

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM1 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Paul Robinson
<b>On behalf of:</b> Highways Agency	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> The Highways Agency have no comments	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM2 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Claire McLean
<b>On behalf of:</b> Canal & River Trust	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> The Canal & River Trust have no comments	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM3 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Graham Saunders
<b>On behalf of:</b> English Heritage	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> After considering the details provided we have no further comments to make, other than those already expressed through our Statement of Common Ground and previous correspondence on the development of the Development Sites and Development Management Development Plan Documents.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM4 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Simon Vince
<b>On behalf of:</b> Heathrow Airport Limited	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> Aerodrome Safeguarding Aerodromes important to the national air transport system are officially safeguarded by the Civil Aviation Authority and the process of ensuring that their operation and development is not inhibited is an integral part of the town planning system. A safeguarding map is derived from a series of protected three-dimensional surfaces above and around the aerodrome. The extent of the zone around Heathrow Airport shown on the official safeguarding map published to each council. Within this area the Planning Authority must consult the Airport Operator on development where the height of any building, structure,	

erection or works would affect the operation of the airport or the safe movement of aircraft i.e. potentially penetrate the protected surface. The aerodrome uses a variety of navigational aids, radio aids and telecommunications systems to facilitate air traffic control and aircraft movements. A new building, structure or extension because of its size, shape, location or construction materials can affect this equipment so the aerodrome must also be consulted to enable an assessment to be made of the potential impact on navigational aids. In addition, at night and in low visibility conditions pilots rely on approach and runway lights to align their plane with the runway and touch down at the correct point. Lighting elements of a development also have the potential to distract or confuse pilots, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the aerodrome and the aircraft approach paths. Safeguarding assessments therefore also consider the impact of lighting proposals for developments.

Bird strikes can cause damage and sometimes catastrophic accidents to aircraft. Over 80% of bird strikes occur on or close to aerodromes as birds cross the airfield and its approaches as they move between sites. Aircraft are particularly vulnerable to collisions with large or flocking birds such as swans and flocks of geese, starlings, pigeons and gulls. Birds can be attracted to the vicinity of an aerodrome or to cross flight paths by the types and location of development, the design of buildings, landscaping and the creation of open standing water. The objective of the safeguarding process is to prevent any increase, and where possible reduce risk to the lowest practicable level, by designing out bird hazards, controlling development and ensuring proper maintenance and management. The developments likely to cause most concern are: facilities for the handling, compaction, and treatment of putrescible waste; the creation of areas of standing water in quarries, sewage works, nature reserves, lakes, ponds, wetlands and sustainable urban drainage systems. The types, form and height of planting in landscaping schemes may also create a bird hazard e.g. a starling roost. Whether or not a development is likely to attract birds will depend not only on the nature of the development itself but also its location in relation to other land uses. Buildings may be attractive to birds depending on the design and use of the building and the availability of food nearby. Pigeons and Starlings are the most common birds to be found roosting in and around buildings whilst gulls may rest on flat and shallow roofs. Wherever possible, the design of buildings in close proximity to an aerodrome should incorporate all possible measures to minimise their attractiveness to birds.

In order to protect aerodromes and aircraft in flight against the hazards of bird strike, safeguarding maps also draw a circle with a 13 kilometres radius from the aerodrome reference point within which the Planning Authority must consult the Aerodrome Operator on any development likely to attract birds. The extent of this zone around Heathrow Airport shown on the official safeguarding map published to each council. [alternatively the Proposal Map may show the safeguarded aerodrome reference point from which this distance should be measured if the airport is within the authority's area].

Government advise that applicants should initiate discussions with the Planning Authority and the Airport Operator at an early stage before submitting an application to ensure that they understand the constraints and provide the information which will be needed for a detailed assessment to be made of the proposal e.g. a construction methodology, navigational

impact assessment, bird hazard risk assessment and bird hazard management plan. If the Planning Authority propose to grant permission or impose conditions contrary to the safeguarding advice of the Airport Operator, they must notify the Civil Aviation Authority and demonstrate they have assessed the application in the light of Government guidance\* and provide a statement of reasons. Ultimately, the application could be referred to the Secretary of State who has the power to issue a Direction.

Safeguarding issues should only prevent development taking place were absolutely necessary to maintain the safe operation of the airport and the movement of aircraft. The safeguarding process rather seeks to mitigate the adverse impacts of development through; alternative design, appropriate landscaping and planting schemes, by conditions restricting how a development operates and may be extended. Legal agreements will be used to deal with aspects of a development, such as implementation of a Bird Hazard Management Plan, which cannot be satisfactorily covered by planning conditions.

**Council Response:**

Noted. Whilst this doesn't relate specifically to the Main Modifications the Council recognise the importance of mapping Aviation Safeguarding Zones, and their relevance to the planning process. In preparing the associated policies map documents, the Council have made the conscious decision to remove those designations which are maintained outside of the development plan process. In the past when such designations have been included, our document (and particularly the paper ones) have become out of date relatively quickly, as and when these layers are updated, which is often more frequent than any review of our development plan documents. To avoid a similar situation it is proposed that such layers are not included on the published policies map. However the Council intends to develop a live interactive online map, where such layers will be uploaded and viewable. This platform has the benefit of being able to be updated on a more regular basis. Accordingly officers, applicants and other interested parties will be able to identify all of the relevant and most up to date information regarding site designations/constraints.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM4 (2)	<b>Name:</b> Simon Vince
<b>On behalf of:</b> Heathrow Airport Limited	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b>	
<p>Within the Safeguarding Zone(s) around [Heathrow Airport shown on the official safeguarding map published to each council, developments will be permitted which demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) the height of construction equipment, the height of the completed development and associated landscaping will not penetrate the protected surface of the safeguarding zone; development may have to follow an agreed construction methodology, restrictions may be imposed on future extensions and the height of landscaping to maintain the integrity of</p>	

the protected surface

b) the position and height of construction equipment, buildings, telecommunications equipment, landscaping and external lighting arrangements will not interfere with the visual and electronic navigational aids of the airport; restrictions may be imposed to enable further assessment of any proposed changes

c) the design and construction of buildings, mining, engineering and other operations (including landscaping, water features and sustainable urban drainage schemes) and material changes of use of land will not increase the bird hazard risk to the safe operation of the airport or the movement of aircraft; the implementation of a bird hazard management plan will be made the subject of a legal agreement.

**Council Response:**

Noted. Whilst this doesn't relate specifically to the Main Modifications the Council recognise the importance of mapping Aviation Safeguarding Zones, and their relevance to the planning process. In preparing the associated policies map documents, the Council have made the conscious decision to remove those designations which are maintained outside of the development plan process. In the past when such designations have been included, our document (and particularly the paper ones) have become out of date relatively quickly, as and when these layers are updated, which is often more frequent than any review of our development plan documents. To avoid a similar situation it is proposed that such layers are not included on the published policies map. However the Council intends to develop a live interactive online map, where such layers will be uploaded and viewable. This platform has the benefit of being able to be updated on a more regular basis. Accordingly officers, applicants and other interested parties will be able to identify all of the relevant and most up to date information regarding site designations/constraints.

**Rep:** DM-MM4 (3)

**Name:** Simon Vince

**On behalf of:** Heathrow Airport Limited

**Main Mod ref:**

**Representation:**

Wind Turbine Developments

The safeguarding requirements for Heathrow Airport includes a circle with a 30 kilometres radius drawn from the aerodrome reference point to indicate the area within which the Planning Authority must consult the Airport Operator on proposed wind turbine development. This recognises the fact that the introduction of wind-powered generator turbines as an alternative energy policy can create problems for aviation. In addition to their potential for presenting a physical obstacle to air navigation, wind turbines can affect radar and other electronic aids to air navigation from radio frequency interference (the rotating blades create electromagnetic disturbance which can degrade the performance of these systems

and cause incorrect information to be received). The amount of interference depends on a number of factors; the number of turbines, their size, construction materials, location and shape of blades. A wind turbine development is also likely to be the subject of consultation with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), NATS En Route Ltd. (NERL) and the Ministry of Defence (MOD).

Government advise applicants to initiate discussions with the Planning Authority and the Airport Operator at an early stage in the process and before submitting an application to ensure that they understand the constraints and provide the information to enable a detailed assessment to be made of the proposed development i.e. a navigational impact assessment study. Where it is determined that a planning application for a proposed development may have an effect on navigational or other aeronautical systems, simulation or other types of interference modelling of the effects of the development may need to be conducted before a decision can be made on the application. It is usual for the developer to bear the cost of the modelling.

Within the safeguarding zone around Heathrow Airport shown on the official safeguarding map published to each council, wind turbine development will be permitted that demonstrates for the duration of the construction period and during operation it will not adversely affect the operation of Heathrow Airport Ltd or the navigational aids, communication or surveillance equipment used for air navigation at Heathrow Airport Ltd.

**Council Response:**

Noted. Whilst this doesn't relate specifically to the Main Modifications the Council recognise the importance of mapping Aviation Safeguarding Zones, and their relevance to the planning process. In preparing the associated policies map documents, the Council have made the conscious decision to remove those designations which are maintained outside of the development plan process. In the past when such designations have been included, our document (and particularly the paper ones) have become out of date relatively quickly, as and when these layers are updated, which is often more frequent than any review of our development plan documents. To avoid a similar situation it is proposed that such layers are not included on the published policies map. However the Council intends to develop a live interactive online map, where such layers will be uploaded and viewable. This platform has the benefit of being able to be updated on a more regular basis. Accordingly officers, applicants and other interested parties will be able to identify all of the relevant and most up to date information regarding site designations/constraints.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM5 (1)	<b>Name:</b> James Guest
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM8
<b>Representation:</b>	

We note that many areas of the Borough lie outside:

- designated conservation areas,
- neighbourhood plan areas and
- locations to be included within area action plans.

We are therefore concerned that large areas of the Borough will lack the local character and context studies upon which the application of London Plan Policy 7.4 relies.

We note that similar concerns have been expressed by English Heritage.

We therefore suggest that the following text is appended as an additional paragraph to the wording contained in MM8.

The Council will support the preparation of Character and Context studies to inform the application of this policy, as recommended in the London Plan and in The Mayor's Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context draft SPG.

Please see London Plan Policy 7.4.B a-e and the accompanying reference to characterisation studies in paragraph 7.14 of the London Plan, which was reproduced on page 40 of Ealing's EDM 1.

We also draw attention to the following statements by The Mayor of London in his introduction on page V of the Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context draft SPG:

It explains the fundamental importance of getting an understanding of a place before taking decisions on its development. It emphasises the importance of engaging with communities and others with an interest or something to contribute from the earliest stages.

Following this structure approach should help ensure quicker and better-informed planning decisions and the kind of high quality buildings and urban realm that will be valued by local residents and users alike.

As a large residents' association with over 500 subscription members, we appreciate that Council resources may be limited and repeat our offer to document the character and context of our area using templates and guidance notes provided by the Council.

We believe that an early study of our membership catchment area should be a priority as it lies outside the designated conservation areas, neighbourhood plan areas and locations to be included within area action plans. A further concern is that we have a number of medium and larger sized opportunity brownfield redevelopment sites in the midst of our otherwise residential area.

We also draw attention to the following statements in The Mayor's draft SPG which emphasise the importance of community consultation in the preparation of character and context studies:

Page 30 - para 3.14, page 49 - para 5.19, page 57 - para 5.38, page 61 - para 5.45, page 62 - para 5.52, page 72 - para 6.10, page 76 - para 6.21, page 77 - para 6.24, page 79 - para 6.29 6.30 6.31,

**Council Response:**

It is not clear how the application of London Plan Policy 7.4 relates to MM8 and it is noted that no changes to the policy

are sought. However, it should also be emphasised that the application of LP 7.4 (and the Ealing local variation) does not depend on comprehensive borough-wide character appraisals and nor do the London Plan or the draft Character and Context SPG suggest that this is so. LP 7.4 indicates that characterisation studies 'can help in this process', and the draft SPG emphasises that assessments can take place at any scale, from the regional level down to individual streets. It is noted that English Heritage couched their comments in relation to character assessments in similar terms of being helpful rather than essential in the application of policy.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM5 (2)	<b>Name:</b> James Guest
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM13
<p><b>Representation:</b>  <b>We draw attention to the Council’s statement in LV 3.4 B that locations outside the named town centres should be regarded as having a “Suburban” setting for the purposes</b> of housing density as set out in Policy 3.4 in the London Plan.  Suburban settings represent buildings with smaller footprints accommodated in larger plots which provide significantly larger private rear gardens than the minimum specified in Baseline standard 4.10.1 on page 69 of The Mayor’s Housing SPG.  Ealing’s UDP Garden Space SPG 13 recognises the character of the Borough and requires the following <u>minimum</u> provision:  Each new dwelling should have a private usable garden space of no less than 50 sqm for a house with under 5 rooms and at least 75 sqm for a larger house.  We believe it is essential that these minimum thresholds are retained.  We are extremely concerned that it is proposed to delete the following statement which prefixed the notes attached to Table 7D.2 in the version included in EDM 2:  <del>These space standards should be read as minima.</del>  The absence of any explicit reference in Table 7D.2 that the values it contains are the minimum Ealing requirements is likely to result in these values being interpreted as the de facto maximum Ealing requirement.  We are also opposed to the use of the word “<b>Typically</b>” at the start of the fourth sentence in the text prefixed by a single asterisk which accompanies Table 7D.2.  We ask that the wording of this sentence is amended to read as follows, with suggested additional text in bold:  <b>As a minimum</b> this would equate to an area of 50 sq. m of private garden space per house <b>for locations outside the boundaries of the designated town centres.</b></p>	

We ask that the final sentence in the block of text prefixed by a double asterisk is extended as follows:  
 Roof space should where possible also be maximised, **providing this does not result in the overlooking of neighbouring private garden space.**

**Council Response:**  
 The notes/key accompanying table 7D.2 with regard to garden space provision recognise the important role of garden space in preserving the established local character/urban grain and in safeguarding the privacy and amenity of existing/future occupants. This policy and others, notably LV7.4 and 7B, would necessitate adequate provision to achieve this desired outcome.

Beyond the minimum standards which derive from the Mayor’s Housing SPG, it was not considered appropriate or necessary to set minimum quantitative space standards for any additional provision, as this would make the policy too rigid and less responsive to specific needs/circumstances of the case, its context and the Council’s spatial priorities in relation to open space provision. In an area of public open space deficiency for example, the policy is designed to allow the Council to prioritise the provision of new public open space over additional garden space provision. It also allows us to prioritise financial contributions over open space provision, where for example the existing quantity of provision is sufficient, but is of low quality and would therefore benefit from further investment. For those cases where garden provision is prioritised over other forms of open space, and a higher level of additional garden space provision is sought (perhaps in suburban settings), it was considered helpful as a guide to make reference to yardsticks (for example 50 sq. m. of private open space per house & 15 sq. m. per flat).

The Council does not consider it necessary to differentiate between locations within and outside town centres, as this is best determined on a case by case basis with reference to policies LV7.4 and 7B.

The policy also seeks to maximise the use of roof space when designing open space provision. Whilst the Council would seek to preserve the privacy of neighbouring occupants, adding additional reference to this in policy 7D is considered unnecessary as this is already adequately covered by policy 7B, and such policies do not operate in isolation.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM5 (3)	<b>Name:</b> James Guest
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Fields Residents Association (EFRA)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM3
<b>Representation:</b> The proposed additional wording in the supporting text of the local variation to London Plan Policy 3.5 represents a significant dilution of the Ealing policy which was proposed by the Council in EDM1. We believe that it will result in the provision of unacceptably cramped accommodation on upper storeys, and that the proposed additional text should be deleted.	

In the event that this is not possible, we suggest that the proposed Council text is amplified by the addition of the following wording.

*While it is the Council's expectation that developments will provide a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m, they may consider applications where this is not possible, for example due to the constraints of converting an historic building. In these exceptional circumstances at least 60% of the area of a room must have a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m and none of the qualifying floor area may have a floor to ceiling height of less than 1.5m.*

**Council Response:**

It is not LBE's intention to dilute this policy and it is not accepted that the proposed wording does this. However, in order to clarify the council's approach, the supporting wording will be revised in a manner compatible with a minor modification to read;

"These space standards, derived from the rigorous work of the London Housing Design Guide, are the most robust design framework for housing currently in use in this country and are essential to the success of Ealing's development plan. The standards remain minima; in practice most development will need to exceed them in order to achieve the objectives of the London Housing Design Guide.

Detailed furnished floor plans should be submitted with all relevant application according to the form set out in the London Housing Design Guide.

A height standard is considered necessary to provide certainty in the application of these spaces standards and accords with the approach of the London Housing SPG. Limited exceptions to this requirement are acceptable in storage areas, in spaces beneath pitched roofs (up to 40% floor area according with the London Housing SPG), and at points in stairways. Where use of these exceptions is proposed, the furnished floor plans must demonstrate that spaces remain usable for their proposed purpose."

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM6 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Chris Brocklebank
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Ltd	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM5
<b>Representation:</b> Catalyst supports the Inspector's amendment that seeks to avoid the unnecessary protection of employment sites. We consider this amendment to be in the spirit of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).	
<b>Council Response:</b> Support Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM6 (2)	<b>Name:</b> Chris Brocklebank
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Ltd	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM14

<p><b>Representation:</b> Catalyst supports this new policy and welcomes opportunities to continue to work pro-actively with the London Borough of Ealing. Central to Catalyst’s on-going delivery strategy is to ensure that proposals are balanced, in terms of their social, environmental and economic planning benefits, and that planning permissions are viable in terms of delivery and implementation.</p>
<p><b>Council Response:</b> Support Noted</p>

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM7 (1)	<b>Name:</b> David Hammond
<b>On behalf of:</b> Natural England	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<p><b>Representation:</b> Natural England does not have any substantive comments to make in respect of the proposed modifications and would refer to our previous correspondence in respect of this consultation document - Changes to Policy 7D – Open Space, do make the policy slightly stronger and therefore more robust and are to be welcomed and encouraged. Also welcomed are the references to overshadowing and wind flow patterns impacts of new developments. Although Natural England does not wish to make any substantive comments in respect of this consultation, we would offer the following general advice.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity enhancements</b> Applications may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of sites from applicants, wherever possible. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that ‘Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity’. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that ‘conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat’.</p> <p><b>Landscape enhancements</b> Applications also have the potential to provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design,</p>	

form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM18 (1)	<b>Name:</b> John Templeton
<b>On behalf of:</b>	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM18
<b>Representation:</b> In the text, please amend 'Fitsherbert Walk' to 'FitzHerbert Walk', and also make this correction anywhere else within the Local Plan. The late Luke FitzHerbert, the founder of the Brent River Park, always insisted that his name should be spelt correctly, with a capital H for ...Herbert. You owe it to his memory and to his widow who still lives in Hanwell, to spell FitzHerbert correctly!	
<b>Council Response:</b> Accepted. Amend as a minor change the name of site in Table 3 of the Policies Map Booklet to read 'FitzHerbert Walk'.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM9 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Jennifer Ponting
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Ltd	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM7
<b>Representation:</b> The objective of reducing the opportunities for criminal behaviour and creating a sense of security in new development is wholly supported by St James and we consider the inclusion of measures to design out crime to be of utmost priority in the design and layout of development proposals. It is however considered that the additional policy wording proposed does not provide for the consideration also, of other design and policy objectives. A change of wording is therefore proposed as follows: Development should not place additional pressure on police resources where this could <u>reasonably</u> be avoided through changes to design and layout, <u>taking into account other policy and design requirements</u> .	
<b>Council Response:</b> Not accepted. It is unclear how reducing crime through design could be the utmost priority and also one of a range of conflicting and competing priorities in the design of schemes. The provision that is objected to form part of the supporting text to the policy and does not serve to override any other policy and design requirements.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM9 (2)	<b>Name:</b> Jennifer Ponting
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Ltd	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM10

**Representation:**

In light of the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in national planning policy, St James suggests a change to the proposed additional wording as follows:

*Residential development and development impacting on existing residential areas should demonstrate that it does not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of residents*

**Council Response:**

Not accepted. It is unclear why the representor considers that the substance of the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF is to reduce the role of the planning system to a negative test requiring only that development has 'no significant detrimental impact' on residents. The wording 'maintain or improve' set out in MM10 responds directly to the environmental role of the presumption in favour of sustainable development in para 7 of the NPPF that advocates 'protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment'.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM1
<p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>We object to this paragraph which attempts to explain the relationship of the policy map to the Management document. It is unsound because it demonstrates the unacceptable complexity of all the documents that will replace the UDP when the 5 sections of the Local Plan are adopted. The policies map/ supplementary booklet should demonstrate the geographical application of all policies which should be comprehensive and not just relate to housing, retail, employment land and changes in Green Belt/MOL not adequately supported by the Green Space Strategy. The later changes cannot be justified on grounds of accommodating built development proposals because the policies for MOL are the same as Green Belt.</p> <p>For Example- Greenford lagoons has been designated from Green Belt to MOL in Table 2 of the Policy Booklet when it has considerable nature conservation value for the Northolt Greenford Countryside park. ECS objected to the proposal in the Core Strategy for education on former GKS playing field which was to be changed from Green belt to MOL. The Council removed the reference to education and the Inspector agreed the designation to MOL. This adopted MOL policy has been ignored and a secondary school is being built on the site. Proposals for flats on this Greenford lagoon site are under consideration and should have been incorporated in the Sites DPD or the boundary changes included on the Policy Map .</p> <p>The complexity of the Plan is going to lead to many misunderstanding over policy, excessive number of petitions to the planning committee, appeals and land speculation. We consider that the limited number of objectors is due to this complexity and those that have objected feel that the local plan and local representations are ignored.</p>	

We were not aware that objections to the proposals map and booklet would be presented at the hearing until it became part of the Development Management Document.

We do not understand why the text refers to the consultation exercise which will have no relevance once the policy has been adopted.

We request the editing of the documents and the policy map and booklet so that they present a comprehensive picture.

**Council Response:**

This new paragraph is intended to provide clarity regarding the relationship between the Development Management DPD and the Policies Map document. Whilst the Council recognises the complexity of the process, the Council have in fact adopted a more rigorous approach in advertising/publishing mapping changes than regulations currently prescribe, initially treating the Policies Map and associated documents as a separate DPD. As a result the Council would argue that the Policies Map had in fact been given greater profile through the consultation process. Two formal stages of consultation were undertaken. The first in summer 2012 and the second in autumn 2012, coinciding with the consultation on the publication draft of the Development Sites and Development Management DPDs. As a result, the content of the Policies Map attracted considerable interest, and a substantial number of representations were received from a broad spectrum of the community/interest groups.

It is agreed that the final sentence of the new paragraph (and the associated Atlas at appendix four), should be removed from the final text of the document before it is published for adoption, as this text would be historical at that point. This change is considered to be of a minor nature.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (2)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM3
<b>Representation:</b> The proposed additional wording represents a significant dilution of the policy proposed by the Council in EDM1. The headroom should provide adequate space for ventilation as well as standing up. Using floorspace with inadequate ceiling height for built in furniture would result in the provision of unacceptably cramped accommodation. The proposed additional text should therefore be deleted.	
<b>Council Response:</b> It is not LBE's intention to dilute this policy and it is not accepted that the proposed wording does this. However, in order to clarify the council's approach, as a minor change the supporting wording could be revised to read; "These space standards, derived from the rigorous work of the London Housing Design Guide, are the most robust design framework for housing currently in use in this country and are essential to the success of Ealing's development plan. The	

standards remain minima; in practice most development will need to exceed them in order to achieve the objectives of the London Housing Design Guide.

Detailed furnished floor plans should be submitted with all relevant application according to the form set out in the London Housing Design Guide.

A height standard is considered necessary to provide certainty in the application of these spaces standards and accords with the approach of the London Housing SPG. Limited exceptions to this requirement are acceptable in storage areas, in spaces beneath pitched roofs (up to 40% floor area according with the London Housing SPG), and at points in stairways. Where use of these exceptions is proposed, the furnished floor plans must demonstrate that spaces remain usable for their proposed purpose."

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (3)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM8
<b>Representation:</b>	
<p>We are concerned that judgements made by the Council about what is high value visual character or poor environmental quality or weak character may differ markedly from those of local people. It is unsound to exclude clear directions about locally listed buildings in all the local plan documents or about conservation areas and those of special character in the Development Management DPD.</p> <p>We note that many areas of the Borough lie outside designated conservation areas, neighbourhood plan areas or locations to be included within area action plans. We are therefore concerned that large areas of the Borough will lack the local character and context studies upon which London Plan Policy 7.4 relies. Similar concerns have been expressed by English Heritage. We propose the following wording is added to MM8:</p> <p><i>"The Council will prepare Character and Context studies to inform the application of this policy, as recommended in the London Plan (footnote to paragraph 7.14) "</i>.</p>	
<b>Council Response:</b>	
It is unclear how the representor can support the inclusion of this wording in MM9 but object to it in MM8.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (4)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM9
<b>Representation:</b>	
Supporting text - This is welcomed	
<b>Council Response:</b>	
Support Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (5)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM10
<b>Representation:</b> Applicants should demonstrate this. It is impossible for a residential development to demonstrate anything.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted. As a minor change revise as; "Applications for residential development..."	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (6)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM11
<b>Representation:</b> ECS objected to some of the rewording of this policy at the Hearing and proposed some changes to the amended text. The purpose of these proposed changes is to ensure that Policy 7C is clear, unambiguous and robust, so that we end up with a policy that it is not open to misinterpretation. At present the policy is unclear and therefore unsound. The proposed changes listed in the eleven points below should be considered together, rather than individually or in isolation in order to achieve soundness.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section A: using “affecting” instead of “of” by so that it reads “Development affecting heritage assets ...”</li> <li>2. Sub-sections B.a and B.b: using “conserve” instead of “retain”, so that they read “conserve and enhance ...”, and “conserve elements ...” respectively</li> <li>3. Sub-section B.a: adding “... quality and ...”, so that the second part of the sentence reads “... that undermine the quality and significance of the Conservation Area”</li> <li>4. Sub-section B.b: adding “... the character and appearance of...”, so that it reads “[retain] conserve elements identified as contributing positively, and seek to improve or replace elements identified as detracting from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area”</li> <li>5. Sub-section B.b: alternatively, we suggested that the text in point 4 above could be amended to refer to “the character and significance of the Conservation Area”</li> <li>6. Section D: using “prevented” instead of “avoided”, so that the first sentence reads “Harm to any heritage asset should be prevented”</li> <li>7. Supporting text – Designated heritage assets: adding a reference to statutorily listed buildings, so that the first sentence reads “Designated heritage assets are defined in the glossary of the NPPF and include statutorily listed buildings and Conservation Areas as a whole.”</li> </ol>	

8. Supporting text – Designated heritage assets: adding, in the last sentence of the first paragraph, “character” so that the reference is to “Conservation Area Character Appraisals” and thus reflects Ealing Council’s own terminology
9. Supporting text – Designated heritage assets: adding, in the last sentence of the second paragraph, “or not” so that the sentence reads “... at risk of harm whether or not this results from ...”
10. We consider that Section C of the policy is not clear, and should be rewritten entirely to read “When applying sustainable and inclusive design principles to the development of heritage assets, the significance of the heritage assets should be understood and conserved.”
11. Also Section D of the policy is not clear, and should be rewritten entirely (incorporating the change in point 6 above) to read “Harm to any heritage asset should be prevented. Proposals that seek to cause harm should be exceptional, and be clearly and convincingly justified in line with national policy.”

**Council Response:**

Points 1 and 2 are accepted in the interests of clarity.

Point 3 is incorrect; heritage assets are protected in terms of their significance not any abstract conceptions of their 'quality' , to the extent that there may be considerations of quality that are wholly unrelated to the significance of the asset then these should be determined in relation to the plan's design and amenity policies.

Point 4 and 5 are incorrect; the provision relates to the form used in CAAs and CAMPs of identifying elements that contribute to or detract from the conservation area, these are not only defined in terms of heritage significance, or even necessarily local character, but contribution to the public realm, it is not helpful therefore to couch this policy clause in terms of significance or character.

Point 6; applications themselves do not prevent harm; they avoid it.

Point 7; the point of this sentence to to emphasise that CAs as a whole constitute designated heritage assets, not just those or their elements that have an inherent heritage value, the reference to statutory listed buildings is beside the point.

Point 8; the reference is intended to bring Ealing terminology in line with national practice.

Point 9 is illogical; it is not possible for harm or risk of harm to derive neither from action nor inaction.

Point 10; LBE considers its preferred wording to be clearer.

Point 11; the point of this clause is to establish that harm should be exceptional in relation to the significance of the asset, the proposed wording does not include this point.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (7)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM12
<b>Representation:</b>	

K and Wharncliffe Viaduct are supported but the list of views should be considered further. It is unsound to include only built structures as land marks. High points such as Horsenden Hill, Down Barns and Warren Farm are equally important. These were recorded as view points which were by their height also landmarks

**Council Response:**

Not accepted. The large natural features mentioned are subject to open space protections that are more effective in protecting their internal and external views. If an area of flat land such as Warren Farm were to be designated a landmark then it would be difficult to avoid listing as such every structure in the borough.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (8)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM13
<b>Representation:</b> ECS object to changes in garden space which is regarded as green not brown in the NPPF. Gardens are very important in an area where sheds can be built under PD reducing green space that helps reduce London heat island effect. 50/75 sq m should be retained - see rep for appendix 1	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted. Beyond the minimum standards which derive from the Mayor's Housing SPG for gardens, it was not considered appropriate or necessary to set minimum quantitative space standards for any additional provision, which in many cases will be sought, as this would make the policy too rigid and less responsive to specific needs/circumstances of the case, its context and the Council's spatial priorities in relation to open space provision. In an area of public open space deficiency for example, the policy is designed to allow the Council to prioritise the provision of new public open space over additional garden space provision. It also allows us to prioritise financial contributions over open space provision, where for example the existing quantity of provision is sufficient, but is of low quality and would therefore benefit from further investment. For those cases where garden provision is prioritised over other forms of open space, and a higher level of additional garden space provision is sought, it was considered helpful as a guide to make reference to yardsticks (for example 50 sq. m. of private open space per house & 15 sq. m. per flat).	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (9)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM14
<b>Representation:</b> Where will it go in the plan? With removal of sensible garden space standards, distance between habitable rooms, references to locally listed buildings and the promotion of car free housing in unsuitable locations, it is easy for	

overdevelopment to be disguised as sustainable by depriving residents of amenities that will enable the development to satisfy and adapt to future needs without expensive redevelopment

Also applicants can argue that a policy is out of date unless they are recorded clearly and adequately in the plan and subsequently monitored. This policy is only sound if it is backed up by clear standards that need replacing in the text and by adequate monitoring.

**Council Response:**

It is unclear what changes if any the representor would like to be made to the wording of MM14.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (10)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM15
<b>Representation:</b> This map should show a full range of policy boundaries and symbols including Conservation Areas, Listed and locally listed buildings. 2 Nature Conservation Management Areas should be retained as shown on the Proposals Map ie Brent River Park and Norwood Green -Osterley Boundaries which were approved in the Core Strategy and are not shown on the policy map. See rep for email	
<b>Council Response:</b> This modification (MM15) is essentially a technical one intended to establish a link between the Policies Map and the DPD. This specific modification does not relate to the content of the policies map document(s). As covered previously the Council has made the conscious decision to remove those designations which are maintained outside of the development plan process, to ensure that the published documents are up to date. The Council intends to develop a live interactive online map, where such layers will be uploaded and viewable. This platform has the benefit of being able to be updated on a more regular basis. Those areas previously designated as Nature Conservation Management Areas in the UDP have largely been redesignated as SINC sites, a more effective designation.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (11)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM16
<b>Representation:</b> ECS object to the omissions from this booklet of footpaths, cycle ways and the errors included in Table 2 MOL and areas of BRP. It includes Warren Farm within the Norword Green-Osterley Nature Conservation Management Area which is a change not adequately identified in the mass of documents that we have had to try understand. It is unsound because it is in the Brent River catchment area, on the Parks Department map of the BRP which shows Council owned land in the BRP (see rep) and this together with adjoining land and Long Wood which is part of the BRP footpath system, has been in	

the BRP since it was set up in the 70s

**Council Response:**  
 This modification is essentially a technical one intended to establish a link between the Policies Map and the DPD. This specific modification does not relate to the content of the policies map document(s). As covered previously the Council has made the conscious decision to remove layers which are maintained outside of the development plan process, including footpaths and cycle routes.  
 It is agreed that for the entry - 'site 42 - Warren Farm/Jubilee Meadow/Long Wood' in table 2 of the Policies Map Booklet, that the text (in column 3) should be amended identifying this area as forming part of the Brent River Park consolidated area rather than 'Norwood Green - Osterley' (as it had previously been in the UDP). This is a minor change and would have no bearing on the application of policies.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (12)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM17
<b>Representation:</b> Atlas of map changes (EPM 6) Atlas map 4 is superseded.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (13)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM18
<b>Representation:</b> We support exclusion of MOL designation from area built upon but not the rear gardens of 110 and 112 St Margarets Rd and return of Community Open Space to MOL.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Noted. The Council would not however support the inclusion of rear gardens at 110 and 112 St Margaret's Road as either MOL or COS, as this land comprises private gardens fenced off and clearly distinguishable from the allotments and the wider MOL area.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (14)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM19
<b>Representation:</b> Adding Heritage Register of Historic parks and gardens is supported.	

<b>Council Response:</b> Support Noted
---

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (15)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM20
<b>Representation:</b> Adding English Heritages Register of historic parks and gardens is supported.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Support Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (16)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM13
<b>Representation:</b> Local policy A add "or area" to contribution. Local policy B We object to the deletion of 'A buffer strip of 5 m around existing or proposed open spaces or 10m in the case of Sinc/SMI This is a very useful rule of thumb that does not have to be imposed in every case if 'normally' is inserted. If new open space is provided any land left open may benefit from being included in the POS rather the adjoining development site. If there are large or tall buildings proposed near an existing open space then more than 5 m would be needed to avoid overshadowing shadowing the POS and shading a sunny Nature Conservation Site is unsound because it would damage the habitat. Table 7D.1 This table gives guidance on types of open space that are required for type and level of development. The format is very unclear. There are too many footnotes We object to the following : 1) All development with child bed spaces should have doorstep play even if there is public open space nearby. In an area of open space deficiency a site for POS should have priority over contributions. Houses/flats at the upper end of 10-149 units ( over 50) should have a site provided rather than contributions otherwise deficiency will never be relieved. 2) Active elderly should contribute towards POS.  Table 7D 2 Private Garden Space and Communal Garden Space is totally inadequate for suburban or urban Ealing which is better served by Table 5D in the UDP. Existing garden Space is regarded as green space and is very important for trees and control of the London Heat island. 50 sq m should be retained for houses under 5 habitable rooms and 75 sq m for a larger house and a group of up to 5 flats. Less may be acceptable in Town Centre. The private garden space for flats is totally inadequate except in a area identified as suitable for high rise where there is access to adequate public	

open space.

**Council Response:**

Appendix 1 and 2 referenced here form appendices to the Main Modifications and not the DPD itself.

Inserting 'or area' to clause A of this policy is considered unnecessary as 'contribution' is defined in the accompanying text as including either actual space provision or a monetary contribution.

Regarding clause B of this policy no further changes were proposed to this aspect of the policy as part of the main modifications. Evidence has already been given and heard at the hearing sessions on this matter. In summary, the policy as written focuses on the outcome of development, rather than prescribing the inputs. The depth of the buffer is best determined on a case by case basis with reference to the specific proposal and context, and this is acknowledged in the accompanying text. To provide a degree of certainty for applicants as to what may be expected, reference is made to a 'yardstick' of 5/10m in the accompanying text.

The format of the tables follows the conventions adopted for other tables in the London Plan. A number of further changes have been published post submission as minor changes, to assist in the interpretation of this policy.

Regarding child play space no further changes were proposed on this particular aspect of the policy as part of the Main Modifications. This specific standard should be read alongside the Mayor's SPG 'Children & Young People's Play and Informal Recreation, which provides further guidance regarding the type of child play space to be sought.

The accompanying key to table 7D.2 already prioritise the provision on-site in areas of deficiency. Moreover these notes also prioritise space provision, over financial contributions on larger sites where need for such space is identified.

Regarding standards for Active Elderly, whilst a contribution towards POS may be sought on a case by case basis, securing allotment provision was prioritised instead.

The Council would argue that the standards set out in the UDP are limited largely focusing on securing garden space provision and often at the expense of other forms of open space. This new policy intends to redress this imbalance, and has been designed to secure provision which is responsive to the specific needs/circumstances of the case, its context and the Council's priorities in relation to open space provision. Whilst table 7D.2 sets minimum standards (taken from the Mayor's Housing SPG) for private garden space, this is intended as minima only, and as noted in the key/accompanying notes to this table in most circumstances these minimum standards will be supplemented by additional private garden space. The Council would however resist setting space standards for this additional provision as this would make the policy too rigid. Retaining standards similar to those in the UDP would limit the Council's ability to prioritise other other forms of open space where need is demonstrated. In an area of public open space deficiency for example, the policy is designed to allow the Council to prioritise the provision of new public open space over additional garden space provision. It also allows us to prioritise financial contributions over open space provision, where for example the existing quantity of

provision is sufficient, but is of low quality and would therefore benefit from further investment. For those cases where garden provision is prioritised over other forms of open space, and a higher level of additional garden space provision is sought, it was considered helpful as a guide to make reference to a 'yardstick'/rule of thumb' (for example 50 sq. m. of private open space per house & 15 sq. m. per flat). The Council does not consider it necessary to differentiate between locations within and outside town centres, as this is best determined on a case by case basis with reference to policies LV7.4 and 7B.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (17)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM13
<b>Representation:</b> Appendix 2 seems a repetition of Appendix 1. Why is it a separate Appendix. We do not know why these documents have to be so complicated.	
<b>Council Response:</b> Appendix 1 and 2 referenced here form appendices to the Main Modifications and not the DPD itself. The revised policy 7D as detailed in appendix 1 to the Main Modifications was repeated at appendix 2 without tracked changes for ease of reference/understanding.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM10 (18)	<b>Name:</b> Judy Harris
<b>On behalf of:</b> Ealing Civic Society (ECS)	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM15/MM16
<b>Representation:</b> ECS objections to Atlas of proposed changes and Policy Booklet We objected to 12 items to EPM 6 and maintain these objections although welcome the return of MOL status to land at St Margaret's Rd. MM15 On the last Hearing Day we argued the Brent River Park boundary which is shown on the proposals map as a Nature Conservation Management Area should be retained on the Policy Map (as should Norwood Green) The park as originally defined included public and private open space along the River Brent continuously through the borough from NE to SW. The Adopted Core Strategy confirmed the parkland as an important amenity for nature conservation, as a floodplain and outdoor recreation: ie Policy 5.2 on protecting and enhancing MOL. " The council in realising the potential of the network of MOL in the borough will promote the following proposals ....f) Brent River park and adjacent MOL *Brent River Park - sensitive management of this public parkland for amenity, nature conservation use and as a flood plain; scope for more intensive outdoor recreation uses in the vicinity of Gurnell pool, subject to addressing flood risk issues; improved athletics track	

and sports facilities. Map 7 of all the green spaces does not show the boundaries of policy areas a-h. The UDP boundaries should be paramount because they are long established as agreed between the council and the Brent River Canal Society. Until the new Policies map and LDP is adopted, the existing boundaries are still valid. The BRP is confirmed as policy in the Adopted Core Strategy and no change was made to the boundary. It relied on the Nature Conservation Management boundary on the UDP Proposals Map

At the Hearing Ian Weake was asked to consider this by the Inspector and Ian came back, after internal discussions held during a break, to insist that it was not deemed necessary to show the Brent River Park on the policy map because:

1 The individual elements with nature conservation value are covered (and hence better protected!) under nature conservation policies was the Ealing Planning Policy Team view.

ECS-Not all the individual elements of nature conservation value are protected. It is particularly important that golf courses and playing fields are managed with wildlife in mind so that grassland is managed to ensure they are species rich and surface run off does not pollute the river. Private gardens and woodland sites support winter survival of birds and insects,

2 We should have objected to it not being shown at the Core Strategy Stage.

ECS had no reason to object at the Core Strategy Stage because it had no intimation that the BRP would, in effect, be later deleted in the Management DPD policy map by removing the Nature Policy Management Areas.

We did not know we should object until the Policy map was put up for objection, which we did in May 2012. The objection to the loss of BRP boundary was reinforced at the Hearing

3 The Policy Booklet already lists which public and community open spaces are in the Brent River Park.

ECS- Table 2 does not specify that the MOL specified as in the BRP is a definitive definition of the BRP. The Map forwarded by Parks Dept. at our request after the closure of the Hearing is almost the same as the list shown in the policy booklet Table 2 which Ian Ross confirms in the Email below as not been the definitive boundary of the BRP. It excludes West Middlesex Golf Course which is in the Table 2 list but both exclude Ealing Golf Course, School playing fields, private grazing land and some private gardens. Not all the individual elements of nature conservation value are protected. It is particularly important that golf courses and playing fields are managed with wildlife in mind so that grassland is encouraged to be species rich and surface run off does not pollute the river. Private gardens and woodland sites support winter survival of birds and insects.

**Council Response:**

This modification detailed at MM15 & 16 are essentially technical ones intended to establish a link between the Policies Map and the DPD. These specific modifications do not relate to the content of the policies map document(s).

Evidence has already been given and heard at the hearing sessions on this matter. In summary, the Council does not consider it necessary to identify the BRP as a separate designation on the map. The policies map as presented is now to

be appended to the Development Management DPD, and defining the extent of the BRP would add no value to the application of the policies being examined. Conversely the lack of any specific BRP designation does not hinder the effectiveness of managing development within and adjoining these areas. The BRP is covered by a variety of different designations and associated policies, both within the Development Management DPD and elsewhere. These policies, and particularly policy LV 2.18 recognise the need to consider open space as a complete network. When considering proposals within or adjoining the BRP, the policy seek to ensure that any such impact is considered with reference to the wider network, and not just the immediate locality. The sites which make up the BRP are listed separately in the schedules which form the Policies Map Booklet. Where individual sites are considered to form or contribute to a larger area of open space, for example in this instance the BRP, this is recognised and recorded in the schedule, as is the case for MOL in table 2 of the Booklet.

Whilst the Council would not now be willing (nor does it deem it necessary) to consider any further changes to the primary designations relating to such open space, i.e. the extent of areas defined as MOL, POS, SINC's etc, we would be willing to review, any sub-groupings attributed to these individual sites as detailed in the tables in the Policies Map Booklet, with ECS/BRCS for accuracy/completeness. Any such changes arising from this review would be of a minor nature.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM11 (1)	<b>Name:</b> David Churchill Icen Projects
<b>On behalf of:</b> Stolken Greenford Ltd	<b>Main Mod ref:</b> MM14
<b>Representation:</b> SGL is broadly supportive of the proposed main modifications to the Development Management DPD, in particular the proposed inclusion of new policy MM14	
<b>Council Response:</b> Support Noted	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM12 (1)	<b>Name:</b> Nic Ferriday
<b>On behalf of:</b> Brent River & Canal Society	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> The Brent River & Canal Society (BRCS) strongly objects to the change in designation of Warren Farm. Until the current LDF process, Warren Farm was clearly part of the Brent River Park. We are in possession of council maps that show this; we have not included these in our email submission because of their size. (We will be happy to supply the maps if there is any question in the Inspector's mind that this is a correct statement.) In the Core Strategy 'Adopted Development (or Core Strategy); Rough Edit Version, April 3rd 2012', page 55, a new designation of land was introduced:	

*“Norwood Green – Osterley: farm management to enhance nature conservation, education, tourism and recreation, including respecting heritage land designation due to association with Osterley Park.”*

This was split off from the pre-existing Brent River Park, as is clear from the same page in the Core Strategy:

“Brent River Park and adjacent MOL (see also Policy 2.9 above):

- Brent River Park (BRP) - sensitive management of this public parkland for amenity, nature conservation use, and as flood plain; scope for more intensive outdoor recreation uses in the vicinity of Gurnell pool, subject to addressing flood risk issues; improved athletics track and sports facilities. Refurbishment of stable block and animal centre
- Norwood Green – Osterley: farm management to enhance nature conservation, education, tourism and recreation, including respecting heritage land designation due to association with Osterley Park.”

While a new category was defined, this was not associated in the Strategy with any particular areas of land. In particular, Map 7 does not show which land was intended as “Norwood Green – Osterley” or indeed “Brent River Park”. It was therefore not possible for consultees such as BRCS to realise the implications of the new designation at that time.

Therefore objections to it were not made.

It is only now, with the publication of the Policies Map Booklet (‘Policies Map Booklet with Minor Changes (Consolidated Incorporating Further Alterations): Submission Document EPM5’), that the significance of the change has become apparent. Namely, that Warren Farm would be removed from the Brent River Park and put into a new category (Table 2, page 37) with somewhat different objectives (see quote above).

The reason why Ealing Council has made these changes has only recently become clear. Ealing Council has been in discussion for a long while with Queen’s Park Rangers (QPR) football club to lease Warren Farm at peppercorn rent to the club and allow them to build a corporate headquarters on it. A high fence would surround 2/3 of the land and the public would be excluded from the entire site, previously open access, except where and when allowed by QPR.

Even Ealing Council accepts that this is “inappropriate development” in MOL and it is clearly contrary to the policies and ethos of the Brent River Park. This explains why Ealing Council first split off a designation from the Brent River Park (in the Core Strategy) and later put Warren Farm into it (in the Policies Map Booklet).

This change is unsound because there is no reasoned justification for taking land out of the Brent River Park. It is now apparent that it is a cynical and deceitful ploy in the LDF to make it easier to justify a handover of public land and development on it that the council was planning in secret

**Council Response:**

This representation does not directly relate to any of the Main Modifications published.

To provide clarity on this matter, the Council can confirm however that no changes are proposed to the planning designations relating to this site from those adopted under the Core Strategy in April 2012. The main change introduced a

that time through the Core Strategy was to add a COS designation to the sports ground. Whether intentional or not, the land (Warren Farm) as defined as MOL did not form part of the Brent River Park in the 2004 UDP, but instead it was listed under 'Norwood Green - Osterley'. This was in contrast to the nature conservation designations which listed it as forming part of the wider Brent River Park. It is agreed that for the entry - 'site 42 - Warren Farm/Jubilee Meadow/Long Wood' in table 2 of the Policies Map Booklet, that the text should be amended identifying this area as forming part of the Brent River Park consolidated area rather than 'Norwood Green - Osterley). This is a minor change and would have no bearing on the application of policies.

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM12 (2)	<b>Name:</b> Nic Ferriday
<b>On behalf of:</b> Brent River & Canal Society	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> BRCS also objects to the taking of Long Wood, Jubilee Meadow and Tentelow Open Space out of the Brent River Park. There is no reasoned justification for these changes which are, therefore, unsound.	
<b>Council Response:</b> It is agreed that for the entry - 'site 42 - Warren Farm/Jubilee Meadow/Long Wood' in table 2 of the Policies Map Booklet, that the text should be amended identifying this area as forming part of the Brent River Park consolidated area rather than 'Norwood Green - Osterley). Nature conservation sites 59 'Long Wood and Meadow' and 100 'Wyncote Farm', in table 5 should also be prefixed with 'Brent River Park:'. These are minor changes and would have no bearing on the application of policies.	

<b>Rep:</b> DM-MM12 (3)	<b>Name:</b> Nic Ferriday
<b>On behalf of:</b> Brent River & Canal Society	<b>Main Mod ref:</b>
<b>Representation:</b> Finally, we note that other groups, such as Hanwell Community Forum, also share these concerns. They have not objected here because they were told that, having not been original objectors, they were not allowed to object at this stage. BRCS considers this is an abuse of the LDF process. As explained above, potential consultees had no reason to suspect what was happening at the Core Strategy stage and therefore would not have felt the need to respond. But because they did not respond then, they are not allowed to respond now, despite the new information in the Policies Map Booklet and resulting new insights. We urge the Inspector to give all parties the chance to comment on this aspect.	
<b>Council Response:</b> This is incorrect. The Hanwell Community Forum had not commented on the publication draft of the DPD's and were therefore unable to submit evidence to earlier stages of the EIP. Many of their concerns were however raised by other	

individuals/groups who attended and presented evidence on such matters. Regarding the publication of the Main Modification, comments were welcome from all parties providing these comments related directly to the modifications published.

The Council have in fact adopted a more rigorous approach in advertising/publishing mapping changes than regulations currently prescribe, initially treating the Policies Map and associated documents as a separate DPD. As a result the Council would argue that the Policies Map had in fact been given greater profile through the consultation process. Two formal stages of consultation were undertaken. The first in summer 2012 and the second in autumn 2012, coinciding with the consultation on the publication draft of the Development Sites and Development Management DPDs. As a result, the content of the Policies Map attracted considerable interest, and a substantial number of representations were received from a broad spectrum of the community/interest groups.