would be reinforced by pedestrian access across the tracks and an attractive | | |

landscaped northern elevation to any development south of the railway which would extend the existing green corridor.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation to accommodate proposals which may or may not propose development over the railway.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

The impact of 6-8 storey buildings on the listed church is unacceptable. Very few buildings in Ealing CA are 8 storeys.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the listed status of the adjacent building, and the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Option A1 a 20 storey building that creates congestion just opposite the station and a group of bus stops is unacceptable. Calling it a gateway is no reason for this intrusion and Villiers House should be demolished in any redevelopment of the station because it has such a negative impact on the setting of the CA. Extending open space is no compensation for damaging the amenity of existing areas.

Response:

Objection noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Option B doubles the disadvantage of A1 with two 20 storey towers with 6-8 storey development creating a very shaded and unattractive shopping space along a narrow alley. Its only advantage is a square opposite Christchurch.

Response:

Objection noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Option C is totally unacceptable retaining all the faults of the scheme rejected after the public inquiry. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Any proposals for this site should be linked to those for EAL07 ensuring that there is a real transport interchange built that does not impinge on Haven Green, and Villiers House replaced by a building of quality of design. | | |
| Response: Current plans relating to provision of improved interchange arrangements do not require land take on the Arcadia site, however the final allocation will reflect the site's relationship to adjacent transport infrastructure. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: The site guidance should provide that any development should have regard to the existing London Plan policy 3C4/DRLP policy 6.2 that requires DPDs to identify and safeguard sites, routes and land alignments for future transport requirements. | | |
| Response: The Development Sites DPD must be in conformity with the London Plan 2011, and it is not the role of the DPD to repeat regional or national policy. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

There is no mention of locally listed building status of the whole centre. ECS objects to the Centre being included in the list of Development sites with housing proposals because there is no space for the units and adaptation of the offices would result in a loss of town centre employment. Change of use or extension of retail should be considered on a case by case basis respecting the character of this pleasant shopping area achieved after intensive community involvement; and lack of any proposals to improve links to Dickens Yard.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building. The Development Management DPD will contain a criteria based policy for the change of use of employment floorspace. The Council considers it would be inappropriate to consider change of use or extension on a case by case basis on a prominent town centre site, in the absence of clear guidance on the role and function of the Centre as a whole.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

Site should be extended to include the forecourt which includes parking for the shops.

Response:

Funding has been secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

None of the options presented are acceptable as long term solutions because they impinge on the common land of Haven Green. Option 3C has the least impact but does not provide safe access to the station or indeed adequate space for the buses that are usually stationary at various stands. The area over the tracks at the rear of the station should be developed for this purpose and Villiers House which has a negative impact on the surrounding CA demolished. The option of rafting over the station should be re-examined as a long-term solution, and meanwhile access should be safeguarded.

Response:

The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access

to the station, in line with Option 1A. The approach does not preclude further future improvements coming forward as part of development proposals. Guidance on building heights and massing will be provided in the final allocation, in particular the opportunity for air rights development. The Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) ruled out a bus station on the site as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Object to the 150 residential units proposed for the site because as part of the Crossrail rebuild of the station 2013-2018 it would prevent the long-term use of 2.8ha of prime town centre land albeit with a complex system of tracks at basement level. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The Crossrail station design has been finalised, and any development proposals brought forward on the site will be required to be compatible with the station. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Object to any proposal for this site that does not reduce the impact of buses, cycles and taxis on Haven Green. | | |
| Response: Funding has been secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: Seek a station that is accessible for all passengers and provides for bus and taxi interchange, drop off and cycle facilities over the railway line. Paid for by a high density/medium height scheme to contain its impact on surrounding conservation areas it would provide an ideal location for retail and offices. | | |

Response:

The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station. The approach does not preclude further future improvements coming forward as part of development proposals.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL08 |

Nature of Comment:

This is an important site in the conservation area. ECS opposes provision of yet another hotel in the town centre because there are already three permissions and one application pending and the construction of any buildings that increase the height of the High Street frontage which would extend the hours of shadow in this shopping area.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses on the site. The London Plan 2011 directs hotel development to town centres and opportunity areas. The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL17 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS object to the inclusion of the 190 residential units and such a large area of offices when current proposals and existing uses only include a hotel, cinema and restaurant use. The latter which abuts Ealing Green was designed to reflect the character of buildings that were demolished. Its forecourt landscaping complements the open space and conservation area. This landscaping should be a requirement of any redevelopment because it is designated MOL. The historic asset, the cinema archway which abuts no 2 Mattock Lane, should also be retained.

Response:

Objection noted. 59-63 New Broadway currently has planning permission for a 20 screen cinema and seven A3/A4 units. The final allocation will reflect this permission as well as providing guidance for the remainder of the site at 14-20 Bond Street and land to rear. 26-42 Bond Street will be removed from the allocation to reflect the completed hotel development at this address. Guidance on layout, built form and design will be provided to a level appropriate within a DPD. The

Council has confirmed that none of the site is designated as MOL.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL18 |
| Nature of Comment: The back land has planning permission for only 9 residential units and the yard and garage are boarded up for demolition. ECS object to 109 dwellings on a back land site with an existing frontage that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The existing planning permission for 9 is much more realistic. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL19 |
| Nature of Comment: The existing building has 4 floors with the 5th floor recessed. The height is just greater than the adjoining part of the conservation area. Land at the rear is used for well organized car parking but Northcote Apartments back onto this space with windows that overlook it and these apartments reflect the mass and height of locally listed houses in Northcote Ave. 51, The Mall is an old mansion with two curved shop fronts of character and make a positive contribution to the CA. ECS object to the redevelopment of this site with higher buildings out of character with the Conservation Area. 51-53 The Mall has a somewhat negative impact but its height is the maximum allowable in this location. The remainder of the site makes a positive contribution. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site boundary will be revised to exclude 1-9 Northcote Apartments. The final allocation will reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: Luminosity Court opposite is a high rise unattractive development; more overdevelopment on this site will add to the traffic | | |

congestion at the junction and to the problem of lack of supporting infrastructure for new development in West Ealing. ECS objects to the proposal for 120 units

Response:

The final allocation will provide further detail layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. It will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The provision high levels of car parking within residential development would not be considered suitable in a high PTAL area.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL12 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS considers the existing buildings should be retained, locally listed and development used to extend Drayton Green PS rather than dominate the school with high density flats. Current application should be refused.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as planning permission has been granted under PP/2011/4513

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL13 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS object to housing on this Employment Site with warehousing and offices which provide facilities for businesses near West Ealing Station. The buildings help noise screening for houses opposite and the site is too close to the railway for housing. Any redevelopment should improve footpath access to Jacob's Ladder bridge across the railway.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL15 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to estimate of 20 housing units on a back land site with difficult access and which has planning permission for 7. |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL16 |
| Nature of Comment: This proposal would be an unfortunate support for an impractical scheme in a very poor residential environment by Northfields depot. Boundary House is in use as serviced offices and the car parking is full during the day. The offices are well located opposite the Piccadilly line station. The site should exclude the existing residential development. ECS would like to see this 60s office renovated and the car park landscaped. We object to any proposals to develop this site that are not comprehensive. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: West part of the site is adjacent to the low rise residential area of Craven Ave and the southern boundary is overlooked by Perceval House offices. This would limit capacity to accommodate both Perceval House parking and any housing units proposed. ECS propose that this would be a suitable site for a leisure centre which was not included in the Dickens Yard Scheme. Car parking for officers could then be provided in the basement. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL09 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

ECS object to proposing housing units in the office corridor. Site proposals should follow the draft Strategy. Loss of office floor space to housing should be deleted because a quantum of office floor space is needed to ensure the success of this quarter.

Response:

Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace within the town centre, and Policy 2.5(b) defines the character of Uxbridge Road between Ealing Broadway and West Ealing as having high quality offices and ancillary functions, which does not preclude introduction of other uses. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review that a critical mass of floorspace office floorspace be retained. The ELR does not recommend against introduction of complementary uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL14 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS supports proposals for office development on this site; and the retention of the former BT /TVU building rather than its demolition as proposed in the residential/hotel application pending.

Response:

The detail of planning applications is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL21 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS object to the proposals for this site because they are incorrect; net office floor space should represent the increased capacity of the site. Proposals do not reflect the unimplemented planning permission for a 165 bed hotel and 3434m² of office space .

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, as construction has commenced on site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL22 |
| Nature of Comment: Potential quantum's are unlikely with the rate of take up of completed new space with limited parking. Height and mass of existing offices are in keeping with Mattock Lane which is part of Ealing Green CA. ECS would object to any buildings significantly higher than existing . | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace within the town centre. The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL23 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS would like to know what the height of buildings would be to accommodate a net increase of floor space of 28,000m2 | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL24 |
| Nature of Comment: This is a Grade II listed building given planning permission for retail and 14 residential units in July 2008. Current use is mixed use retail and commercial. | | |
| Response: This is not a Grade II Listed building however there is a listed mile post at the front of the building. | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: ECS objects strongly to the unplanned proposals for sites in West Ealing which promote the loss of buildings and frontages to provide housing or mixed uses with little thought to environmental problems or the urban improvements | | |

needed, and the provision of amenity space or social infrastructure. PTAL values are not very high varying between 2 and 4 and its retail floor space except for two stores is more appropriate to a district centre. Any further development should reflect the local character without concentrating a lot of people in a polluted, unattractive environment.

Response:

The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support a strategic approach to development and change by ensuring the most suitable sites are brought forward and that the more appropriate combination of uses and scale of development are promoted on each site to achieve balanced development. West Ealing is not a district centre, it is part of Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

ECS propose more buildings are locally listed and appropriate frontages identified as of value so that owners are encouraged to renovate properties.

Response:

The identification of buildings/facades for inclusion on the local list is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

Hoardings, adverts and out of date shop signs are also a visual barrier to regeneration.

Response:

The control of advertisements is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

Urge that the south side of Witham Road is developed in a more sensitive manner including landscaping of the car park on the northside. West Ealing needs urban design skills applied to coordinate its regeneration, not a series of sites proposed for numerous housing units where developers will strive to maximise profits by overdevelopment.

Response:

Unclear from representation are of land referred to.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL10 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS objects to any additional units now that the Genesis flats are virtually complete and there are important facades and locally listed buildings. Some frontages are locally listed. UDP vol.2 identifies 19-35 Broadway but the group 25-39 Broadway seem the most likely candidates as they are shown of façade value. The Salvation Army Citadel in Leeland Road has attractive façades to both Leeland Rd and terrace and we request it is listed and the frontage numbers corrected.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The part of the site which includes listed buildings and buildings of heritage value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL25 |

Nature of Comment:

Planning permission for 7 residential units (P/08/2669) is more realistic than the 25 net increase proposed. The modern brick building is currently covered in scaffolding presumably to carry out the 2008 planning permission. ECS object to 18 additional units proposed, 7 is enough.

Response:

This site will be removed from the next iteration of the development site document

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL26 |

Nature of Comment:

The property should be renovated not redeveloped. These are modern shop units with flats to the rear which limits capacity to redevelop. The modern brick row of shops is two storey with no room for amenity space or expansion of retail

space. ECS object because there is no site area to increase retail at ground floor level and raising the roof to provide 40 new residential units would take light from the Hugh Clarke House which is an attractive 2/3 storey courtyard development for old people at the rear.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. It will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD and provide sufficient flexibility to allow refurbishment, redevelopment or a combination.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL27 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS object to the lack of consideration of local character. Conversion and renovation seems the most appropriate strategy for the south side of the road where low rise properties will provide a more attractive shopping environment with sunshine in winter. No.59-65 Broadway have a typical 1930s design of tiled frontage that should be retained.

Response:

The final allocation will take the character of the area into consideration in providing further guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL28 |

Nature of Comment:

ECS consider the scope for redevelopment seems limited and the housing/commercial uses depend on ELR which recommends the retention of mixed uses. Renovation for offices provides cheap accommodation. Recent improvements to the pedestrian street seem inappropriate for users in winter months. The area should have improved management for example the current stallholder has unattractive awnings. Perhaps a kiosk could be purpose built. Broadway frontage is a designated shopping frontage and of façade value especially 91-97 so that rear access should be retained. Sainsbury's east façade is also a shopping frontage with an interesting sculptured wall which needs restoring.

Response:

The ELR's recommendation of retention of a mixed use character for the area does not preclude development. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The final allocation will remove the buildings of facade value from the site boundary. . The restoration of Sainsbury's property is outside of the scope of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL29 |
| Nature of Comment: ELR which recommends mixed uses. | | |
| Response: The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to the inclusion of 147-149 in the site (147 is a locally listed building). | | |
| Response: The locally listed status of the building will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to the redevelopment of this 4 storey modern development with 4 shop units to provide 40 units when it is more appropriate for a more limited number of flats. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL32 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: ECS object to an overdevelopment of the small part of the site which is in Chignell Rd. Land at the rear on Singapore Rd is a Muslim Educational facility which is to be redeveloped as a Mosque with a range of community facilities. British Home Stores at 104 -110 Broadway is already developed over all the site area east of Brownlow Rd. leaving 1-10 Chigwell Place for redevelopment for 78 housing units and 800 m2 of retail floor space. This will only have disabled parking so that it will generate a need for public parking.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The final allocation will be sensitive to existing uses on the site and clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. No planning application has been submitted to the Council for the building of a new mosque and community facilities.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EAL33 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Grade II listed building. It has potential for school or residential use. ESC is concerned that if this listed building is empty or in temporary use but without an agreed future use, it may become 'at risk'.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as the future use of the site as a education facility or conversion to residential is more appropriately considered through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EALX01 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The redevelopment of this site would result in high cost residential units with a small % of affordable housing because of the total investment required. ECS query why it is included as an extra site. It is a complex site with a range of thriving uses.</p> | | |
| <p>Response:</p> | | |

Objection noted. The site will not be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EALX02 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS consider that any redevelopment for residential use should reflect the character of Gordon Rd. The office building is currently in use and ELR recommends retention of mixed uses. The warehousing at the rear is vacant. If it is vacated housing should have adequate private amenity space because this is an area of open space deficiency. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide further detail on built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD and clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: This low rise warehouse is in scale with the development around the site. ECS considers the retail unit provides an important facility and car parking for part of the district centre | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EALX04 |
| Nature of Comment: This warehousing area between 2 railways and development adjoining the North Circular Rd. would make a poor environment for the 47 residential units proposed in an area (PTAL4). | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | EALX05 |
| Nature of Comment: Given the close proximity to noisy and polluting uses this seems an unsuitable site for residential use. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HAN01 |
| Nature of Comment: This proposal has started. | | |
| Response: The site is under construction and will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HAN02 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to a net residential increase of 70 on a 1.0ha site adjacent to MOL with a PTAL of 1A. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site is under construction, with scheduled completion in 2012/13, and will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: Existing access to the site is unacceptable as is the impact on St Mellitus Church. The redevelopment of 97-101 Uxbridge Road to a higher rise proposal for the whole site would be out of character of the area and would no longer contribute to the setting of the conservation area. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission | | |

P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HAN04 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| This is a large amount of floor space for such a small site that would significantly change the character of this part of Hanwell leaving no amenity space for the flat dwellers in an area of open space deficiency. The residential use should be eliminated if retail and offices is proposed, although we are unsure about the demand for offices in a small centre like Hanwell. We would like to see existing buildings upgraded rather than redeveloped because they contribute to the setting of the conservation area. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. The Development Management DPD will contain policies regarding residential amenity. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HAN05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| These garages give Hanwell Town Centre a very negative image. They are 2 separate sites and should be treated as such because 162-164 is more difficult to redevelop than 144-156 because of the impact on Maudesville Cottages. The potential for office use seems exaggerated. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The proposed allocation will not preclude phased redevelopment of the site. Development Strategy Policy 1.2(b) sets out a sequential approach to new office development within the borough, and Hanwell Town Centre is not identified as an area suitable for an overall net increase in office floorspace over the plan period therefore the site will not be identified to deliver a specific quantum of office development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HANX01 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: There are few retail warehouses of this type in the borough and garages also support the local economy. The site should be removed from the DPD. |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HANX02 |
| Nature of Comment: This is a useful facility which helps residents and workers who lack storage space in their homes or businesses and it should be encouraged to remain on site by removing reference from DPD. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HANX03 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS support the designated as a community open space in the Proposals Map Atlas but request it is retained as Green Corridor as it currently fulfils that role. | | |
| Response: Support noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of residential development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HANX04 |
| Nature of Comment: These sites should be deleted as no information or plans are provided and therefore this is not an adequate consultation. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | HANX05 |
| Nature of Comment: These sites should be deleted as no information or plans are provided and therefore this is not an adequate consultation. | | |
| Response: Comments noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will include detailed guidance on those sites considered to contribute to achieving the objectives of the Development Strategy. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT01 |
| Nature of Comment: We do not understand why the net increase in housing units is recorded as 862 units when the outline planning permission is for 756 units gross and the phase 2,3 application for gross 167 units. We object to these misleading figures and the prospect of more increases in density in an area where past poor design have left tenants in substandard, high rise accommodation with a lack of open space; yet the Masterplan is not available until 2011. We understand tenants are being consulted in detail. ECS object to the lack of consultation with adequate information at a stage when there can be some meaningful input. | | |
| Response: Comments noted. The Masterplan has been approved therefore the site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT02 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to high rise development in Acton Town centre on a car park which is important to a centre with limited public transport accessibility. This shopping centre forms an attractive frontage to the High Street which is part of the setting of the conservation area. Remodelling of the rear would not necessarily impact on this but loss of the well organised and well used council car park could damage the viability of the town centre. The range of shops is unlikely to be altered by | | |

redevelopment and 120 residential units would require high rise development which would impact on the conservation area and its listed buildings. The elevation of much of the site due to location on a Thames river terrace would increase this dominance.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the requirement preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on height and massing, including if the site is considered an appropriate location for a tall building. Overall parking levels on the site will be maintained.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT03 |

Nature of Comment:

We think that the 200 units was estimated in error. The PTAL is described as 3-4 and by checking the Map 12 in the Strategy only the south end of the site which is Green Corridor is shown as 4. The developable part is show as 3. Using Table 3.2 from the DRLP and selecting average unit size in an urban setting, the proposed average no of units per hectare is 55-145. The local context is particularly constrained so that the lower end of the range is likely to be applicable This would result in between 33 and 87 units according to GLA policy not the proposed 200 (assuming the site area is correct). This is a major miscalculation and if similar mistakes are replicated over the borough would result in much over-development in the future. We request that all the sites are rechecked so that this does not occur. Also object due to impact on the setting of conservation areas, the Green Corridor and on the amenity of existing and proposed residents. Also this type of use should be retained near town centres so that local building activities can be supported without long van journeys.

Response:

Objections noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The impact of any future development proposals for the site on the setting of conservation area, the green corridor and the amenity of existing and proposed residents can only be determined at the planning application stage when detailed proposals have been submitted to the Council for assessment. The Employment Land Review confirms that within the town centre boundary, the full range of town centre uses are appropriate and does not recommend special protection of uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT04 |
| Nature of Comment: 120 housing units with 2000sqm retail does not seem to relate to current proposals. We would like to see historic assets retained including the Victorian Passmore Edwards library, the Edwardian Municipal buildings and the swimming baths which has had significant past investment to ensure its future. We object to the loss of the existing pool. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council has worked closely with English Heritage on the redevelopment proposals for Acton Town Hall, and the planning application submitted in 2012 reflects these discussions as well as community input. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT04 |
| Nature of Comment: If the Priory Centre is no longer needed as a community centre then it should be returned to school use with out of hours access to the playground facilities for the burgeoning school population. | | |
| Response: Education has confirmed that the Priory Centre is suitable for uses as a primary school and this will be reflected in the latest version of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT04 |
| Nature of Comment: Consideration should be given to including the magistrates' court in the site area. | | |
| Response: The Magistrates Court has been sold and a planning application submitted for its conversion to residential, so it will not be included in future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT04 |

| |
|--|
| <p>Nature of Comment: ECS support the view that the community centre representatives expressed during the consultation that they wished to retain a separate existing premises.</p> |
| <p>Response: The Council has worked closely with community groups using the Town Hall premises to ensure adequate re-provision or relocation as required by the groups.</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT05 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Object to this site because we think it should not be a pattern for further development of Acton Town Centre in that S106 money will not compensate the community for the impact of this development on Acton or its social infrastructure. Optimising the potential of sites required by the DRLP should not be interpreted as housing at any cost to the environment.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The site is currently under construction and will therefore be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. The Council agrees that optimizing the potential of sites is not to be interpreted as housing at any cost.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT06 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: ECS object to this loss of the MEL (2007 permission for residential/office) which the ELR recommended retention and which if redeveloped could provide office accommodation close to a station and benefits from the attractive environment of the nature reserve.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The Employment Land Review (pg.56, Site 26, in reference to Colonial Drive) recommends that there may be scope to capitalise on the area's accessibility and deliver new offices for the local market as part of a mixed use development. This recommendation will be carried forward in the final allocation.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT07 |
| Nature of Comment: Wish to comment on the proposals made by Crossrail/TFL when these are available. | | |
| Response: The next iteration of the DPD will make reference to the most up-to-date proposals for Acton Mainline Station available at the time of consultation | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT08 |
| Nature of Comment: Site capacity is identified as 35 residential units but the environment is poor due to noise and vibration from the adjacent railway and Yard. Residential amenity of property on Horn Lane reduces its capacity and which is likely to be influenced by the rebuilding of the Crossrail station and provision of an interchange. We are very concerned about residential proposals in noisy polluted environment like this and regard it as unacceptable that the suffering of existing residents should be taken as a precedent for further residential development. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and set out general design principles. Mitigation measures required in relation to noise issues are considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT08 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to any redevelopment of this site until adequate space is safeguarded for an interchange of rail/buses/taxis and cycles with a drop off point for private cars and noise and pollution levels are reduced. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will make reference to the most up-to-date proposals for Acton Mainline Station available at the time of consultation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT09 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: We object to the proposal for 18 housing units on this 0.6ha site because it is too close to the aggregate depot and the polluting HGVs that access it. It should be removed from residential area notation. Any permission on the site should ensure adequate landscaping to separate the site from housing and replace advert hoardings.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. Rezoning of the site for residential is not possible due to the safeguarding of the waste transfer facility and aggregates depot, however the final allocation will support consolidation of existing industrial uses to improve buffering of existing residential properties in the area.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT10 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: These sites belong to Transport for London and we do not believe there is adequate space for 500 residential units if the bunds, footpath and cycleway with tree and shrub planting are to be accommodated in the Green Corridor with a development that reflects the local character and takes into account the high levels of pollution from passing vehicles. This land was purchased for highway use, and therefore priority should be given to other forms of transport before totals for housing schemes are agreed. ECS object to any reduction in width of this Green Corridor below 25m and residential totals should be amended to accommodate this. Continuity of bunds, footpath and cycle way is essential.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Transport for London has confirmed that the land identified is not required for transport purposes. The Development Sites DPD does not propose reduction in the width of the Green Corridor as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACT11 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: ECS object to this proposed loss of the West Acton Community Centre and the location of two separate schools on adjoining sites which does not appear to make best use of the available land. We note that there has recently been a public consultation for such a school at the Church of the Holy Family site, Vale Lane which is not in accordance with this</p> | | |

proposal. This latter site is unsuitable for a school given its impact upon neighbouring residential roads which are already affected in rush hours by rat-running traffic.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. The Council notes that while the response form stated ACTX01 as site reference, ACTX01 refers to 40-48 High Street not the West Acton Community Centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX01 |

Nature of Comment:

Support the redevelopment or complete renovation of this frontage. This buildings have been derelict above ground retail units for about 20 years. It is believed to belong to a subsidiary of Freshwater Ltd. The Council should consider compulsory purchase as it disfigures Acton High Street.

Response:

Support noted. This site is not considered appropriate for compulsory purchase.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX02 |

Nature of Comment:

18 residential units which must overcome issues of queuing traffic at a busy junction, noise and air pollution. This was an attractive building until it was painted red. It provides a room for events and renovation should be encouraged with removal of advert. Hoarding that have an undesirable impact on the conservation area. We support renovation of this property.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX03 |

Nature of Comment:

Why are these included without any information

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX04 |

Nature of Comment:

Why are these included without any information

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX05 |

Nature of Comment:

Why are these included without any information

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX06 |

Nature of Comment:

No plan or area provided but the Catholic Church is visibly in use on Sundays and it is used by a school. Residents and worshipers object to its inclusion. We object to the inclusion of this site. If it is retained in the schedule the recent amendments to DRLP require it to be considered for alternative worship in Further Proposed Changes to Policy 3.17 (Social Infrastructure) submitted by the Greater London Authority to the EiP

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | ACTX07 |
| Nature of Comment: As there is no plan it is not possible to comment. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: Sources quoted include Park Royal Southern Gateway Position Statement April 2008 and Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework Feb. 2008. These documents were not subject to adequate consultation. | | |
| Response: The Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework was subject to a rigorous preparation process (refer to section 1.3 of the OAPF) including public consultation by the Mayor, and formally adopted by the Mayor of London in January 2011. It does not create policy but clarifies existing policy, and is in conformance with the London Plan. It is used as a material consideration when assessing strategic planning applications. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to the extension of the Southern Gateway Special Opportunity Site (SOS) for any more built development or redevelopment. We particularly object to the Changes to the Proposals map 11 which show: 1) loss of Green Corridor to SOS which would destroy the amenity for residents, cyclists and pedestrians. 2) the application of SOS policies across the Western Avenue which is a real barrier with fencing, traffic jams or lanes of moving vehicles, but above all highly polluting and where the existing local character of the west side is totally unrelated to the present Southern Gateway which is a closely packed high rise group of buildings that are poorly designed, and give an unattractive sky line which is an unfortunate image for potential business entrepreneurs to have of Park Royal. 3) The loss of MEL and locally listed Elizabeth Arden building which forms the core of a group of industrial buildings to the east of Wales Farm Rd. It should be | | |

retained together with the MOL.

Response:

Objection noted. The Development Strategy DPD does not carry forward the designation of Special Opportunity Site. The final allocation will therefore reflect the boundary of the Southern Gateway as set out in the Park Royal OAPF.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01 |
| Nature of Comment: Any undeveloped land should be landscaped for open space. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01A |
| Nature of Comment: We object because this is a site surrounded on 3 sides by tube and major access roads to the industrial estate and residential led mixed use is inappropriate. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01B |
| Nature of Comment: If there is to be a Station Square instead of the petrol station there is no room for a residential mixed use development | | |
| Response: The final allocation will reflect the proposals within the Park Royal OAPF, and clarify the approach to the proposed North Acton Station Square. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: This vacant site should be POS not residential led mixed use. What were grounds for the appeal to be dismissed. Any buildings would shade Trentham and Poulton Courts to the north. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011) establish the strategic planning framework for the Southern Gateway. The OAPF sets out a coordinated approach to development to ensure that adequate amenity space is provided. The appeal was dismissed on several grounds, including inadequate provision of amenity space. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01D |
| Nature of Comment: These buildings were redeveloped in the last 25 years with a satisfactory office development. Overshadow of the open cemetery should not be increased by raising the height of these modern buildings. The site is unsuitable for residential use as it lies at the junction of 2 access roads to Park Royal and there is no POS or community facilities. We understand there is an outstanding planning application for high rise buildings not mentioned. | | |
| Response: The London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011) establish the strategic planning framework for the Southern Gateway, and proposals within the Development Sites DPD must conform to this framework. The OAPF sets out a coordinated approach to development, and the final allocation will provide guidance on built form and massing to a level appropriate to a DPD. Planning application P/2008/3774 is a Screening Opinion application, not an application seeking outline or full planning permission. A Screening Opinion seeks to confirm if an Environmental Impact Assessment is required should an application for planning permission be sought. There are currently no outstanding planning applications on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01E |

Nature of Comment:

The site is unsuitable for residential use as it lies at the junction of 2 Park Royal access roads adjacent to a third one Portal Way and there is no POS or community facilities.

Response:

The London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011) establish the strategic planning framework for the Southern Gateway, and proposals within the Development Sites DPD must conform to this framework. The OAPF sets out a coordinated approach to development, and the final allocation will provide guidance on built form and massing to a level appropriate to a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01F |

Nature of Comment:

The advertisements on this building which is used as a large advertisement hoarding set an unacceptable level of environmental degradation for Western Ave.

Response:

The control of advertisements is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01G |

Nature of Comment:

This disfigured locally listed building was threatened by an application-P/2005/1647 for 228 dwelling units 3792sqm of B1/B2 retail 685sqm and 65sqm community use. But the site was sold. It is adjacent to the Council estate and Victoria Industrial estate at the rear. We object to a proposal to include it in the Southern Gateway.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building. The Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PAR01H |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: An application is being considered to increase the already enormous number of students on site by eliminating community rooms. We object to this proposal. |
| Response: Objection noted. The details of a specific planning permission are outside the scope of the Development Sites. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE01 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to loss of POS proposed in the redevelopment of this housing. | | |
| Response: Objection noted, The final allocation will clarify the requirement to retain the Public Open Space. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE02 |
| Nature of Comment: Propose this site is reserved for community use. The museum has a 25 year lease on half the site so that this should be excluded. The part at the rear of 31a-33c Oldfield Lane is of nature conservation interest so the area available for redevelopment is only that which remains. Greenford would benefit from being a community use related to the park such as a children's centre. | | |
| Response: | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE03 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no explanation as to how 45 extra dwellings can be fitted into this site of 0.3 ha with 1900sqm of retail and 1900sqm of offices. We object to any overdevelopment of this site | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect | | |

appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to a change of designation from MEL to Special Opportunity Site for which a large number of housing units are proposed. High buildings would be inappropriate because of the impact on Horsenden Hill. The Employment Land Report supports the retention of this site in employment use with supported by allowing office use. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Development Strategy DPD does not carry forward the designation of Special Opportunity Site. The final allocation will therefore reflect the outcome of discussions with the GLA regarding the potential release of industrial land. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE05 |
| Nature of Comment: This waste recycling and council depot if redeveloped should reduce its impact on the adjoining MOL/BRP. We object to any intensification of existing use that imposes on this very vulnerable stretch of the BRP. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD as it is addressed in the WLWP. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE06 |
| Nature of Comment: Object to any alteration in the MOL/BRP boundary proposed in the Map changes that do not relate to current permissions for school buildings. The base map is not clear and we wish to see any playground/school playing field retaining this protection. | | |
| Response: | | |

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE07 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS object to the proposal on Green Belt; also to the location of a secondary school adjacent to a major trunk route where vehicle pollution will be carried on site by the prevailing SW winds and with a PTAL of 1B-3 which will make access for students more difficult. The Council should seek a site that does not include loss of important open space and remove this from the document. We particularly object to the proposal to remove this land from Green Belt because with population increase there will be a greater demand for playing fields. The Council has opposed lose of Green Belt land over many years and it now changes its policy to enable a school to be located on an inappropriate site adjacent to the A40. This is setting an unfortunate precedent. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, however the site has been confirmed for use as a secondary school. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GRE08 |
| Nature of Comment: It is very close to another school, not an ideal location site for another one. We object to the lack of sustainable planning of school sites | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, as Education is reviewing potential locations for new schools. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GREX01 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to mixed use development with a stated potential for 76 housing units. The uses on this site seem substantial and essential for this part of the borough The site abuts the BRP/MOL so that high rise development is contrary to policy | | |

and if any unused land adjoining Cardinal Wiseman HS becomes available it should be used for school purposes.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GREX02 |
| Nature of Comment: We object strongly to the redevelopment of this site. It is a locally listed building which is essential to the community and if underused should be managed better. The site should be removed from this document. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will reflect to locally listed status of the building and the requirement to retain the existing uses on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GREX03 |
| Nature of Comment: This site should be removed from the document. No information provided but the Development Sites Table 10.21 in the UDP suggests restaurant/café, retail housing as appropriate. These are all acceptable town centre uses in existing premises which reflect the character of the area. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | GREX04 |
| Nature of Comment: Suggestions for future use of this site are requested. No information is provided, not even a map to show where it is and consultation at Greenford Hall was so ill attended and limited in its coverage that it is difficult to make any sensible proposals. The UDP proposes retail and housing which are acceptable town centre uses that do not require identification in the Development Sites DPD. It should be removed from the document. | | |

Response:
Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NOR01 |

Nature of Comment:
We do not understand how increasing the number of units on this estate by 263 dwellings will help the levels of deprivation. Higher density mixed tenure will not help those who lack jobs, childcare or transport to jobs or amenities especially as the PTAL is 1A -2. We consider the accommodation of family units in high rise flats is not a recipe for improving housing conditions once the newness wears off. We would like to be consulted at an early stage in redevelopment proposals

Response:
Comments noted. Allocation will be updated to reflect progress on the planning application for the site, which includes a net gain of 155 units and new community centre. Network Housing Group (the development partner) are carrying out extensive consultation on proposals. The appropriateness of family sized units in high rise flats is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NOR02 |

Nature of Comment:
We object to housing proposals if this site is needed for future school use. School population fluctuates and reuse of existing buildings is better than

Response:
Objection noted. The provision of educational facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NOR03 |

Nature of Comment:
The planning history of this Green Belt Land records the loss of its character and openness as soon as it is used for school building. This is not in line with current Green Belt government advice and should not be a precedent for the next

secondary school site.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NORX01 |
| Nature of Comment: This provides inadequate information on an unidentified site in an area where no consultation meeting has taken place. There is no clue as to why it was included or why 33 units are proposed. We suggest it is removed. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The site was identified through the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, however it is not proposed to be carried forward in the next iteration of the DPD the telephone exchange is operational. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NORX02 |
| Nature of Comment: There is inadequate information about the site including its location which does not appear to agree with the address or my A-Z. It is in an area where no consultation exercise has taken place so that there is no clue as to why it was included or why 20 units are proposed on a 0.4 ha site. We suggest it is removed. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The site was identified through the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, however it is not proposed to be carried forward in the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | NORX03 |

Nature of Comment:

We support the redevelopment of this site. The Base map is out of date and does not show the impact of this car lot on the new leisure centre. It is a difficult site to redevelop because it is so close to the bridge and either it should be landscaped open space or a low rise redevelopment to complement the attractive leisure centre. Community use other than a landscaped station car park is unlikely as there is such lavish provision of facilities in the leisure centre. Car parking at the leisure centre is very restricted.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | PER01 |

Nature of Comment:

We are very concerned that there is no mention that this is the floodplain of the River Brent and proposals seem to ignore the river and current policy 3.1 in the UDP for the Brent River Park that no development will be permitted that detracts from its landscape, nature conservation or hydrological roles. Perivale Park is already developed for sport but development near the swimming baths and its car park will reduce the flood water capacity and could impinge on an area of nature conservation importance. The PTAL is low for Gurnell Pool and users very dependent on car access. We object to this location for a sports hub.

Response:

Objection noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | General |

Nature of Comment:

We were very concerned that so few people attended the consultation at the Dominion centre and that there was so little discussion of what will happen to the town centre shops and other town centre uses when the new neighbourhood is added. Currently leisure facilities are lacking, there is an open space deficiency and health and education sites are needed that do not use valuable open space. It is unsound not to plan increases in open space and allow schools on MOL when there is an identified deficiency. Access to the Crossrail station will be so difficult by bus that those for whom it is too far to walk may prefer to use cars for the whole journey.

Response:
 The Council is currently preparing an Opportunity Area Planning Framework for Southall, in partnership with the GLA, which will involve extensive engagement in addition to the public consultation on the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | General |
| Nature of Comment: The Southall Development Study is not available on the website. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU01 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to the increase in density by 193 units in an area of low PTAL without an adequate master plan to show open space increases and improved transport at a time when TFL is cutting its service for bus improvements. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Allocation will be updated to reflect progress on the Masterplan for the site. The selected development partner will carry out extensive consultation on proposals as these become available. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU02 |
| Nature of Comment: 23 units does not seem to represent an adequate estimate of the increase in housing units on this estate over the plan period because phase 4 is only a small part of the area shown. We object because this is an estate with many problems and there is inadequate information. We would like to see more places to play in line with Consolidated London Plan/RLP requirements for doorstep play; and community facilities linked to Dormers Wells School/Leisure centre. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Allocation will be updated to reflect progress on the site, with 23 units likely to complete 2012/2013, and | | |

additional proposals to demolish three blocks and build approximately 60 new houses. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies on requirements for playspace to be used in the determination of planning applications.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: We object to any housing/town centre uses being built before adequate access to the South Rd is provided/financed. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Details of access requirements on the site are set out in P/2008/3981 granted in 2010. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Information on hotel and infrastructure is needed to judge the scale of the development. There is a danger of it becoming a high rise isolated housing estate with a town centre of retail warehousing and a poor environment due to the railway, the gas holders and polluted groundwater. Workers will be dependent on Heathrow for employment. | | |
| Response: Outline planning permission for comprehensive redevelopment of the site was granted in 2010, as detailed in P/2008/3981. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: A more positive presentation is needed in the Sites DPD which reduces the impact of blocks of flats on the canal and green belt, making the most of the access to the Crossrail station. | | |
| Response: Outline planning permission for comprehensive redevelopment of the site was granted in 2010, as detailed in P/2008/3981. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Local public open space should be defined next to the gasholder and local employment next to the railway. | | |
| Response: Outline planning permission for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the site was granted in 2010, as detailed in P/2008/3981. | | |

| | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Object to changes to the proposals map designating most of the site as a housing estate. There should be a local employment site and defined POS. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Outline planning permission for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the site was granted in 2010, as detailed in P/2008/3981. This permission includes a public park and provision for employment uses. | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Improvements to the layout of the residential area should be sought through discussion of detailed planning applications. | | |
| Response: The detail of planning applications is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: It does not seem logical to build 590 housing units on this industrial area when the working population of Southall is being expanded by at 2500-5000 workers close by where no industrial floor space is proposed. | | |
| Response: The source of the suggested uplift in jobs is unclear. The London Plan 2011 identifies Southall as an Opportunity Area, | | |

with the potential to create 1000 additional jobs by 2031.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: Public Transport improvements and landscaping would help provide a better work environment and attract new businesses as summarised in para 4.13 of the Mayor's Outer London Commission report. | | |
| Response: Suggestions noted. The final allocation will provide guidance and potential transport and public realm improvements associated with redevelopment of the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU04 |
| Nature of Comment: The site is changed from an MEL to an Employment site in the "Changes to the Proposals Map" We object to any loss of employment uses because it is unsound for the future residents of the housing estate proposed on the gas works site to rely on working at Heathrow. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate nature and scale of employment uses on site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU05 |
| Nature of Comment: Retention of the existing retail floor space is essential until the large retail units are available on the Southall gas works site. If the telephone exchange has spare floor space it could be used for commercial purposes. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses on the site, however the site is not a designated retail frontage. The Telephone Exchange is fully operational and it will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The loss of car parking would add to the appalling congestion in South Rd. and seriously reduce the existing vitality of this shopping frontage. Redevelopment at higher densities would increase this congestion and we do not see how a net increase of 1000 sqm of retail can be achieved on this site. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and the appropriate mix of uses on the site. Car parking provision will be retained as required by the businesses. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| We object to proposal for housing and retail on this site which should provide for community facilities and more imaginative regeneration proposals such as urban open space if it is redeveloped. In the long term leisure uses and a Town Square with a market might provide for the current liveliness if the retail units are superseded by development elsewhere. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The evidence base for the proposed changes to the allocation is unclear. The final allocation will provide guidance and potential transport and public realm improvements associated with redevelopment of the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU06 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| We object strongly to the loss of these brick frontages that give the north side of Merrick Rd. together with Sunlight Radio and the Southall community centre which frame the view, such an interesting character. These are all locally listed buildings and are an important group and heritage asset for Southall. Clarification needed – Where is the petrol station? | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the arches. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU07 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| We support the MEL and Employment Site designations as shown on Changes to the Proposals Map except for the inclusion of Phoenix House when it has permission for residential use. We object to proposals that redevelop the town centre uses on the remainder of the site as their loss would reduce the viability and facilities in the Town Centre. We are concerned that the net increase of 310 residential units is unrealistic other than that permitted in 2008 for 149 units in Phoenix House. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Support noted. The final allocation confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and clarify the appropriate mix of uses on the site to ensure the continued vitality of the neighbourhood centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU09 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| We object to the current planning application for 103 units; regard as on overdevelopment of a site in the setting of the canal conservation area with a very low PTAL. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. Planning permission has been granted subject to legal agreement, and the details of planning applications are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU10 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| We do not understand why 11-16 Willey Industrial Estate is included in the site area when small units are likely to generate more employment growth than larger ones and there is no planning history of a land use change. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify site boundaries and justification for inclusion. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU10 |
| Nature of Comment: The site abuts the Canal so that access to the towpath should be provided and there is a local open space deficiency. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU11 |
| Nature of Comment: This site will presumably be influenced by bridge widening needed for the gas works site redevelopment. If it is no longer needed for a gurdwara it should be available for another religious or community use according to the DRLP. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide guidance and potential transport and public realm improvements associated with redevelopment of the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU12 |
| Nature of Comment: Site is more suited to industry, leisure or offices than residential use given its location next to the station which already has good connections to Heathrow. Crossrail will probably bring only limited improvement; would offices fare any better than Phoenix House which has been empty for a long time? | | |
| Response: Suggestions noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses on the site, which is within the Southall Major Town Centre boundary. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU14 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

Despite having a recent planning permission for 2 B1 units this site is proposed for 39 residential units on back land of 0.6ha with PTAL of 2. We object to undesirable back land development. The housing potential should be recalculated taking this into account.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will not be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU15 |

Nature of Comment:

The UDP suggested a master plan was needed and promoted a wide range of uses for this site which are repeated in the options. There is no sign of a master plan but the predominant education use is likely to continue and therefore there is little need to promote residential use or offices. We suggest site is removed.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses on this key town centre site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU16 |

Nature of Comment:

Permission was refused previously because this is a difficult site to provide vehicular access but would make an area of POS for a children's play ground.

Response:

Suggestion noted. This site will be removed from future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

24 net residential are proposed on this large site most of which is MOL. The area west of Glade Lane was landscaped because it was too noisy for housing. We would support a marina in Maypole Dock but we object to the retention of the SOS triangle of land adjacent to the railway east of Glade Lane.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. The small triangle to the west of Glade Lane is allocated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOU18 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| This site has a very low PTAL and ECS objected to the planning application that was refused in August. Incorporation of an ecological buffer is not enough. This is MOL on which some housing was to be allowed to enable the remainder could be public open space. An ecological buffer is not POS. Were 30 units allowed on appeal? P/2010/1894. We object to the ecological strip being defined as green corridor in Changes to the Proposal Map. It should be defined as MOL. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Planning application P/2010/1894 was granted on appeal, and the site will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. The details of planning applications are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX01 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Should be removed as uses there are likely to continue | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Should be removed as uses there are likely to continue | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX03 |
| Nature of Comment: ECS strongly object to redevelopment of these sites and if alternative uses have to be found because the current ones are no longer needed, then the current buildings/open space around them should be retained. A community use should be retained at 06. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX04 |
| Nature of Comment: Should be removed as uses there are likely to continue | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX05 |
| Nature of Comment: Should be removed as uses there are likely to continue | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Judy Harris | Ealing Civic Society | SOUX07 |
| Nature of Comment: No map or address is provided so that this consultation is inadequate and should be removed. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: All of them have a density and proposed building heights which would result in buildings of mass, bulk and height in excess of those which should be permitted in a conservation area (see our proposed wording for Policy 7.7). | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no indication of acceptable traffic and access arrangements. This is due to the absence of any broader plan for the centre of Ealing which would relate the different blocks and proposed developments to each other, and no plan for traffic management through the centre as a whole. | | |
| Response: It would be inappropriate for the allocation to require a set access location in the absence of a full transport assessment for the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: The proposals to build on the south side of Haven Green over the north embankment of the Great Western railway line (the present BBC car park) are unacceptable because there would be no adequate space for servicing other than across the public open space; cost could not be met other than by an unacceptable quantum of housing; visual intrusion on Haven Green would truncate the longer view and foreshorten the public space; adverse effect on line of mature trees that mark the southern boundary and give the space much of its present character as a 'haven'; adequate amenity space could not be provided; railway land below car park should be safeguarded for future possible widening of tracks. | | |
| Response: | | |

Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation to accommodate proposals which may or may not propose development over the railway. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and reflect the requirement to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| There is no adequate reference to the need for integration with developments on site EAL07 (Ealing Broadway station), nor to the needs for a public transport interchange, for which this is one possible site. | | |
| Response: | | |
| Current plans relating to provision of improved interchange arrangements do not require land take on the Arcadia site, however the final allocation will reflect the site's relationship to adjacent transport infrastructure. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Little note appears to have been taken of the points established at the public inquiry into the Glenkerrin application to develop this site, other than the pedestrian route across the site. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The evidence base for the design principles included within the options is the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre Spatial Development Framework (2008, updated September 2010). This document took account of the points established at the public enquiry regarding planning application P/2007/4246. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| More open space and community use (e.g. for an arts centre facing a square or piazza opening across the rail tracks which would be a magnet for the surrounding region) would give this site a status and attraction to bring in more visitors to | | |

the town centre as a whole, to the wider benefit of all.

Response:

The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. All of the suggested uses are considered acceptable in principle within a town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

High density on this site will result in high cost housing which will make it impossible to meet the required proportion of affordable homes. Turing the centre of Ealing into a commuter's residential area adjacent to the station would militate against the general borough strategy of providing homes for locally employed people and would not meet the demands of Ealing's homeless population, particularly the need for family housing.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. There is no evidence provided to support the assertion that high density housing is high cost.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

Too specific a quantum at this stage of uncertainty about the real needs for Ealing's retail trade is unnecessary and unwise.

Response:

The Council agrees that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

To attract premium office tenants into Ealing, as envisaged by the Strategy generally, requires quality accommodation of adequate size close to the station (i.e. within a 'pedshed' of 400m) rather than the much greater distance now contemplated in the strategy.

Response:

There is no evidence provided to support the assertion that office accommodation must be within 400m of Ealing Broadway Station.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

The proposed uses are muddled and the Interchange Study includes a large area (Haven Green) outside the site. The preferred option under that study is totally unacceptable as a long-term solution to the need facing the centre of Ealing for a high-quality public transport interchange which is capable of expansion to meet the projected increase in passengers from Crossrail and any growth in visitors to the town centre for retail, leisure and other purposes. The impact on Haven Green public open space of any of the interchange options as long-term solutions is clearly unacceptable.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses on the site. The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station necessary to meet the projected expansion in passenger numbers as a result of Crossrail.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

Significant public investment is needed if this site is to be made into a genuine "gateway" for a reinvigorated Ealing town centre, and to capitalise on the opportunities offered by Crossrail. The station area needs to include the present forecourt, and be part of a wider study which looks at revised traffic and pedestrian circulation across the whole of the area including the Arcadia site, including the possible removal of through vehicular traffic by closing the northern spur of Ealing Broadway. It also needs to be seen in conjunction with the Arcadia site (EAL05), and not in isolation.

Response:

The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station. The Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (2010) considered a range of options within a study area that included the Arcadia site. Plans relating to provision of improved interchange arrangements at Ealing Broadway Station do not require land take on the Arcadia site, however the final allocation for the Arcadia site will reflect the its relationship to Ealing Broadway Station.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

More of the options from the Interchange Study should have been presented for consultation, including the possibilities of providing a fully integrated rail/tube/bus/taxi interchange, partly or wholly over the tracks on either side of the present road bridge. The short-term financial constraints which militate against an immediate commitment to one of the more imaginative and therefore expensive options should not be permitted to close off the possibility of such development in the future. No development should be permitted which prevent this happening, by 'safeguarding' land on both this site and on the Arcadia for a suitable combined solution.

Response:

Consultation within the Development Sites DPD was limited to those options from the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (2010) assessed as deliverable. The approach to be taken forward does not preclude further future improvements coming forward as part of development proposals, however there is no evidence to support safeguarding of land on either site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |

Nature of Comment:

An immediate need is to address the extremely poor access arrangements to the station and its platforms, and the Council should redouble its efforts to oblige Network Rail, First Great Western and TFL to recognise the serious and pressing nature of the problem, without waiting for Crossrail.

Response:

Funding has been secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>Whilst a high density development would be acceptable as a solution to the wider needs of the area, the housing quantum is rather too high for a mixed-used development on this site, if all other proposed uses are to be accommodated, particularly if an integrated transport interchange as well as premium office space is to be provided.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure residential development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide further detail on built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>No retail quantum specified. A well-designed genuine gateway should attract good retail tenants, as at other urban stations with significant footfall.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The Council agrees that a well-designed gateway to the town centre is necessary to attract high quality retail tenants, and this will be reflected in the final allocation to a level appropriate within a DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Tony Miller | Ealing Borough Liberal Democrats | EAL07 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>No office quantum specified. Good design, unlike Villiers House, would be essential to attract a significantly prominent tenant, who would probably require a minimum of 4500 sqm.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The Council agrees that a well-designed gateway to the town centre is necessary to attract high quality office tenants, and</p> | | |

this will be reflected in the final allocation to a level appropriate within a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | General |
| Nature of Comment: Please note that there was a problem downloading the LDF Development Sites document. Despite a request for this document to be emailed to me, I have not been able to view it. The following comments are made in respect to my client's portfolio. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | SOU06 |
| Nature of Comment: Workspace request that the Arches Business Centre at Merrick Road is identified for intensified employment uses. Workspace considers that the Arches could also provide an opportunity to provide mixed-use floor space that not only provides B floor space but also caters for the growth in leisure, culture, arts and potentially provide space for employment training facilities. Its location in respect to Southall Train Station, Southall Town Centre and the gas works regeneration site makes this site important for the area's regeneration. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate nature and scale of employment uses on site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | SOU06 |
| Nature of Comment: The site is located with Southall Town Centre and contains sufficient land to develop further buildings and consequently provides employment intensification opportunities. The increase of employment floor space at this location will help sustain the existing employment use and will enable sufficient flexibility and building quality to secure the continued use of the estate in the long term. This will provide benefit in employment and economic terms through continuing to provide | | |

opportunities for a wide variety of small and medium sized businesses

Response:

Suggestion noted. The final allocation will clarify the appropriate nature and scale of employment uses on site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Aladdin Business Centre, 426 Long Drive

Workspace request that Aladdin Business Centre be allocated as a mixed-use development site that incorporates residential and employment uses. The allocation of this site for mixed-use development will provide an opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment at this site, enhance the surrounding area and improve the residential amenity of the surrounding area.

The Aladdin Business Centre located at 426 Long Drive provides workshop and industrial floor space. The business centre is located to the rear of Long Drive and is accessed from the adjacent residential area. The site is accessible to Western Avenue (A40). Perivale Underground Station (Central Line) and South Greenford Station (mainline) are within walking distance and have frequent services into central London. Numerous bus routes also service the area.

Response:

Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the land is designated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011, and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011) does not identify this site as being acceptable for mixed-use development incorporating residential uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Workspace own the following properties in Park Royal, which are all located in close proximity the proposed Southern Gateway: Europa Studios , Victoria Road; Acton Business Centre; Park Royal Business Centre, Park Royal Road; Westwood Business Centre, 98 Victoria Road; 28 - 30 Park Royal Road; 2 and 10 Cullen Way. Workspace request that these sites be identified for intensified economic development.

Response:

Suggestion noted. These sites are not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the

principle of employment use/intensification on these sites is established through the London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: These properties are characterised as being two/three stories in height and provide office and light industrial floor space. They are located north of the Underground Railway Line and in close proximity North Acton Underground Station. These are currently under-used however they have the potential for a significant increase in employment floor space. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. These sites are not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the principle of employment use/intensification on these sites is established through the London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Ransome & Company | Workspace group plc | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Workspace considers it important to promote the development of the emerging growth economies such as leisure, culture and the arts at these sites. These industries are thriving in West London and Workspace has experienced an increase in demand for artists and small cultural venues across London including Park Royal. The development of these industries will diversify the economy and improve the Borough's resilience to changes in the long-term economy. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. These sites are not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the principle of employment use/intensification on these sites is established through the London Plan 2011 and the Park Royal OAPF (January 2011). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| Nature of Comment: Comments re: Employment Land Review. The currently allocated site at Glade Lane falls within the geographic area of | | |

Site No.19 as defined in Figure 5.1 of the ELR report. Clear from associated text on pg. 53 of the ELR that the authors had not considered the land at Glade Lane separately from the main area of the Middlesex Business Centre. Given the size of the vacant allocation at Glade Lane it is surprising that reference is not made specifically to this land.

Response:

The Employment Land Review considers clusters of employment sites, and within each assessment addresses the functioning of each site. The site forms part of the wider Strategic Industrial Land as designated by the London Plan 2011.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The analysis on pg. 53 of the ELR is silent in respect of the currently vacant employment allocation at Glade Lane. This land is isolated from the remainder of the Middlesex Business Centre by virtue of the railway line to the north, Maypole Dock to the west, and the existing industrial site immediately to the north of the site. Because of these barriers the site can only be accessed via Glade Lane which is a quiet residential road. The site cannot therefore be regarded as forming part and parcel of the Middlesex Business Park and the boundary of Site No.19 should not have included the land at Glade Lane

Response:

The Employment Land Review considers clusters of employment sites, and within each assessment addresses the functioning of each site. The site forms part of the wider Strategic Industrial Land as designated by the London Plan 2011.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The employment allocation for Glade Lane is identified in the current UDP which was adopted in 2004. Despite this the land has not been taken up for employment use since this time and in our view is unlikely to be taken for this purpose in the future due to the constraints of the site. Not only is the site constrained by adjoining residential development an door accessibility making the site commercially unattractive.

Response:

The small triangle to the west of Glade Lane is allocated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011. The Council acknowledges the constraints of the site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity

Area Planning Framework.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: In view of the above it is considered that the recommendations in the ELR in respect of Site No.19 are not relevant to the land at Glade Lane and therefore should not prevent the land at Glade Lane coming forward for alternative forms of development more suited to the location. In our view the ELR should not preclude the proposed allocation SOU17 remaining in the development sites DPD (ELR recommends that there should be no rush to release Site No.19 for non-employment purposes).</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: This allocation will bring forward vacant and contaminated land for development in a manner which will enable the regeneration of the area and enhancement of the Canal side Park in a planned and comprehensive manner. The site could potentially deliver employment, much needed residential canal moorings and facilities, healthcare facilities and accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly and those requiring sheltered or close car housing.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. The small triangle to the west of Glade Lane is allocated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: A comprehensive master plan for the site has been developed in discussion with Council officers, the Environment Agency and British Waterways. |
| Response: Noted. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| Nature of Comment: Whilst the land to the west of Glade Lane included in SOU17 is currently identified as employment land in the UDP it is considered that this land, and the wider SOU17 site, are unsuitable for this use. The location of the site is considered unattractive commercially for employment development, as demonstrated by the fact that this land has not come forward for employment development despite its allocation for this purpose | | |
| Response: The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| Nature of Comment: The land is accessible via Havelock Road and Glade Lane which are residential roads. The use of the land for industrial purposes is further constrained by its proximity to residential properties as these roads are not considered appropriate to accommodate a large volume of traffic normally associated with industrial operations. | | |
| Response: The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

In terms of accessibility the site performs relatively poorly with a PTAL of 1b. The site is therefore considered unsuitable in terms of transportation for the high trip generation associated with office development as it is remote from transport hubs and could therefore encourage private car use, particularly during peak periods. Whilst the PTAL is low, the land is still accessible by a variety of travel modes including by foot, cycle and bus with linkages to Southall Rail Station.

Response:

The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The mix of uses proposed would provide employment outside the normal business use class categories, for example a nursing home would typically employ 50-60 persons, many of whom would be drawn from the local area

Response:

The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The type of person trips generated by the proposed mix of uses would typically involve a variety of different travel modes including car movements with occasional lorry deliveries, however these would be spread throughout the day avoiding peak congestion times and having less impact on the residential development surrounding the site. The transport infrastructure for the site is therefore considered more appropriate for the development uses proposed.

Response:

The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The canal related uses would provide ancillary facilities to serve canal users and mooring residents. Such uses are supported by the Blue Ribbon policies in the existing and emerging London Plan. There is high demand for residential moorings in the area with limited supply and the proposal will deliver up to 75 additional moorings and improve facilities for existing residents of Maypole Dock

Response:

The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:

The mix of uses proposed would enable the restoration of the contaminated Special Opportunity Site identified in the current UDP and bring this land into recreational use as well as improving the Canal side Park and increasing recreational opportunities for local residents and enhancing biodiversity

Response:

The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next

iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Bell Cornwell LLP (Michael de Courcy) | Maypole Dock Limited | SOU17 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The site could accommodate up to 75 residential mooring. In addition the site could accommodate up to 70 residential units.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The Council acknowledges the constraints of the small triangle of land to the west of Glade Lane site, and its future use will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD, and the former Special Opportunity Site allocated as Metropolitan Open Land in the Proposals Map. TThe Green Space Strategy does not support the net loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| BNP Paribas Real Estate (Lisa Bowden) | Royal Mail Group Ltd | NEW SITE |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Royal Mail's Ealing DO (Ealing Green, W5 5EH) is surrounding by a mix of uses including residential and college with open recreational land to the immediate west. Request that this site is included in the Development Sites DPD, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the reprovion/relocation of Royal Mail's operation prior to site redevelopment. This will ensure that Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their statutory obligations. The site is currently operational, but consider that there is potential for the site to be brought forward for a range of uses including residential, commerical and/or retail.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Suggestion noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as it does not contribute to the purpose of the Development Sites DPD and any change of use is most appropriately established through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| BNP Paribas Real Estate (Lisa Bowden) | Royal Mail Group Ltd | NEW SITE |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Royal Mail's West Ealing DO (Manor Road, W13 0HY) is located on the corner of Drayton Road and Manor Road. The site is predominately surrounded by residential uses and is located within close proximity to West Ealing Station. Request that this site is included in the Development Sites DPD, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the reprovision/relocation of Royal Mail's operation prior to site redevelopment. This will ensure that Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their statutory obligations. The site is currently operational, but consider that there is potential for the site to be brought forward for a range of uses including residential, commercial and/or retail.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Suggestion noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as it does not contribute to the purpose of the Development Sites DPD and any change of use is most appropriately established through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------------|----------------|
| BNP Paribas Real Estate (Lisa Bowden) | Royal Mail Group Ltd | NEW SITE |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Royal Mail's Hanwall DO (21A Edinburgh Road, W7 3JZ) is located off Southfield Cottages and predominately surrounded by residential uses. Request that this site is included in the Development Sites DPD, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the reprovision/relocation of Royal Mail's operation prior to site redevelopment. This will ensure that Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their statutory obligations. The site is currently operational, but consider that there is potential for the site to be brought forward for residential use.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Suggestion noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as it does not contribute to the purpose of the Development Sites DPD and any change of use is most appropriately established through the planning application process.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| BNP Paribas Real Estate (Lisa Bowden) | Royal Mail Group Ltd | SOU15 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Royal Mail does not object to the inclusion of their site within the Beaconsfield Road/South Road. However, we request that for Royal Mail's Southall DO to come forward for development, it will be essential to relocate and re-provide Royal Mail's operations. As previously stated, this request is in line with the London Plan (adopted February 2008) which states that LPAs should develop local policies and criteria to manage their industrial land to ensure the provision of fit for purpose sites and achieve the efficient use of land (Policy 3B.4 Industrial Locations).</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Royal Mail has confirmed that operations will cease at the site in July 2012, and the premises have been sold in anticipation of this.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Bob Roscow | Bob Roscow | EAL |
| <p>Nature of Comment: A hook for Ealing - suggestions for any kind of 'must see' public feature in Ealing centre to act as a draw for visitors Suggestions/ideas include: Low wall tropical fish tank, window on the world - live screen showing a street in new york/paris, hanging gardens of Ealing, Ealing fountain, Ealing moving statues, Ealing streams, Ealing clockwork aquarium .</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Suggestions noted. These are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however comments have been passed to the Council's Regeneration Team.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| DMH Stallard (Geoff Smith) | Monopoli Trust | NEW SITE |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Land between 38-40 Uxbridge Road, Hanwell. 0.42ha site proposed for 5-6 residential dwellings. Currently shown on</p> | | |

Proposals Map as MOL; seek removal of designation as this land is not part of Hanwell Cemetery and is in separate ownership. The site is in a very sustainable location, being on major bus and cycle routes, and is within easy walking distance from Hanwell District Centre and Ealing Metropolitan Centre. It is also close to primary and secondary schools and recreation grounds.

Response:

Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and the Green Space Strategy does not recommend removal of this designation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------|--|----------------|
| Drivers Jonas Deloitte | London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) | EAL09 |

Nature of Comment:

The site is in close proximity to Ealing fire station which is locally listed and should therefore be conserved and protected. The LFB do not object in principle to a new development at this site they strongly suggest that any new development proposal is encouraged to consider the operations and local listing of the adjacent fire station. Operational traffic will be required to be kept to a minimum whilst on-street parking should be prohibited. It is also essential that traffic generated by the new development is firmly assessed within a Transport Assessment. Only through careful consideration of both traffic and parking can the proposal have a negligible impact on the LFB and its effective service.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect LFB requirements as detailed.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------------|--|----------------|
| Drivers Jonas Deloitte | London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) | EALX01 |

Nature of Comment:

The site is in close proximity to Ealing fire station which is locally listed and should therefore be conserved and protected. Any development proposal should be subject to the same considerations set out for EAL09. The site has been identified through the SHLAA for mixed-use residential and retail, but the details have not yet been outlined. The LFB request to be

informed and consulted on any further progress towards the delivery of these sites.

Response:

The final allocation will reflect LFB requirements as detailed.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| English Heritage | English Heritage | General |

Nature of Comment:

Development Sites DPDs provide a means of implementing Core Strategy spatial policies and objectives at a site level. As a general approach, English Heritage recommend that for each site any relevant heritage assets are identified (in text, and on a plan), along with consideration of their particular sensitivities and opportunities in relation to the development of the site. Information on historic significance can be drawn from the borough's conservation area appraisals and management plans.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The final allocations will include identification of any heritage assets relevant to the site, along with consideration of the particular sensitivities and opportunities in relation to the development of the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| English Heritage | English Heritage | General |

Nature of Comment:

For major sites, including any sites of particular historic interest, planning briefs could be established to guide this process further. Where appropriate, these could also provide more detail regarding appropriate locations for tall buildings however full details need to be provided in line with the EH/CABE Guidance (para 2.9)

Response:

Suggestion noted. Final allocations will contain guidance on the appropriateness and location of tall buildings.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | EAL30 |

Nature of Comment:

This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution.

Response:

Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: This site crosses the Grand Union Canal | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | GRE05 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | GRE06 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HAN01 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. The site is under construction and will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HANX01 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HANX02 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HAN04 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. The risk of groundwater pollution will be highlighted in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HAN05 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. |
| Response: Noted. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | HANX03 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. It not proposed to include this site in the next iteration of the DPD as the Development Strategy DPD identifies the site as Community Open Space and Green Corridor, precluding the possibility of residential development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | PER01 |
| Nature of Comment: This site lies in Flood Zone 3b, an area at a high risk of flooding that forms the functional flood plain. The River Brent runs through the centre of the site and it is also on a area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | SOU |
| Nature of Comment: All the allocated sites in Southall are in an area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: Adjacent to the Grand Union Canal | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| Nature of Comment: Sites over 1ha in Flood Zone 1 (low risk). There are a number of allocated sites over a hectare. A surface water FRA will be required as part of any application for these sites. THE FRA should demonstrate that the surface water run-off can be reduced to Greenfield rates (or a justification why this cannot be achieved). Additionally, the FRA will be required to demonstrate that the opportunity to maximise SUDS on site has been achieved, in accordance with Policy 4A.14 of the London Plan 2008 | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| Nature of Comment: Development adjacent to the River Brent. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Thames Drainage Bylaws, the prior written consent of the EA is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the banks of the River Brent, designated a 'main river' | | |
| Response: Noted. Relevant allocations will reflect this requirement. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

The majority of sites mentioned above are in an area that is at high risk of groundwater pollution. This is because the sites are located on minor aquifer. A minor aquifer is where the geology of the area is made up of permeable layers. As a result it is very easy for pollutants to enter the water supply. In this area the aquifer is capable of supporting water supplies at a local level and forming an important source of base flow to rivers. Any application for development at the above sites will require a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) as part of the planning application. A PRA is designed to assess the level of potential risk presented to the groundwater on the site.

Response:

Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------|----------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Grand Union Canal. Any development should provide a 5 metre set back from the Grand Union Canal to ensure biodiversity in that area is protected and enhanced in accordance with PPS9.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Noted. Relevant allocations will reflect this requirement.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------|----------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Would welcome the opportunity comment on the Sustainability Appraisal document once it has been produced.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Noted.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------|----------------|
| Environment Agency (Katie Arthur) | Environment Agency | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Did not receive a Sequential Test to accompany the Sites document, Would welcome the opportunity to comment on this document also.</p> | | |
| <p>Response:</p> | | |

Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Frogmore (Hanne Puttonen) | Property owner | EAL14 |
| Nature of Comment: The Westel House site has been vacant since 2007 and extant planning permission for office development is no viable in current economic climate. Given this background and the Town Centre location of the site, the current allocation of suitable uses is too narrow. A greater residential and /or other mixed use options should be considered in order to encourage the redevelopment this prominent site. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will include revised site boundaries to reflect recent permission on the site for residential and hotel development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Frogmore (Hanne Puttonen) | Property owner | EAL14 |
| Nature of Comment: Much greater quantum of office space already existing on the site than what is suggested in the site allocation. Given Town Centre allocation and high public transport accessibility much denser development can be achieved and will be required in order for an economically viable scheme to be achieved. Wider selection of uses should also be considered. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The next iteration of the DPD will include revised site boundaries to reflect recent permission on the site for residential and hotel development. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: GSK fully endorses the proposals for mixed use redevelopment of the land within the proposed Greenford Green Special Opportunity Site (SOS). It is essential that in taking forward the proposed mix of uses (employment, residential, hotel and country/leisure) that sufficient flexibility is retained. If the mix of uses is too prescriptive this could hinder the regeneration | | |

| |
|--|
| of the site. |
| Response: Support noted. The final allocation will contain sufficient flexibility to support regeneration of the site. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|----------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: The site specific policy must be consistent with proposed policy 4.2 of the Development Strategy which proposes the a SPD will be prepared to guide the future re-development of the site. This will also ensure that the site specific policy is consistent with policy in the emerging Replacement London Plan relating to the strategically co-ordinated release of employment land within a defined SIL. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will ensure consistency with relevant Development Strategy policies. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|----------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: Layout and design should be based on a proper review of the site constraints and opportunities as well as market demand for uses. These issues also need to be explored and resolved through engagement with landowners in consultation with the Council and statutory consultees. | | |
| Response: Agreed. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---|----------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: It is noted that the proposed potential net residential units identified is 326 dwellings. However, it is unclear how this | | |

number has been calculated and the site is not identified within the London wide strategic housing availability assessment. The proposed quantum of net residential units should be based on a proper assessment of the site as described above.

Response:

The final allocation will not include potential net residential units as it is not the purpose of the Sites DPD to undertake detailed assessments of capacity. The figure of 326 was an estimate based on site area, PTAL and mix of uses.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:

No net retail floor space is proposed. As part of the future redevelopment of the SoS some retail floor space may be appropriate to serve the development and wider area as appropriate. The policy should allow retail floor space as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:

We note that the quantum of potential net office floor space is TBC and therefore allows for flexibility in the redevelopment of the GSK-owned land. However we would comment that the quantum of net office floor space should be determined primarily by market demand

Response:

Support noted. The final allocation will not detail specific quantum of development to ensure policies are flexible.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Iceni Projects | Stolkin Properties LTD (SPL) (Formally GSK) | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:

We note that the quantum of potential net industrial floor space is TBC and therefore allows for flexibility in the redevelopment of the GSK-owned land. However we would comment that the quantum of net office floor space should be determined primarily by market demand

Response:

Support noted. The final allocation will not detail specific quantum of development to ensure policies are flexible.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

My client supports the proposed designation of site PAR01A for residential-led mixed use development. The site is one of few cleared sites within the Southern Gateway area and has been vacant for over ten years. Redevelopment is not hindered by any existing uses/occupiers or by any significant environmental issues such as noise/air pollution and land contamination. It is located close to North Acton station entrance, local shops and Acton Cemetery.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

Discussions have taken place with Ealing's Planning and Regeneration Team over the last two years regarding the redevelopment of the site and a residential-led mixed use scheme has now reached an advance pre-application stage. My client intends to submit an application shortly. The site is therefore deliverable at an early stage of the plan period.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

The proposed designation is consistent with the Mayor's Park Royal OAPF and the Park Royal Southern Gateway

| |
|---|
| Position Statement. |
| Response: Support noted. The Mayor adopted the Park Royal OAPF in January 2011. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |
| Nature of Comment: The London SHLAA identifies an allocated housing site in Victoria Road in Phase 4. In view of the advanced stage of preparation for submission of an application on this vacant site, my client considers the site should be allocated in an earlier stage. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The phasing indicated in the SHLAA is indicative only. The 2010/11 Housing Trajectory considered that 500 units were deliverable in the first five years of Development Strategy in the Southern Gateway. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |
| Nature of Comment: The SHLAA identified the potential for 977 new units on Victoria Road. The Sites DPD identifies 1500 units as the potential net additional residential units within the Southern Gateway. The Sites DPD should identify potential net additional units (and non-residential floor space) on a site by site basis, in order to facilitate the spatial objectives for the Southern Gateway. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide further detail on built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Park Royal OAPF identifies potential net additional units and non-residential floorspace over the Southern Gateway as a whole, and the Development Sites DPD will retain this flexibility rather than allocate specific quantum on a site-by-site basis. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

The pre-application submissions for site PAR01A show it is capable of accommodating approximately 250 units, together with ground floor commercial space. Site PAR01A should be designated as 'high density residential-led mixed use development' and the potential net additional residential units and commercial floor space should be identified specific to this site.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide further detail on built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Park Royal OAPF identifies potential net additional units and non-residential floorspace over the Southern Gateway as a whole, and the Development Sites DPD will retain this flexibility rather than allocate specific quantum on a site-by-site basis.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

My client supports the spatial objective which seeks to located the majority of new residential units in the northern part of the Southern Gateway, furthest from the area of potential noise and pollution, in accordance with PPS23 and PPG24

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Harper Planning | First Network | PAR01A |

Nature of Comment:

The status accorded to the 'North Acton Station Square/Public Realm Strategy Draft (July 2010)' is questioned as a background document for the site allocation. This document does not form part of the LDF evidence base and has not been subject to public consultation

Response:

The next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will clarify the status of the proposed North Acton Station Square, to ensure adequate public consultation is carried out.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Mathew Mainwaring | Indigo Planning | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: 2 Creswick Road, Acton, W3 9HD. Current use single dwelling on 0.28ha site. Planning application for 8 family dwellings to be submitted December 2010 | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the principle of residential development is established by the current residential use on the site, and it is a small site with the capacity to deliver less than 10 units. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: The land to the rear of 79 – 101 Uxbridge Road was the subject of recent appeal decision (APP/A5270/A/10/2129134). It was accepted by the Inspector that the buildings to the front of the site are unlikely to come forward in the foreseeable future. This is due to the multiple ownerships involved (32 freehold and leasehold interests) which make land assembly unrealistic. The land to the rear is capable of development and should not be held back pending the unlikely prospect of comprehensive development. This will inevitably restrict the quantum of development that the site can generate and the mix of uses. It is likely that the site will be developed for a single use with residential being the most appropriate. | | |
| Response: The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN03 |
| Nature of Comment: We are looking at a revised scheme in light of the Inspector's comments which will inform the amount and form of | | |

development on the site and would hope to bring this forward for pre-application discussion in the next few weeks.

Response:

The site will be removed from future versions of the Development Sites DPD. Planning permission P/2011/3777 (pending legal agreement) for residential to rear of site. Remaining land fronting Uxbridge Road small site most appropriately brought forward through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:

As a key landowner my client supports the principle of comprehensive redevelopment. There is a highly realistic prospect of the land coming forward for development within the plan period. We agree that there is the potential for a mixed use scheme.

Response:

Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:

Given the nature of the site and the space around the building on three sides there is scope for a significant building at the entrance to the supermarket car park. A well designed building of greater height than others in the area could provide an attractive and strong feature in this location.

Response:

The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, responding to the local character of the area.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:
Residential use is the most likely viable use for the upper floors in this location. 40 to 50 units would be more appropriate.

Response:
The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The Council considers that the mix of uses on this town centre site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:
This is a realistic figure for retail on the ground floor to provide vitality and interest for any scheme, particularly at street level.

Response:
Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Hanwell Motors (Mr S Brown) | HAN04 |

Nature of Comment:
We support this figure provided it is not a requirement. It should allow flexibility for either residential or office use or a mix of the two. As such the figure is potentially on the low side.

Response:
The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Scott Consultancy | Sorbon Homes Limited | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

Land at Twyford Sports Ground, Twyford Ave, Acton W3 9QA. Site is 1.5ha, currently derelict and unused for a number of years. Formerly part of the British Gas Sports and Social Club. Proposed use for residential and sports/leisure; available immediately. Submitted summary of proposals by Shanley Home for land adjacent to Wasps Training Ground. Propose 9 detached house on northern half of the site with the southern half as playing fields. Site history set out in SPG6 Twyford Avenue Community Open Space. The bulk of the former sports and social club is now used by Wasps Rugby Club. The area of land subject to these representations is in separate ownership. It was previously used as tennis courts and a bowling green. Some of the structures associated with this remain. The land is currently designated as Community Open Space.

Response:

Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the land is designated as Community Open Space and the Development Strategy retains this designation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Brendan O'Connor | Network Rail | General |

Nature of Comment:

Where developments are to be carried out that will increase the demand upon the railway infrastructure, for example by increase passenger patronage, it is felt that S106 agreements should seek to mitigate the developments' impact in accordance with Circular 5/05. To the end, Network Rail should be considered as a future beneficiary of S106 money from developments that will impact upon it. This would allow Network Rail to carry out works to improve station facilities and address capacity issues raised by the additional demand.

Response:

S106 is considered through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Brendan O'Connor | Network Rail | General |

Nature of Comment:

Works to enable Crossrail are planned through the Ealing borough and includes works at Acton, Ealing Broadway, West Ealing & Southall stations. Network Rail would like to take this opportunity to re-iterate that development proposals near these stations or the railway line should seek consultation from Crossrail limited.

Response:

Noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Brendan O'Connor | Network Rail | ACT03 |
| Nature of Comment: Part of this site allocation (to the south adjacent to the railway line) is owned by Network Rail and used in connection with the operation of the railway. As such, the land is not available for development and we would request it is not included in the ACT03 development site. It is considered that the allocation (for development) of this section of land would fail the test of soundness as it is neither effective nor justified (as outlined in PPS 12) as it includes key rail infrastructure. | | |
| Response: The portion of land under Network Rail ownership required for key rail infrastructure will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) | Tesco Stores Ltd | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Tesco Store and town centre car park, Greenford Road, The Broadway and Oldfield Lane South, Greenford UB6 8QY. Site are 1.2ha, current use retail and town centre car park. Approval for redevelopment (with part retention of existing buildings) by recetio of a building on 3 levels to provide a large retail store; A1/A2/A3 community use units; car parking on two levels .The site is currently within UDP Development Site 85 where the preferred uses include retail, parking, community, etc. We consider that the site should be included within the Development Sites DPD, with the preferred uses to reflect the scheme approved by the Planning Committee on 22 April 2009 | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the acceptability of the proposed allocation has been established through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

I know the cost of redeveloping / building above the current station was mentioned as extremely expensive, but how about the cost of relocating the station to between The Broadway and Springfield Road. I have looked on Google maps and it looks very possible, including extending the District Line under Haven Green, and would be extremely low impact for commuters with a simple 'switch over' when complete. We must do something bigger and better for the Crossrail connectivity and to make Ealing station state-of-the-art and future proof.

Response:

The possibility of a bus station on the site, centred over Network Rail tracks, was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

All the options all make the area very disconnected from the current Ealing Broadway Shopping Centre. I propose one or two sky walks over the Uxbridge Road to connect the new development to the current Shopping Centre and make one fantastic shopping area. I think the new development should be totally enclosed and have no gaps instead having big corridors internally. Also a sky walk to connect the development to the Spring Bridge Road Car Park

Response:

The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Details such as covered walkways and sky ways most appropriately considered via the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

I think the Spring Bridge Road Car Park should be extended west over the track to increase capacity considerably, all the way to Longfield Avenue, with an entrance/exit there, to provide fantastic Crossrail/Council/Town Hall parking. This could also be integrated with the new development behind the Town Hall providing traffic free access to the development/station

Response:

The possibility of an integrated transport interchange on the site, centred over Network Rail tracks, was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: With the sky walks, I think it would then make it possible, and in keeping with the area, to develop to the same or possibly one or two levels higher than the current shopping centre. I say one or two as I believe this could give fantastic views over Ealing for conferencing/restaurants/bars/clubs. The second would be best totally glazed for minimal impact. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Details such as covered walkways and sky ways most appropriately considered via the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: I think an active ground floor to Haven Green is essential but this could be part of the new shopping centre | | |
| Response: Support noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: I believe the best opportunity for high rise/residential buildings is opposite the current Ealing Broadway Station entrance, as this is furthest away from the church spire, especially as viewed from Haven Green. I think the entire section along the eastern edge should be 9 storeys as Villiers House and provide wonderful residential and penthouses to attract the very best people to Ealing. I think you could get at least 300 flats along there. | | |
| Response: The Development Management DPD will contain guidance on tall buildings. In particular, it will distinguish between tall buildings and landmark buildings, which are considered distinct in that there is no presumption that a landmark building is also a tall building. Should a site be considered as providing an opportunity for a tall building or landmark structure, this will be detailed in the allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Robert Balaam | Robert Balaam | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: I think there is also a great opportunity to widen the Uxbridge Road the entire length for a Bus Station, providing great connectivity and also reducing Haven Green congestion. | | |
| Response: There are no proposals to widen the Uxbridge Road. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Savills (L&P) Ltd (Guy Dixon) | Savills (L&P) Ltd (Guy Dixon) | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: Clayponds Village, Sterling Place, Ealing, London W5 4RA. Site area is 1.8ha, current use student housing. ICL are currently reviewing their various sites which provide student accommodation across London. This process will result in the rationalisation of their sites with some being partially or entirely released from core student accommodation use. Accordingly ICL seek a formal site allocation for Clayponds Village at Sterling Place to enable them to release this site, in full or in part, to open market housing. Site available immediately/within 5 years. Currently there are 138 units on site; anticipate that it would be possible to provide a further 40 dwellings through infill/minor redevelopment which, along with the potential change of use, reinforces the requirement for this site submission at this stage. A similar submission was made to the London SHLAA call for site in December 2008. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the current use of the site is a form of residential, therefore the principle of residential use is established allowing the site to be brought forward through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | GRE04 |
| Nature of Comment: The 'Location and Access' details miss the towpath link that runs through the area, and connects it as a sustainable walking and cycling route to other waterside residential/commercial sites. | | |

Response:
The final allocation will highlight the towpath link.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:
Under 'Description', the northern and southern parts of the site are described as being separated by the GUC – we would prefer that the canal was thought of as joining and bringing together these areas – as Sir Terry Farrell described the waterways: “connecting not dividing communities”.

Response:
The final allocation will consider the role of the canal.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | GRE04 |

Nature of Comment:
The site benefits from having the Grand Union Canal at its centre, that can be utilised to be a unique feature and resource to support the amenity needs of the local community.

Response:
The final allocation will consider the role of the canal.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | HAN02 |

Nature of Comment:
This site has a long canal frontage, located on the towpath side, and should therefore make the best possible use of its waterside location to enhance the environment of the GUC. We consider that the retaining wall at the back of the towpath should be opened up to better integrate the waterside with the development.

Response:
The site is under construction, with scheduled completion in 2012/13, and will be removed from future iterations of the

DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU01 |
| Nature of Comment: With regard to location and access, the towpath should be recognised as a sustainable walking and cycling link. The Grand Union Canal and its towpath is a great asset for existing and future residents of this estate, but any redevelopment should incorporate enhancements to the waterway in order to make it a safe and welcoming environment that encourages use for sustainable transport and amenity. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will recognise the towpath as a sustainable walking and cycling link, and ensure that redevelopment proposals incorporate enhancements to the Canal to encourage its use. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: British Waterways submitted detailed comments on the proposals for this site, but were disappointed that the Mayor did not take forward our request for a contribution towards the waterway environment. We consider that the waterside is a very important element of the site, and the towpath should be carefully integrated into the development to promote interaction with the canal environment. The towpath is in a poor condition and would not be suitable for accommodating the expected increased numbers of visitors from the redeveloped site using it as a valuable transport link and amenity resource, and should therefore be addressed as part of the works. | | |
| Response: The detail of planning applications is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU03 |
| Nature of Comment: We also commented that the redevelopment of the site should comprehensively include enhancements to the surrounding area to include dealing with the contamination on part of the land adjacent to the Minet Country Park, which is likely to | | |

remain unusable unless dealt with as part of a regeneration project of this size.

Response:

The detail of planning applications is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU09 |
| Nature of Comment: The Grand Union Canal towpath forms an important walking and cycling link alongside this site. We feel that the requirement to be 'sensitive to the canal' should be clarified. Development should address the canal to encourage integration and promote a welcoming waterside environment. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The final allocation will clarify the relationship of the site to the canal. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU09 |
| Nature of Comment: We also consider that this site should be incorporated with Adelaide Dock to the east (freehold ownership by LB Ealing and long leasehold interest by BW), as an opportunity for a more comprehensive redevelopment to enable better public access and integration to the adjacent canal, which the Planning Inspectorate, in his report, made several references to as an asset to the site. Adelaide Dock is currently used by operation staff although BW is in a position to rationalise its operational use of this site and would therefore like to see a residential-led development which also incorporates BW's operational requirements. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU10 |
| Nature of Comment: As above, this site should be incorporated with Salisbury Depot and Adelaide Dock in a comprehensive redevelopment that maximises the opportunities of the waterway environment. | | |

Response:
Suggestion noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU11 |

Nature of Comment:
The Grand Union Canal and its towpath should be mentioned as part of the site considerations here.

Response:
This site is not in close proximity to the Canal.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU17 |

Nature of Comment:
There is high demand and a chronic shortage of residential moorings in London, so British Waterways would support a new canal and moorings here.

Response:
Support noted. The future potential of the area to support a new canal and moorings will be considered through the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU18 |

Nature of Comment:
This site was not a former boatyard, and was sold on a long lease, so it is not relevant to refer to British Waterways.

Response:
Comment noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOU18 |

Nature of Comment:

We have previously objected to the introduction of a “5m buffer zone” here, which prevents the site properly integrating with the waterside, and does not guarantee improved biodiversity. We have experience of managing and enhancing ecological habitats throughout our network of waterways, reservoirs and docks, and have found that a more flexible approach to providing biodiversity improvements than a blanket “buffer zone” can be more productive and ensure that the full, multifunctional nature of the waterways are promoted in sustainable developments. The Inspector’s recent appeal decision on this site did not specify specifically that a buffer zone should be incorporated, and we consider that alternative ecologically beneficial measures should be assessed, which we would be happy to help in the design of.

Response:

Planning application P/2010/1894 was granted on appeal, and the site will be removed from future iterations of the DPD. The details of planning applications are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOUX01 |

Nature of Comment:

This site benefits from a very long canal frontage, and there is therefore a great opportunity to create a high quality waterside development that enhances the canal environment. It is situated on the towpath side of the canal and the waterside could therefore integrate well with a high quality public realm within the site, as at Sheldon Square in Paddington. It could also incorporate waterside uses such as the floating classroom, floating café boats, business barges, and other visiting commercial uses such as the Puppet Barge or Sandwich Barge.

Response:

Suggestions noted. This site is not proposed to be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOUX02 |

Nature of Comment:

This site also benefits from a long canal frontage, close to Willow Tree Marina, and could be opened up to fully maximise the opportunities presented by the asset of the waterway. In most cases the canal no longer has an important functional relationship with industrial uses as it did when it was first built, and such industrial employment uses can be a poor neighbour, detracting from the amenity of the waterway and failing to make the best use of the opportunities presented by the canal. We would therefore support the change of use of the site to a residential or residential-led mixed use, that

opened up the canal to use by the local community, residents and visitors, and more positively exploited its assets for economic, social and environmental improvement.

Response:

Suggestions noted. This site is not proposed to be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOUX03 |

Nature of Comment:

Again, the waterside frontage of this site should be positively exploited as an asset to improve the canal environment.

Response:

Suggestions noted. This site is not proposed to be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | SOUX03 |

Nature of Comment:

We would recommend that the adjacent waterside employment sites be considered for inclusion for a more comprehensive waterside redevelopment.

Response:

Suggestions noted. This site is not proposed to be included in future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:

NORWOOD YARD - This site is owned by BW and BW's joint venture company, H2O Urban, and planning permission was recently granted for a residential scheme (reference P/2007/4416).

Response:

Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the acceptability of the proposed allocation has been established through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
| Claire McAlister | British Waterways London | NEW SITE |
| Nature of Comment: NORWOOD VAUXHALL GARAGE, POPLAR AVENUE - This site is owned by BW. There is currently a lease on the site to a car dealership, however BW has aspirations to redevelop the site in the future. Given the constraints for the site (e.g. site access) for employment uses, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Urban Task Force report 2005, BW believes a residential development would improve the canal setting and enable the site to take advantage of its canal side location. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the proposed change of use on a small site is most appropriately considered through the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Carmelle Bell | Thames Water Plc | General |
| Nature of Comment: Thames Water are unable to determine the infrastructure needs of all the developments contained within the document. Thames Water would be happy to work with the Borough and provide more detail at the site specific/preferred options stage when more information is available but in very general terms it is easier to provide infrastructure for a small number of large clearly defined sites than it is for a large number of smaller less defined sites. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary to provide the infrastructure. | | |
| Response: Suggestion noted. The next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will focus on large, clearly defined sites. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Carmelle Bell | Thames Water Plc | General |
| Nature of Comment: We have concerns regarding Water Supply Capability in relation to the development sites proposed in the Plan. Specifically, the water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from development, particularly in relation to the South Acton Trading Estate, Arcadia and Dickens Yard. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations of the impact of the development in liaison with the developer once the scale of each development is known (this will also apply to a number of the other sites in the plan). | | |

Response:

The next iteration of the DPD will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site to support Thames Water in forward planning. The Development Sites DPD will provide broad capacity indicators, however the scale of individual developments is confirmed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Carmelle Bell | Thames Water Plc | General |

Nature of Comment:

We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to the sites proposed in the draft Plan. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all these development sites. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the developments in liaison with the individual developers once the scale of each development has been determined. It is likely that infrastructure upgrades will be required to serve development and it is vital that these are in place ahead of occupation if internal/external flooding of property is to be avoided. In order to fully understand the level of upgrade required, studies would have to be undertaken

Response:

The next iteration of the DPD will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site to support Thames Water in forward planning. The Development Sites DPD will provide broad capacity indicators, however the scale of individual developments is confirmed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Carmelle Bell | Thames Water Plc | General |

Nature of Comment:

Whilst Thames Water has no objections to the initial proposals, we request that the Council ensures appropriate consideration is made to the Thames Tunnel scheme during progression of the emerging Development Sites DPD due to the project's national, regional and local importance.

Response:

The Development Strategy DPD reflects the importance of the Thames Tunnel scheme.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|------------------|-----|
| Carmelle Bell | Thames Water Plc | ACT |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The site at Acton Storm Tanks, which is situated within the London Borough of Ealing, has been identified as our preferred site. Two other short listed sites have also been identified outside the borough, but these are not preferred. We do not propose for the inclusion of the Acton Storm Tanks as a new site within the Development Site DPD due to the initial current stage of the Thames Tunnel project, which may be subject to change following the results of our Phase 1 consultation. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will reflect progress on the Thames Tunnel as appropriate. | | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| This 'confection' a feature of London's Regional Spatial Plan is the source of much of our dissatisfaction with the LDF. For three years now WEN has campaigned about the clear logicity and artificiality of 'lumping' West Ealing centre with Ealing centre together to create the EMTC | | |
| Response: | | |
| The boundary of Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The plethora of documents which attempt to present EMTC preferred land use options and certainties do not present a cohesive picture. Crucially Tibbalds' latest of its EMTC spatial proposals describes four different 'Scenarios' as to where and how much residential, retail, 'town centre', and office space might exist in a future EMTC. But the Development Sites documents present us with certainty as to the location and quantum of preferred use. Tibbalds selects one of these Scenarios as its preferred choice, but we can find no reference in any of the documents as to what choice of Scenario the Council has made (if indeed any choice has been made). Only at the Arcadia site do both the Tibbalds and the Development Sites documents present us with site development Options (four of them). Sadly the Options sets in each document are significantly different. One might also assume that there would be some 'mapping' between the four site | | |

Options with the four EMTC Scenarios. This information should it exist — is not however presented to the reader.

Response:

The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

WEN objects to the proposal for sites in the West Ealing section of the EMTC which promote the destruction of buildings and frontages to provide housing or mixed uses with little thought to buildings of merit, environmental or urban improvements needed, and the provision of amenity space or social infrastructure.

Response:

The final allocation will provide further detail on built form and design details to a level appropriate within a DPD, including identifying the buildings and facades of architectural/heritage value. The Development Management DPD will contained detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including amenity requirements.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

The architecture in central West Ealing includes some attractive frontages to the Broadway and side streets. Any further development should reflect the local character without a lot of people in a polluted, unattractive environment. Buildings of character along the shopping street range in age from Victorian, Edwardian and 1920/30s tiled frontages of which the former Woolworth building at 96 Broadway is the most splendid and 156 Broadway, already locally listed, the most attractively restored.

Response:

Agreed. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix and reflect the local character of the area.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Ealing Council wants to demolish over 50 shops at 11 'Development Sites' on the Uxbridge Road in the centre of West Ealing over the next 15 years. These will be replaced by residential blocks many of which will have new shops at ground level. There are another seven residential developments planned close to the Uxbridge Road in West Ealing. An estimated 3,500 new residents in total will occupy the 1,245 new homes (mostly flats). It is by no means clear as to how many new shops will be built; what the size of these new shops will be; or in fact who, if anybody, will occupy these new shops | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| No rationale is provided in the plans as to why so many new housing sites and why many of these particular sites have been chosen for 'development'. There is no discussion whatsoever as to whether shop owners and occupiers want their shops demolished or whether they will return to re-occupy the new shops. | | |
| Response: | | |
| The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. Not all sites included in the Initial Proposals version of the DPD will be taken forward in the final version of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| WEN objects to the proposed overdevelopment of West Ealing centre and the lack of community involvement in selecting the sites for demolition/development. Ealing's Statement of Community Involvement 2006 2.4 says that '..the Council will undertake community involvement which is. . . based on the earliest possible involvement and sense of ownership of local policy decisions'. This policy has clearly been breached and with regards to the housing/retail plan for the centre of West | | |

Ealing the Ealing 2026 LDF is unfit for purpose.

Response:

Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The feedback from the consultation on the Initial Proposals will be taken into account in determining those sites taken forward in the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: The Ealing 2026 LDF proposes that the preferred use of 18 Development Sites in the centre of West Ealing involves the building of 1,245 new homes over the next 15 years. Some 3,500 new residents will live in these new homes. There are two State Primary Schools in the centre of West Ealing - St John's and Drayton Green. Neither of the schools has vacancies in four of the seven school Years, with the maximum vacancies in any one year being for four children in Year 5 at Drayton Green. There are no plans in the LDF to expand these schools or to build a new Primary School in the centre of West Ealing. | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Fielding Primary (to the south of West Ealing centre) has no vacancies in five of the seven school Years. The capacity of this school has recently been raised to a staggering 870 children and the LDF plan to add another form of entry can only be described as excessive. Hathaway Primary (to the north of West Ealing centre) has no vacancies in two of the seven school Years, but does have 24 vacancies in Year 6. Although there is Council owned open land immediately adjacent to the school there is no LDF plan to expand this school. | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: There is no State Secondary School in West Ealing and no LDF plans to build one. | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: There are three State Secondary Schools in the neighbouring town of Hanwell - Drayton Manor, Brentside High and Elthorne Park. There are currently no vacancies in any of the Years at any of the schools. There are no LDF plans to expand pupil numbers at Drayton Manor or Brentside. There were LDF plans to expand Elthorne High but National Government recently cut the funding for this expansion | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: There also appears to be no land allocation in West Ealing for the building of any private schools. | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: The Ealing 2026 LDF Development Strategy 1.2 (c) states that the LDF should 'deliver the right level of for growth'. With 3,500 new West Ealing centre residents planned to arrive by 2026, the 'right' level of State Primary and Secondary education infrastructure has not been planned to accommodate this residential growth. As such the West Ealing 2026 | | |

LDF is not fit for purpose in this regard.

Response:
The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The Ealing 2026 LDF proposes the building of 1,245 new homes in the centre of West Ealing. This will bring 1,200 new residents into Green Man Lane Estate alone and 3,500 in total to West Ealing centre. There are no plans to build a new healthcare facility in West Ealing and no site has been identified for this purpose.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The provision of healthcare facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Although 'reprovisioning' of the NHS Grosvenor House and Mattock Lane healthcare centres is proposed in the LDF there is no mention of any spatial expansion at either site. In fact at a public meeting to discuss the ultimately abortive Daniels healthcare centre in 2008 the NHS said it would be impossible to develop the Mattock Lane site</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The provision of healthcare facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The Ealing 2026 LDF Development Strategy 1.2 (c) states that the LDF should 'deliver the right levels of infrastructure for growth'. This condition has clearly not been met in terms of new healthcare infrastructure to support the 3,500 new residents in central west Ealing. As such the Ealing 2026 LDF is unfit for purpose.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The provision of healthcare facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- The Drayton Court Hotel - Development on this site has just commenced to convert it to a 27 bedded hotel. | | |
| Response: Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- Manor Building, Manor Road Planning permission was granted on this site months ago for the building of 38 flats. | | |
| Response: Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- Daniels/Lovelace House, Uxbridge Road - 3,556 sq In of newly built retail space has remained empty now for over two years. The site is a boarded up eyesore and a crying waste of built space. The LDF offers no mention of the space and no suggestions as to what other 'preferred use' options might be entertained. Clearly there has been no interest shown by | | |

anyone in terms of retail use.

Response:

Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- West London Islamic Centre, Singapore Road - Planning permission has been granted to build what will certainly be the most visually distinctive new building in West Ealing centre for a generation a Middle Eastern style mosque. The Islamic Centre is part of a development (EAL32) which includes BHS, half of Brownlow Road and half of Chigwell Place. 'Religious' is not one of the 'Options' quoted so the future of the site remains a mystery to WEN. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and make reference to the mosque. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: Even within the confines of West Ealing no developments are proposed for north West Ealing or south West Ealing. There are no plans to demolish shops on Northfield Avenue and replace them with blocks of flats and new shops. Ironically, in our view, the most successful West Ealing implementation of the new block of shops approach is at the old ESSO garage site on Northfield Avenue — and not on the Uxbridge Road in the centre of West Ealing. | | |
| Response: Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>If these Development Sites on the Uxbridge Road in West Ealing are indeed developed -involving the demolition of many existing shops - many independent traders will be forced out and are unlikely to return to occupy the much more expensive new shops (many months later). If lots of new traders subsequently occupy these new shops then the 'damage' will only be one of possibly changing the retail profile. However, if few new traders take up the expensive new leases the damage of 10s of empty shops in West Ealing centre will be considerable.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. Rental rates and lease arrangements are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL03 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>WEN would like this estate to be renovated and successfully managed on-site. We object to the demolition being proposed and the passage of ownership of 1.6 hectares from the public to the private sector. The demolition could well remove the mental health drop-in centre with no commitment to replace it.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The selected development partner will carry out extensive consultation on proposals as these become available.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>Tibbalds and the 'Arcadia Site Options' leaflet claim that the Arcadia site (EAL05) 'is the most notable development opportunity in Ealing Metropolitan Centre'. This clearly isn't true as the creation and development of an integrated transport hub around Ealing Broadway Station is the most notable development opportunity in the centre of Ealing. Without this integrated transport hub no significant growth in the numbers of centre residents, workers or visitors is safe,</p> | | |

feasible or desirable.

Response:

Funding has been secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

The spatial requirements of the integrated transport hub should take precedence over any considerations as to changes to buildings and land use which currently make up the UDP defined Arcadia site. North/south traffic flows are poor in the centre of Ealing and it's not safe or sensible to allow more residents, workers and visitors into the centre without making some major changes to the transport infrastructure. We can no longer contemplate the entry and exit to the station being a major vehicular traffic flow. The land between the south eastern tip of Haven Green and The Mall (the north/south bit of 'The Broadway') needs to be banned to traffic and pedestrians. . It's possible that the one-time BBC car park could be converted into an east/west road. It's also possible that a new road could be built from the western end of Madeley Road to The Mall (entering it where Carmelite House now stands).

Response:

The possibility of an integrated transport interchange on the site was considered in the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (August 2010) and ruled out as undeliverable.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:

A new Development Site should be created which joins together EAL05 with EAL 07 into one single mixed use Development Site. The mixed uses could be integrated transport hub (bus station, train/tube station, atrium with retail, private car/taxi/mini-cab pick-up and drop off), offices, homes and retail.

Response:

Suggestion noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Of the four Options proposed by Tibbalds the least awful of the four is Option 2. However the building heights proposed are too high; the retail space is too much and probably unachievable in terms of occupancy; and the commercial/office space also looks on the high side. | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL10 |
| Nature of Comment: Seventy homes to be built here. The 25 units permitted on Genesis Housing Site look complete. The Salvation Army Citadel in Leeland Road has attractive facades to both Leeland Road and Leeland Terrace and we request it is listed. The Barclays Bank building also has attractive features and we request it to be listed. We object to any additional units now that the Genesis flats are virtually complete and there are important facades and locally listed buildings. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. Existing development does not preclude a redevelopment of the site. The part of the site which includes locally listed buildings and buildings of heritage value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: The site description is inaccurate and offensive. 'The site comprises one-storey buildings occupied by small businesses. The site is currently under utilized comprising a mixture of rundown, retail, take-way and business units. This site is in contrast to the Waitrose and residential development on the opposite side of Drayton Green Road' - Less than 10% of the site is one-storey small businesses. The West Ealing Heel Bar, the hot chicken take-away shop, Majestic Wine and the garage are all flourishing (not rundown) businesses. This is in sharp contrast to the new residential tower block across the | | |

road which is losing tenants because the lifts keep breaking down and the chronic damp problems in the lower floors.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the current use of the site

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL11 |

Nature of Comment:

Probably the ideal use of this 0.3 hectares of space would be as the West Ealing Crossrail Car Park. In order for access to this car park to be improved, the Five Roads barrier on Hastings Road will need to be removed to allow better access to from the south and east. (The opening-up and re-structuring of the Five Roads community will almost certainly be required in order to provide improved access to the new West Ealing Crossrail Station in Manor Road.)

Response:

Crossrail does not require this site for car parking facilities associated with West Ealing station. The five Roads barrier will not be removed on the road as this has been provided to prevent rat running through a residential area.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL12 |

Nature of Comment:

The Site Description is totally inaccurate. The building and the associated land behind the building have no association whatsoever with the adjacent International Presbyterian Church. WEN has campaigned consistently for the retention of the building and its conversion to some useful community facility which could include Affordable Housing or an expansion of the adjacent Drayton Green Primary School.

Response:

The site will be removed from the next iteration of the sites allocation as planning permission was granted under P/2011/4513

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL13 |

Nature of Comment:

Access Storage is the major storage facility in West Ealing. It is well used and should be retained Its current land use designation for storage should be retained.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL24 |

Nature of Comment:

This is a fairly modern building. WEN can not see the point in knocking it down. If there is dwindling office demand then conversion to residential would be acceptable.

Response:

Objection note. The site will be removed from future iterations of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL25 |

Nature of Comment:

Mixed use retail and commercial with potential net for 25 housing units. Planning permission for 7 residential units (PPI0812669) is more realistic than the 25 net increase proposed. The modern brick building is currently covered in scaffolding presumably to carry out the 2008 planning permission. We object to 18 additional units proposed, 7 is enough.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL26 |

Nature of Comment:

These are modem shop units with flats to the rear which limits capacity to redevelop. The modern brick row of shops is two storey with no room for amenity space or expansion of retail space. The property should be renovated not redeveloped. We object because there is no site area to increase retail at ground floor level and raising the roof to provide 40 new residential units would take light from the Hugh Clarke House an attractive 213 storey courtyard development for elderly people at the rear.

Response:

Objection noted. Site Allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land over the next 15 years. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. The allocation will be sufficiently flexible to allow refurbishment, redevelopment or a combination.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL27 |

Nature of Comment:

No.59-65 Broadway has a typical 1930s design of tiled frontage that should be retained. We object to the lack of consideration of local character. Conversion and renovation seems the most appropriate strategy for the south side of the road where low rise properties will provide a more attractive shopping environment with sunshine in winter

Response:

The final allocation will provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD, taking into account the local character/

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL28 |

Nature of Comment:

Broadway frontage is a designated shopping frontage and of facade value especially 91-97 so that rear access should be retained. Sainsbury's east facade is also a shopping frontage with an interesting sculptured wall which needs restoring. We consider the scope for redevelopment is limited and the housing/commercial uses depend on ELR which recommends the retention of mixed uses. Renovation for offices provides cheap accommodation.

Response:

The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site, and reflect the facade value of the buildings which will be removed from the site boundary.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL29 |

| |
|---|
| <p>Nature of Comment: Mixed use retail and commercial with potential for 24 units net, subject to review following ELR, which recommends mixed uses.</p> |
| <p>Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site, taking into account the recommendations of the ELR.</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL30 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Potential net residential units 50 & 250m² retail, local listed building (no 147 surgery). We object to the inclusion of 147-149 in the site.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The listing of 147 Grosvenor Surgery will be a consideration of the final allocation, and the Council will revise site boundaries appropriately.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL31 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: We object to the redevelopment of this four-storey modern development with four shop units to provide 40 units when it is more appropriate for a more limited number of flats.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EAL32 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: The proposal suggests a net potential of 78 units and 800m² retail floor space. Land at the rear on Singapore Road is a</p> | | |

mosque site which is to be redeveloped for Muslim community facilities in addition to the Mosque. British Home Stores at 104 –110 Broadway is already developed over all the site area east of Brownlow Road, leaving 1-10 Chigwell Place for redevelopment for 78 housing units and 800 m2 of retail floor space. We object to an overdevelopment of the small part of the site in Chignell Road.

Response:

Objection noted. Any site allocation will be sensitive to existing uses on the site. No planning application has been submitted to the Council for the building of a new mosque and community facilities. BHS will be removed from the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EALX01 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Incredibly, no mention is made of the existence, or the proposed fate of the Government Job Centre at 86-92 Uxbridge Road! On just 0.5 hectares 149 flats would occupy quite a tall residential tower block. (For comparison at Green Man Lane Estate on 4.9 hectares 705 homes are to be built). | | |
| Response: | | |
| Objection noted. The site will not be included in future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | EALX02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| WEN would favour the main building being converted to flats rather than it being demolished and a new building created. | | |
| Response: | | |
| BT has confirmed that the nature of the building structure does not make it possible for conversion. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | HANX02 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The only large publicly available storage facilities in the West Ealing area are those at Access West Ealing and Access | | |

Hanwell. However both are designated Development Sites for homes and 'mixed use employment'. There is no commitment at these sites to maintain them as storage facilities and there are no other West Ealing or Hanwell Development Sites identified for which storage is a preferred use. The Ealing 2026 LDF removes all major public storage facilities from W13 and W7. This is a wanton destruction of well used facilities with no spatial provision for their replacement. This is inadequate land use planning. In this context the LDF is unfit for purpose.

Response:

Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |

Nature of Comment:

The logical and rational approach to defining Ealing's 2026 LDF would begin with carrying out a Borough wide audit of service provision adequacy. Any inadequacies of the services which imposed additional land use demands could then be noted. Next, one would attempt to project the changing service needs of Ealing residents over the next 15 years with a view to translating this to land use needs. Finally one would research and select where in Ealing these new and retained service facilities — to meet current and future needs should ideally be located. There is little evidence to suggest that Ealing Council has carried out this process in the formulation of the 100s of pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF.

Response:

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan serves this purpose.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |

Nature of Comment:

Ealing 2026 LDF appears to be largely about building 12,481 new homes in Ealing. WEN accepts the SHMA/I-INS estimate that Ealing's Affordable Housing needs are 3,213 homes. However the idea that 9,250 homes for private sale should be built in Ealing in order to make up the Affordable Housing deficit seems absurd. Where is the evidence that Ealing needs another 9,250 private homes?

Response:

The London Plan 2011 sets a target of 890 new homes per annum for Ealing to meet the projected population growth, based on the results of the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: Ealing Council has agreed with the Mayor of London to build 890 new homes every year from 2007 to 2016. Many nearby London boroughs have agreed to much, much lower annual targets (e.g. Richmond 2'70, Hillingdon 365, Harrow 400 and Hounslow 470). | | |
| Response: The London Plan 2011 sets a target of 890 new homes per annum for Ealing to meet the projected population growth, based on the results of the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: There is a desperate need for Affordable Housing throughout Ealing, London and the UK. The latest, local Strategic Housing Assessment (SHMA) and Housing Needs Study (HNS) data published by the UK's leading charity for the homeless — Shelter — reveals that Ealing's Affordable Housing needs are 3,213 homes. However Hounslow's Affordable Housing needs are greater at 4,188 homes and so are Hillingdon's at 3,564 homes. Why then has Ealing Council agree to double the annual home building targets of Hounslow and Hillingdon, both of whom have well-documented greater Affordable Housing needs? | | |
| Response: The London Plan 2011 sets a target of 890 new homes per annum for Ealing to meet the projected population growth, based on the results of the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Policy 1.2(a) of the Development Strategy sets a strategic target of 50 percent of all new homes built in the borough as affordable. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: Ealing is also currently missing its home building targets by considerable margins (e.g. in 2008/9 it built only 298 homes | | |

and in 2009/ 10 just 306).

Response:

The rate of housing completions is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: WEN objects to Ealing Council agreeing these excessively high annual LDF home building targets. No evidence has been provided Why Ealing's targets are so much higher than neighbouring boroughs and there is clear evidence Ealing is unable to deliver them. | | |
| Response: The annual house building targets are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: Some of the most densely populated wards and areas in Ealing (e.g. Walpole, Southall Green and South Acton) have been chosen in the LDF as the locations for large, new residential developments over the next 15 years. 9,788 new homes are to be built in the so-called Uxbridge Road Corridor, which stretches from Acton to Southall. Areas of low population density (e.g. North Greenford, Perivale and Northolt Mandeville) have not been chosen for major, new residential developments. | | |
| Response: Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

These spatial selections for housing densification are illogical, unexplained and will degrade the quality of life for Uxbridge Road Corridor residents.

Response:

Site allocations seek to deliver particular objectives within the Development Strategy and support/promote proposals for the use of land. Therefore only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the LDF (2011-2026), will be included in the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |

Nature of Comment:

Adequate, new, local educational, healthcare and law and order facilities have not been planned to support these 20,000+ new residents.

Response:

The provision of education, health and other facilities are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |

Nature of Comment:

In October 2009 the Office of National Statistics (ONS) predicted that there would be some seven million UK residents aged 75 and over out of a total population of 67.8 million by 2023. (The ONS further predicted that by 2033 approaching 5% of the total UK population would be 85 or over). Extrapolating these figures for Ealing in 2026, out of a total population of 350,000 over 35,000 residents will be 75 years old or over. The 2001 National Census in Ealing counted 16,382 residents aged 75 and over in Ealing. It is therefore logical to assume that the need for nursing homes and care homes for the elderly will double by 2026. Out of the 103 Development Sites identified in the Ealing 2016 LDF literature Only one site features 'care home/nursing home' as a preferred use spatial option (Glade Lane/Maple Dock, Southall H» 24 units). There is no discussion in any of the documents about the need for spatial allocations for care homes/nursing homes and how this need might be met.

Response:

The provision for nursing and care home is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: There is no commitment to using any of Ealing's 21 square miles to build any new cultural facility. It is true that the Broadway Cinema site is scheduled for a replacement cinema and the Questors Theatre is scheduled for a replacement theatre. According to the LDF there are no plans for any new cultural facilities at Pitshanger Manor. Negotiations have been on-going for two years now with a view to parts of Ealing Town Hall being repurposed as an Arts Centre. But clearly there is no formal commitment to this as there is no mention of it in the LDF. So there are no plans for new theatres, cinemas, art galleries, exhibition halls, musical rehearsal rooms, concert halls, and dance studios. One can only presume that Ealing Council deduces that amongst the 300,000 (rising to 350,000) people in Ealing there is little desire for local culture.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The provision of cultural facilities, including the nature of facilities provided at Pitshanger Manor and Ealing Town Hall, is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is : Crossrail - Five very significant Crossrail developments will take place over the next 10 years at Acton, Ealing Broadway, West Ealing, Hanwell and Southall Railway Stations. Not to include any details on three of them (the last three in the list above) in the LDF documents is baffling. It is also inevitable that with 100s/1000s of additional passengers using Crossrail and the Crossrail Stations that new and improved transport infrastructure will be needed in the immediate vicinity of all these stations. There is no mention of this in the plans either.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The importance of Crossrail is confirmed in the Development Strategy DPD, and the Development Sites DPD will provide the most up-to-date information available on station layout where proposed allocations include or are adjacent to a future Crossrail station.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: We are told that a new Crossrail Station will be built in Manor Road. But not only do details of the station not appear in the Development Sites document, neither do any details of whatever developments may be required in Manor Road to deal with the expected influx of many new users of the new station. | | |
| Response: | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- Crematorium 70% of all deceased persons in Ealing are cremated. However none of them are cremated in Ealing as Ealing has no crematorium. No land has been identified in the LDF in the whole of Ealing as a site for a crematorium. By 2026 there are projected to be 350,000 Ealing residents. To continue to expect families and friends to travel many, many miles to Brent, Mortlake or Ruislip for the cremation of their loved ones is wholly unreasonable. This omission amounts to both a poor quality of life and a poor quality of death. | | |
| Response: The provision of crematoriums is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| Nature of Comment: Missing in the 600+ pages of the Ealing 2026 LDF is :- Citizens' Advice Bureau - For a population rising from 300,000 to 350,000 it seems why no spatial provision is made for at least one Citizens Advice Bureau | | |
| Response: The provision of CAB services is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Just what is meant by enclosing an area with a red line? Can we presume as with Arcadia, Dickens Yard and Green Man Lane Estate that all will be demolished inside that red line?</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The red line indicates the site boundary, inside which the policies contained within the site allocation will apply. Should development proposals come forward on that site over the next 15 years, the planning application will be assessed against the policies that apply within the allocation. Site allocations serve the purpose of providing site specific guidance in addition to the more general policies contained within the Development Strategy and Development Management DPD to ensure that any development proposals brought forward optimise the potential of the site in contributing to Ealing's spatial vision. Allocation does not presuppose demolition.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: There is no commentary or narrative about whether tenants and owners - both large and small - have been informed of these proposed demolitions. There is no indication whether large company occupiers - like Barclays Bank, Boots, Sainsbury's, Burger King and BHS - have given any indication as to whether they will re-occupy their retail space in newly built shops.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. There is no presupposition of demolition.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Eric Leach | West Ealing Neighbours (WEN) | General |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Some Development Sites include very recent developments - some unfinished. For example site EAL10 includes a</p> | | |

Genesis housing and retail development. Does the red lining surrounding this current development mean the new development would be demolished? If it doesn't mean this then why is the Genesis development site included in EAL10?

Response:

There is no presupposition of demolition. The inclusion of a new development in the allocation reflects the Council's view that the larger site forms a prominent role and therefore development proposals for individual properties should not be considered in isolation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Janet Smith | Janet Smith | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: Residential - some possibility with reservations | | |
| Response: Support noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Where do council employees park? Congesting even more scarce parking spaces. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Who wants to live near a busy railway line? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL20 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: Retail would be out of general reach |
| Response: Objection noted. The site is within the town centre boundary, and retail uses are appropriate within a town centre. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Arcadia should remain including car park. Remaining site could be redeveloped in line with Arcadia appearance | | |
| Response: The evidence base for the design principles included within the options is the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre Spatial Development Framework (2008, updated September 2010). This document identifies the Arcadia Centre as making little contribution to the character of the town centre, and as unfit for modern retail requirements, | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: High population thoroughfare, poor living quality especially for families | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Development Management DPD will contain detailed policies against which planning applications are assessed, including consideration of residential amenity. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| C D Stubner | C D Stubner | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Area unsuitable for industrial traffic | | |
| Response: Agreed. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------|--------------|----------------|
|------|--------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|--------------|--------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EALX06 |
| Nature of Comment: This is an important site for local services and residents. It must be preserved. It provides local employment | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no need to join the site with BHS. | | |
| Response: BHS will be removed from the final allocation. | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: The distinct retail space in Chignell Place needs to be preserved | | |
| Response: The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: Retail should be focussed on small units or market place to encourage small retailers | | |
| Response: The final allocation will provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. The Council will encourage the provision of smaller independent retail units for larger retail developments as per policy 4.9 of the London Plan. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL28 |
| Nature of Comment: The existing supermarket needs to be saved, it is a hub for the local community. The car park needs to be preserved - it is vital for the local residents | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the appropriate mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, and support the continued provision of a large foodstore | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL26 |
| Nature of Comment: These are modern retail units increasing the height of the site is impractical given the sites to the north. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL26 |
| Nature of Comment: Affordable retail space for net additions | | |
| Response: The Council will encourage the provision of smaller affordable retail units in larger developments, in line with policy 4.9 of the London Plan. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Car park usage should be maintained to avoid extra pressure on local parking by council and local office workers. | | |

Response:
Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:
There is enough flats already.

Response:
Objection noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:
The sub station needs proper provision. This is a good site for garage or car parking use

Response:
Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the presence of the electricity substation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:
This is too many residential units for this site

Response:
Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:
Considerable additional office space should be provided for local employment opportunities

Response:

Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no layout information on which to comment. | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The next iteration of the DPD will provide guidance on layout. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no justification for the additional residential developments. Balanced economic development in Ealing implies extra office space for employment. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Development Strategy Ppolicy 2.5(a) identifies the need to provide both additional residential and office development in the town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: More office space should be permitted to encourage local employment | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. Developmet Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identfiies to potential for up to | | |

90,000 square meters net office floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| Industrial and retail uses should be preserved. There are already large disused residential capacity within 200 yards. Local garage premises must be preserved to maintain local residents cars and provide local employment | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. Industrial uses are generally inappropriate adjacent to residential properties. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nick Woolven | Nick Woolven | EAL10 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| The parade of shops/bank with Leeland Mansions contains the most attractive set of shop frontages in West Ealing - it must be preserved. This is too dense for West Ealing - we need the car park. Retail, particularly affordable retail space should be actively encouraged in West Ealing to support the economy. Office space particularly affordable space should be encouraged to increase local employment | | |
| Response: | | |
| The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site and and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. Rental rates and lease arrangements are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however the Council will encourage the provision of smaller retail units in line with policy 4.9 of the London Plan. The buildings of heritage value will be removed from the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL30 |

| |
|--|
| <p>Nature of Comment: Another proposal to remove existing services e.g. Quick Fix. Grosvenor surgery is an attractive Edwardian building, it should not be abolished</p> |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. The listing of 147 Grosvenor Surgery will be a consideration of the final allocation and the Council will revise site boundaries appropriately.</p> |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL30 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: There are sufficient shops in West Ealing. Many are closed. There just needs to be a strategy to support traders so that they can be filled.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026. The issue of vacant shops is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL28 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: There isn't any proper explanation of what is proposed. I'm concerned that the shop facades facing Uxbridge Rd particularly no 85-87 are in Edwardian attractive brickwork. Need to keep Edwardian buildings</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. It was not to provide detailed proposals for the site. The facade value of 85-87 the Broadway will be reflected in the final allocation.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL11 |

Nature of Comment:

This seems to be a proposal to build another ugly tall block of 'square block' flats. More high rise residential units are unacceptable. The existing shops are fine. I resent small businesses being pushed out. There is already an over supply of office space in Ealing. A lot are empty. I disagree that a garage is removed. Removing garages and their workshops seems a feature of Ealing's policies, why? We need these services.

Response:

Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL10 |

Nature of Comment:

The parade of shops/bank with Leeland Mansions contains the most attractive set of shop frontages in West Ealing - it must be preserved. Some possibility for residential with reservations

Response:

Support noted. The part of the site which includes listed buildings and buildings of facade value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:

This is a locally listed building. I do not support demolition or interfering with the architecture. Its fine as it is.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building. The Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: There is no explanation of how 150 residential units are to be put in the centre. There will be/already is plenty of residential units in Ealing centre | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: Retain existing retail and take initiative to see all the shops filled. | | |
| Response: Support noted. Initiatives to see shops filled are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL06 |
| Nature of Comment: There isn't any explanation of how 2500 square metres of new office space are to be put into the centre. We would not want the car park to be removed. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will not propose removal of the car park. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: | | |

I have read all the options in the separate doc 'Arcadia site options'. The lease objectionable is option A2 because it has no tall buildings and more open space. See SEC proposals

Response:
Support noted.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: It should be maintained as retail space. Other use could be a cinema | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The ground floor of the majority of the site is designated retail frontage, where retail is the preferred use. A cinema is established as acceptable in principle within a town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Retail space should be maintained potentially with cinema | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The ground floor of the majority of the site is designated retail frontage, where retail is the preferred use. A cinema is established as acceptable in principle within a town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kate Woolven | Kate Woolven | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Why more office space when there is office space empty in Ealing as it is. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: The co-op serves the community that don't have access to other large supermarkets too far away to walk to. The community would suffer accordingly. It would be detrimental to S Ealing to lose Wickes and its car park facility for local residents | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: Only 59 residential units? What else is planned for this site? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The potential net residential units was determined in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, based on the midpoint capacity of the appropriate density range from the London Plan for a suburban setting, if the entire site was developed for residential. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EALX02 |
| Nature of Comment: No explanation other than 182 residential units. More information needed. If this amount of residential units are suggested, where are the plans for better social infrastructure for this site? | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years and not to provide detailed proposals for the site. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The final | | |

allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure required to support projected population growth within the borough.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EALX01 |
| Nature of Comment: No explanation other than 149 residential units. More information before I can approve. What about the job centre? | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years, not to make detailed proposals for sites. Objection noted. The site will not be included in future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL26 |
| Nature of Comment: There are enough shops in West Ealing. Many are closed - there needs to be a support structure for traders. | | |
| Response: Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). Support for traders is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: No car parking space for Ealing Town Hall staff with essential car use status. Where do local residents park in the evenings and at weekends? How do you attend town hall meetings? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Why are we cramming more and more housing into central Ealing? The car park is important to keep. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Support A2. It's the least objectionable as height is limited to 9 stories. Please keep car parking space for visiting shoppers. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The final allocation will clarify the parking requirement on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: A doctors surgery, a dental practice and a kindergarden would be valuable. | | |
| Response: Support noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The ground floor of the majority of the site is designated retail frontage, where retail is the preferred use. All of the suggested uses are acceptable in principle within a town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Only 100 flats seems about right for size of the site. | | |
| Response: | | |

Support noted. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Judith Paris | Judith Paris | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: We have enough small units. Ealing needs a department store. We can't all go to Westfield's | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD, in line with the recommendations of the West London Retail Needs Assessment. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Why does it say 'no relevant planning history'. A new large mosque is being built there. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. No planning application has been submitted to the Council for the building of a new mosque. Any site allocation will be sensitive to existing uses on the site. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Is BHS being demolished? Are the small shops being demolished? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The allocation of a site does not mean that it will get demolished. BHS however will be removed from the final allocation. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------|-------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Is more retail needed? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL32 |
| Nature of Comment: Is more office floor space needed? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010). | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL29 |
| Nature of Comment: Why residential? Why are the council stuffing more and more people into Ealing? Why not a health centre providing a comprehensive service or even a private health centre? There are too many people in the borough already. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Residential uses are appropriate in locations where infrastructure and amenities are located and which benefit from high level accessibility. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges as set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The provision of a health centre is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however the final allocation will be sufficiently flexible to allow a health centre should one be proposed for this site, as it is an appropriate use in a town centre. | | |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL28 |

Nature of Comment:

50 'home's' is too many. What it means is 'flats', and are there provisions for concrete systems? If there aren't, then they are vulnerable to vandals and drug addicts. Why is it all for housing? Where is the detail for shops, pubs, health centres etc? Too many residential units. There are no proposals presented only potential is given. No details given other than for residential.

Response:

Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. It was not to provide detailed proposals for the site. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. All of the suggested uses are considered appropriate within a town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL26 |

Nature of Comment:

These properties are relatively new. Why are you demolishing them? I object to so many houses/flats being built to encourage more and more people into Ealing.

Response:

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:

Where are the town halls staff meant to park if you remove this car park? Residents also use the car park.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:

More & more housing, more and more people stuffed into Ealing.

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Response: Objection noted. |
|--------------------------------------|

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL06 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: The centre is a locally listed building. I do not support demolition or interfering with the architecture |
|--|

| |
|--|
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the locally listed status of the building. The Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process. |
|--|

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL06 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: No more housing, no more people. |
|---|

| |
|---|
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Development Sites DPD is to support the delivery of the Development Strategy through allocating land for a particular use or type of development. Population projections that form part of the evidence base of the LDF confirm the need to provide additional homes. |
|---|

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL06 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: We need the car park. |
|--|

| |
|---|
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will not propose removal of the car park. |
|---|

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maggie Wilson | Maggie Wilson | EAL06 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: We need the car park. If the council are proposing more office space, how are you proposing to provide it? |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will not propose removal of the car park. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Tibbalds Arcadia option A2 is the best of the bunch but 4 storey residential frontage to Haven Green is not appropriate. Too much shading. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will provide further detail on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Details such as shading of Haven Green are most appropriately dealt with via the planning application process. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: 368 residential units is too many. No primary school places in central Ealing to support this. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The provision of primary school places is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL05 |
| Nature of Comment: Retain existing provision, no net gain is required. Its difficult to fill retail space at present. | | |

Response:
 Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD, in line with the recommendations of the West London Retail Needs Assessment.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL05 |

Nature of Comment:
 Probably not required. There is many empty office space in West London.

Response:
 Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site. The Employment Land Review suggests a requirement of 90,000square metres net additional office floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:
 Its perfectly good as it is. Just leave it alone. It's won awards.

Response:
 Objection noted. The Development Sites DPD carries no presumption that this building would be demolished. Any proposals for demolition can only be assessed through the planning application process.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL06 |

Nature of Comment:
 Not suitable for housing. No schools nearby and none planned.

Response:
 Objection noted. The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL06 |

| |
|---|
| Nature of Comment: Where are these to be proposed? Is there a need for extra office space? |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies potential for up to 90,000 square meters net office floorspace in Ealing Town Centre to 2026, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010). |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL10 |
| Nature of Comment: No clear plan for what is proposed. Leave car park, Salvation army and Leeland Mansions. Some residential possible with improvement to the above shop accommodation. 70 seems far too much - no local primary schools | | |
| Response: The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years and not to provide detailed proposals on the site. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. The part of the site which includes listed buildings and buildings of heritage value will be removed from the next iteration of the Development Sites DPD. The provision of educational facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: New buildings in this area together form a ugly environment - really ugly. Well done, top marks for ugliness. The 'run down retail and business units', I find much less objectionable than the new brash units. How come the authorities differ from my views? More densely packed tower blocks - no. There are no nearby primary schools. St John's with 4 units recently crammed in is full. Drayton Green is full. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix. The | | |

provision of educational facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: Just down the road, Daniels has been empty for 3 years. Extra retail is not needed. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: West London is over supplied with Office accommodation, so not needed | | |
| Response: Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 90,000 square metres net office floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Employment Land Review (2010). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL11 |
| Nature of Comment: Not required that local services are removed | | |
| Response: Objection noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL20 |
| Nature of Comment: Leave it as a car park. I attend 3-4 meetings a month. I walk and cycle in the summer but drive and park here in the winter for town hall meetings | | |

Response:
Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:
No more town centre development without primary school plans

Response:
The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL20 |

Nature of Comment:
Car park is available for public use at weekends and evenings. Leave alone please.

Response:
Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the level of parking to be retained on the site.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL26 |

Nature of Comment:
These are established businesses. They are relatively new and up together. No 'business cleansing'.

Response:
Retail is the preferred use within designated shopping frontages, otherwise within the town centre boundary town centre uses are considered appropriate. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses on site, and provide guidance on the form of retail development to a level appropriate within a DPD. Rental rates and lease arrangements are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. The Council will encourage the provision of smaller affordable retail units in larger retail developments, in line with policy 4.9 of the London Plan.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------|-------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL26 |
| Nature of Comment: Daniels which was up the up the road has been empty for 3 years - do not need any more retail. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL28 |
| Nature of Comment: This is a fully occupied area. Car parking is required. Where do you intend to put the 50 units? In the car park? | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL28 |
| Nature of Comment: Still no primary school provision in the area | | |
| Response: The provision of educational facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL28 |
| Nature of Comment: 150 square metres is so small, why is it mentioned at all? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| | | |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

| | | |
|--|---------------|-------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL29 |
| Nature of Comment: Possible residential use but best to leave the same. Why has this site been selected? Why not the building 121-129? There seems no logic in this site document? No clear detail given | | |
| Response: Objection noted. This site was identified in the Ealing's Metropolitan Centre Spatial Development Framework (2010). | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: You have ear-marked this site but not ear-marked the site on the other side of Coldershaw road, why? And you have included 147 which is listed, why? | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The listing of 147 Grosvenor Surgery will be reflected in the final allocation. Only those sites that are considered central to delivering the policies and objectives of the Development Strategy, and likely to come forward during the lifetime of the plan, will be included in the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: Some might be built | | |
| Response: Support noted. | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: Is this in addition to what is there already. I think we have enough. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail | | |

floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010).

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL30 |
| Nature of Comment: Quickfit is a 'factory site'? And should remain. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: Rather nice parapet above of shop fronts. Some residential is possible - 40 too much. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will consider the locally listed status of 130 and 132 the Broadway. The Council considers that the mix of uses on the site can be established through various combinations, and this flexibility will be reflected in the final allocation. The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL31 |
| Nature of Comment: We have enough | | |
| Response: Objection noted. Development Strategy Policy 2.5(a) identifies the potential for up to 50,000 square metres gross retail floorspace to 2026 in Ealing Town Centre, as supported by the Retail Needs Study (2010). | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EAL32 |

| |
|--|
| Nature of Comment: The mosque and Afro Caribbean shops are not mentioned. Any redevelopment could be seen as business and racial 'cleansing' of this area. Planners must be much more sensitive to such sites. |
| Response: The final allocation will be sensitive to existing uses on the site and clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site. |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX01 |
| Nature of Comment: There is local employment - small offices, plumbers merchants & pub. Please leave alone. 149 is too many - no primary schools. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will not be included in future iterations of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX02 |
| Nature of Comment: Potential for employment site but not for residential. 182 units are not suitable as no primary school places in this area. | | |
| Response: The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on the site, having regard to neighbouring uses and the recommendations of the Employment Land Review. Provision of educational facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: Dense housing needs building supplies in community not 45 minute drive away. Some parking provision is very useful. | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such | | |

as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: You see it as low value we as elderly see it as useful. Perhaps you only want the young and vigorous in the borough | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The final allocation will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on site. Retail use such as Wickes is an appropriate use in the town centre. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX03 |
| Nature of Comment: Little Ealing & Grange school is full now | | |
| Response: The provision of education facilities is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX06 |
| Nature of Comment: Please leave as it is. People have cars and they need servicing. It is much more convenient if these are near where people live and work | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The site will be removed form the next iteration of the DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | EALX06 |
| Nature of Comment: Please leave as it is. People have cars and they need servicing. It is much more convenient if these are near where people live and work. Why make people drive 3-10 miles to have their cars servicing - no concept of sustainability | | |

Response:
Objection noted. The site will be removed from the next iteration of the DPD.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:
Daniels department store - unable to let as a retail premise so find alternative use e.g. youth centre, skateboard park, arts centre - why is the regen team so short of ideas?

Response:
Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward for inclusion in the next iteration of the DPD as the identification of a vacant retail premises for a specific alternative use is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, and the suggested uses are established as acceptable in principle on the site due to its location within a Metropolitan Town Centre. Comments will be passed to the Council's Regeneration Team.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Arthur Breens | Arthur Breens | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:
South East corner of junction of Mattock Lane with Culmington rd - we are badly in need of a new primary school. If regen team knew the current problems they would have identified new sites for primary/secondary schools. All documents appear to be developer lead, not residential or need lead.

Response:
Suggestion noted. This site is not proposed to be carried forward in the next iteration of the DPD as the identification of new sites for primary/secondary schools is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. Education is reviewing potential locations for new schools.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Nigel Bennett | Metropolis pd | NEW SITE |

Nature of Comment:
West World, Westgate, Hanger Lane, W5 1DT. Current use B1 Office and car park. Proposed mixed use with residential, office/research and development/light industrial, hotel and car parking.

Response:

The site is designated as Strategic Industrial Land by the London Plan 2011, precluding possibility of allocating the site for mixed use development suggested.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Rachael Bust | The Coal Authority | General |
| Nature of Comment: No observations. | | |
| Response: Noted. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Suzanne Edwards | Suzanne Edwards | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: My objections to the LDF are over development and high rise blocks will ruin Ealing's unique suburban appearance making it another faceless clone town. An aesthetically appealing area is paramount for a sense of pride and wellbeing. I believe such intense housing will achieve the opposite. Swamping Ealing town centre with new homes will make it a potential sink estate of the future and all the associated problems | | |
| Response: The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate in a DPD, and reflective of Ealing's character. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Suzanne Edwards | Suzanne Edwards | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: No one has factoring in of the effect this will have on the associated transport infrastructure, schools and health facilities. Ealing will not be an appealing place to live. | | |
| Response: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan serves this purpose. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Suzanne Edwards | Suzanne Edwards | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: During the interim and uncertainty of the future the town centre and in particular the future of the Arcadia Centre something needs to be done and quickly to improve the existing shops. Empty units, tacky clothes shops and the ubiquitous pound store create the impression of a down trodden area and attract a less affluent demographic. The knock on effect is the better shops can't attract the right footfall and everything is dragged down to it's lowest common denominator. If you want to make money for Ealing you are going to have to attract it. | | |
| Response: Vacant shop units are outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Suzanne Edwards | Suzanne Edwards | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: North Tyneside Council is trialling a new window treatment that at first glance gives the impression that units are occupied by installing fake business facades. Surely Ealing could adopt this policy as well as ensuring that scruffy occupied shops do something to improve their appearance. | | |
| Response: Suggestion is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however suggestion has been passed to the Council's Regeneration Team. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: We appeared to be not much further forward in having a revamp on the town centre. The council appears to be filling in sites, site by site, rather than giving the residents what we have asked for during two previous public enquires: a redesigned town centre with infrastructure which then allows the planners/sites/developers to fit in with that rather than the sites dictating more blocks and strip development. | | |
| Response: | | |

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL07 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: Why the roads and infrastructure between the station and the town hall and the immediate surrounding areas are important is: you can't just look at the Tibbalds Plan without thinking about the effect of any new buildings on access, traffic, and flow. It will be impossible for people coming to the station from Ealing Green or Ealing Common or the west by car to drop off or collect and then get back again if a circular route is not retained. Traffic would be forced along Maddley Road and then create more jams turning right into Hanger Lane.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: The Crossrail station design has been finalised and funding secured from Transport for London to carry out improvements to the station forecourt area (completion 2014) in advance of Crossrail to improve interchange arrangements and access to the station, including improved drop off facilities for cars.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL07 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: It would be better to allow building over the station, a proper interchange where buses can drop off and collect and then no shadows would fall on Haven Green. Parking and drop off could be under Haven Green.</p> | | |
| <p>Response: Consultation within the Development Sites DPD was limited to those options from the Ealing Broadway Interchange Study (2010) assessed as deliverable. The approach to be taken forward does not preclude further future improvements coming forward as part of development proposals, however there is no evidence to support safeguarding of land on either site.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL17 |
| <p>Nature of Comment: I notice that some sites in Bond Street are being earmarked for development. As the town hall itself is a feature of Ealing, as its Pitshanger Manor, why not open up the space opposite the town hall and make a view all the way across to</p> | | |

Pitshanger Manor. The area below the Uxbridge Road could be pedestrianised with low rise cafes and boutiques shops on either side (ever been to Windsor?) with outdoor seating and fountains and have parking underneath existing car park. Put the hotel backing onto Bond Street with its entrance on the Uxbridge Road or high street (see hand-drawn plan)

Response:

The Council supports implementation of the outstanding permission for a multi screen cinema at 59-63 Uxbridge Road. The final allocation will support improved connections from Uxbridge Road through the Ealing Green and Pitshanger Manor.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

If the high street was widened, a new roundabout could filter west bound traffic coming from the south to the west

Response:

There are no plans to widen the high street to provide a new roundabout.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

We are still for the cinema, why not close in the Ealing Broadway shopping centre with glass and have a smart cinema complex like Fulham Broadway or Whiteley's, higher up, with cafes and restaurants on the upper and lower levels allowing shoppers still to use the car park. It might bring more people into Ealing in the evening. It should be built to be in keeping with the nice white and redbrick feel of the place.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The Council supports the implementation of the outstanding permission for a multi screen cinema at 59-63 Uxbridge Road, however leisure uses are considered appropriate throughout the town centre.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

The flats in a town centre will not meet the needs of those on the housing waiting list. Cheaper land needs to be identified

where houses and flats for families/older people's residential homes can be built near new schools, with new surgeries and health centres, and leisure facilities for children and young people. The flats, at the prices being offered are likely to house middle class professionals and public sector professionals with housing association help. This type of housing is also needed but how much is needed?

Response:

The Housing Strategy sets out the required mix of social/affordable rent and intermediate affordable homes that are required in the borough, based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009). This is updated every five years, and forms the basis for negotiations on private residential and mixed use schemes for the provision of affordable units via S106 agreement.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

Tower blocks are not wanted by people with children and may create slums in the future. In Acton the council is regenerating old tower blocks and regenerating the area to create a better sense of community. Have the planners not noticed this? The residents have already rejected the high blocks proposed in two public enquiries. Please take the matter to a higher authority: it is not a national policy we wish to have imposed on us. The developers are having to meet too many conflicting criteria: In order to be allowed to build they have to put in so much social housing, so the density and height has to increase. We could house more people if we chose land further out or built new homes. This would be the best use of taxpayers money.

Response:

The final allocation will confirm the setting and PTAL range to ensure development proposals reflect appropriate density ranges at set within the London Plan 2011 density matrix, and provide guidance on layout, built form and design to a level appropriate within a DPD. Higher densities do not require tower blocks, and the Council welcomes the support for the approach adopted at South Acton Estate.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

For your information there is a new development called the Golden Mile with flats along the A4 at the junction of South

Ealing Road and the A4. It is likely that this large development will use facilities and services which come under Ealing as well as Brentford and put more pressure on roads, buses, doctors surgeries and so on. Perhaps the housing department could take some space in this development for people on the list.

Response:

Suggestion noted. The allocation of social housing is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however the borough's Housing Team ensures that cross boundary issues are addressed.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

At the moment there is a lot of property for rent and sale in Ealing, Acton, Perivale and Southall, on private sector websites. The intended amount of units to be built along the Uxbridge Road may not be required. More accurate stats are needed to say if the number of proposed units is correct. With new limits on the amount councils can pay for housing benefit, rents may come down. Incentivising housing associations to do up ore properties might enable some of the social housing needs to be met.

Response:

The London Plan 2011 sets a target of 890 new homes per annum for Ealing to meet the projected population growth, based on the results of the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The renovation of existing properties for social housing is outside the scope of the Development Sites DPD, however this is promoted in the borough's Housing Strategy.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |

Nature of Comment:

More importantly the amount of building proposed would change the character of our area fundamentally. Even though the council in the plan says it cares about the environment, this is not a priority when it comes to the type of developments they are allowing along the Uxbridge road – no trees, no play space, no healthcare and so on.

Response:

The Development Management DPD will contain policies on the provision of playspace and other amenity requirements against which planning applications will be assessed.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| F Freedman | F Freedman | EAL |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>The sites in Ealing, which are currently used as garage and repair workshops seem to have been earmarked for development. These small businesses provide an excellent service to motorists. Surely you can find a way of retaining these types of businesses, which also provide jobs for young people with training. It could be a good idea to consider work/living spaces as a way of attracting self-employed and small growing businesses to Ealing.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>The next iteration of the Development Sites DPD will clarify the acceptable mix of uses and their arrangement on sites, including provision for business/employment uses. Garages and repair shops are generally inappropriate adjacent to residential properties.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Kevin Goodwin | Kevin Goodwin | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>The site was the subject of a recent refusal of planning permission both by the Council and on appeal for residential. The site is not suitable for conventional residential development site due to the constraints highlighted by the planning Inspector. Our clients own the site and there was no prior engagement with them by the council over the use of the site prior to the publication of the DPD.</p> | | |
| Response: | | |
| <p>Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. The Park Royal OAPF, adopted by the Mayor in 2011, included extensive engagement with landowners in the Southern Gateway.</p> | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Kevin Goodwin | Kevin Goodwin | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: | | |
| <p>We are currently at pre-application stage in respect of a student accommodation led mixed use scheme. The site should therefore be allocated for student accommodation which addresses the issues of child play space and will complete the</p> | | |

regeneration of this site.

Response:

Objection noted. The final allocation will reflect the proposals for the Southern Gateway (Section 10.5) within the Park Royal OAPF. The Development Management DPD will contain policies against which planning applications area assessed.

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Goodwin | Kevin Goodwin | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: No quantum is given | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. | | |

| Name | Organisation | Site Reference |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Kevin Goodwin | Kevin Goodwin | PAR01C |
| Nature of Comment: No quantum is given | | |
| Response: Objection noted. The purpose of the Initial Proposals version of the Development Sites DPD was to invite early comments on a wide range of sites considered to have the potential to deliver development over the next 15 years. | | |