

**Southall Gateway  
Supplementary Planning  
Document**

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

**May 2015**

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 'Southall Gateway Supplementary Planning Document' was published by Ealing Council for public consultation from 16th March to 24<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

1.2 The Southall Gateway SPD forms an update to the adopted Southall OAPF, specifically to chapter 4.2 'Southall Gateway'.

1.3 The SPD was the subject of public consultation in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and Ealing's Statement of Community Involvement and this Consultation Statement has been produced in accordance with Regulation 12 (a).

1.4 In accordance with regulation 12(a), this Consultation Statement sets out:-

- (i) The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning documents (see APPENDIX 1)
- (ii) A summary of the main issues raised by those person (see SECTION 3); and
- (iii) How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document (see SECTION 4 and APPENDIX 2)

## 2 THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

### The consultation arrangements

- 2.1 The consultation period took place from 16th March to 24<sup>th</sup> April 2015.
- 2.2 The SPD was published on the Council's web site during this period along with advice on where and when the SPD was available for inspection. Copies were deposited for inspection at each of the borough's Main libraries and at the Council office (Perceval House).
- 2.3 Letters and an E-Bulletin were sent to all individuals/organisations recorded on the Council's consultation database.
- 2.4 The consultation was also publicised at various meetings including at the Local Plans Advisory Committee and the Planning and Community Working Group, and a presentation to the congregation of the Gurdwara.

### The response

- 2.5 62 representations were submitted by 11 individuals and organisations. The respondents included:
  - 8 statutory bodies:
    - Greater London Authority (GLA)
    - Heathrow Airport Limited
    - Highways England
    - Historic England
    - Marine Management Organisation
    - Natural England
    - National Grid
    - Transport for London (TfL)
  - 2 site owners:
    - GL Hearn on behalf of Michael Hunt
    - St James Group Limited
  - 1 housing association:
    - Catalyst Housing Limited

### 3 SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED

3.1 The main issues raised by respondents are summarised below

#### Key Issues

- The principle of comprehensive scheme with high quality built form and public realm was supported.
- Clarification was sought about the relationship of this guidance to other character areas in Southall OAPF.

#### Other issues

- Mention was sought of the background evidence that supported Southall OAPF.
- Clarity was sought over the status of funding for the pedestrian/cycle bridge.
- Advice was given of a range of technical constraints to the site stemming from gas infrastructure.
- Clarification was sought about the status of the design guidance set out in the SPD.
- A range of clarifications were suggested to the indicative mapping.
- The use of Fig 5, which illustrates a previous scheme, was questioned

## **4 RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED**

- 4.1 A full summary of the consultation responses received, the Council's response and any proposed changes to the SPD as a result of the consultation responses is provided within Appendix 2 of this Statement.

## APPENDIX 1: CONSULTEES

### Specific Consultees

Amec on behalf of National Grid  
Anglian Water  
Atlantic Electric and Gas  
BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding  
Brent Council  
British Gas  
British Gas Properties  
British Waterways London  
BT Group plc  
Canal & River Trust  
Countrywide Farmers Plc  
Croydon Council  
Department for Culture, Media and Sport  
Department of Health  
Director of Asset Management  
Ealing Primary Care Trust  
Ecotricity  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Equality and Human Rights Commission  
Forestry Commission  
Good Energy Limited  
Greater London Authority (GLA)  
Harrow Council  
Heathrow Airport Limited  
Highways Agency  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Hounslow Council  
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham  
London Borough of Havering  
London Borough of Hillingdon  
London Energy Plc  
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority  
London Waterways - Canal and River Trust  
Marine Management Organisation  
Metropolitan Police Authority  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
NHS  
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit  
NHS Property Services Ltd  
North West London Strategic Health Authority  
Npower  
O2 (cellnet)  
Opus Energy Limited  
Powergen  
RenewableUK  
Richmond upon Thames Council  
Scottish Gas  
Scottish Hydro Electric  
ScottishPower  
Seaboard Energy Limited

Southern Electric  
Sports England  
SWALEC  
SWEB Energy Limited  
Telecom Plus PLC  
Thames Water  
Thames Water Property Services  
Thames Water Utilities Ltd  
The Theatres Trust  
Three Valleys Water  
T-Mobile (UK) Limited  
Transport for London  
Transport for London, West London Tram (TFL)  
Virgin HomeEnergy Limited  
Vodafone Group Plc  
Wandsworth Council  
West London Health Estates  
West London Waste Authority

### General Consultees

A2Dominion Group  
Action Acton  
Actionvale Community Centre  
Acton Alliance  
Acton Community Forum  
Acton Green Residents Association  
Acton History Group  
Afghan Academy  
Age UK Ealing  
Alder King  
Alliance Planning  
Alzheimers Concern Ealing  
Ancient Monuments Society  
Apna Ghar Housing Association Ltd  
Armenian Hayashen  
Arup Partnership  
Ascott Avenue Residents Association  
Ashra-Asian Carers Project  
Asian Family Counselling Services  
ASRA Housing Association  
Austin Mackie Associates Ltd  
Avenue Road/Villiers Road Residents Association  
Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd  
Barton Willmore  
Bedford Park Society  
Bell Cornwell LLP  
Bellway Homes  
Biscoe Craig Hall  
Boston Manor Residents Association  
Boyer Planning Ltd  
BREEAM  
Brent River & Canal Society

Brentham Society  
British Geological Survey  
Brookside Consulting  
Burland TM Ltd  
Buro Happold Ltd  
Caldecotte Consultants  
Campaign for Real Ale Limited  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Capita Symonds  
Catalyst Housing Ltd  
CBRE  
Central & Cecil Housing Care & Support  
Central Ealing Residents' Association  
CgMs Consulting  
Charles Russell LLP  
Chris Thomas Ltd  
Churchfield Community Association  
Churchill Hui  
Cissbury Consulting  
City & Provincial Properties Plc  
Colne Valley Rural Development Forum  
Council For British Archaeology  
Councillor A Young  
Councillor Abdullah Gulaid  
Councillor Alexander Stafford  
Councillor Andrew Steed  
Councillor Anthony Kelly  
Councillor Aysha Raza  
Councillor B Mahfouz  
Councillor B Reeves  
Councillor Benjamin Dennehy  
Councillor Binda Rai  
Councillor C Costello  
Councillor Charan Sharma  
Councillor Chris Summers  
Councillor Ciaran McCartan  
Councillor D Pagan  
Councillor D Scott  
Councillor Daniel Crawford  
Councillor David Millican  
Councillor David Rodgers  
Councillor Dee Martin  
Councillor E Harris  
Councillor Edward Rennie  
Councillor Gareth Shaw  
Councillor Gary Busuttil  
Councillor Gary Malcolm  
Councillor Gregory Stafford  
Councillor Gurmit Kaur Mann  
Councillor H Rose  
Councillor Harbhajan Kaur-Dheer  
Councillor Hitesh Tailor  
Councillor I Potts  
Councillor Ian Proud  
Councillor Isobel Grant  
Councillor J Anderson  
Councillor J Cowing  
Councillor J Gallagher  
Councillor J Popham  
Councillor J Stacey  
Councillor Jasbir Anand  
Councillor Joanna Camadoo  
Councillor Joanne Dabrowska  
Councillor Jon Ball  
Councillor Josh Blacker  
Councillor Joy Morrissey  
Councillor Julian Bell  
Councillor Kamaljit Dhindsa  
Councillor Kamaljit Kaur Nagpal  
Councillor Karam Mohan  
Councillor Kate Crawford  
Councillor Kieron Gavan  
Councillor Lauren Wall  
Councillor Lynne Murray  
Councillor M Reen  
Councillor Mik Sabiers  
Councillor Mohammad Aslam  
Councillor Mohammed Kausar  
Councillor Mohinder Kaur Midha  
Councillor Munir Ahmed  
Councillor Natasha Ahmed-Shaikh  
Councillor Nigel Bakhai  
Councillor Nigel Sumner  
Councillor Patricia Walker  
Councillor Patrick Cogan  
Councillor Paul Conlon  
Councillor Penny Jones  
Councillor Peter Mason  
Councillor Rajinder Mann  
Councillor Ranjit Dheer  
Councillor Ray Wall  
Councillor Rosamund Reece  
Councillor S Ahmed  
Councillor S Singh Kang  
Councillor Sanjai Kohli  
Councillor Sarfraz Khan  
Councillor Seema Kumar  
Councillor Shital Manro  
Councillor Simon Woodroofe  
Councillor Sitarah Anjum  
Councillor Steve Hynes  
Councillor Surinder Varma  
Councillor Swaran Padda  
Councillor Tariq Mahmood  
Councillor Tej Bagha  
Councillor Tejinder Dhami  
Councillor Theresa Byrne  
Councillor Theresa Mullins  
Councillor Tim Murtagh  
Councillor W Brooks  
Councillor Wendy Langan  
Councillor Y Johnson  
Councillor Yoel Gordon  
Councillor Z Abbas-Noori  
Creffield Area Residents Association (CARA)  
Crest Nicholson Developments Ltd  
Crime Prevention Design Advisor  
Crispins Wine Bar  
Curl La Tourelle Architects  
D.S Bhasin

Dalton Warner Davis LLP  
David Wilson Homes Ltd  
Day Lewis Planning Limited  
Defence Estates Operations South  
Deloitte LLP  
Denton Wilde Sapte  
Derek Horne & Associates  
Development Securities Plc  
Dialogue  
DMH Stallard  
Dormers Wells Residents Association  
DP9  
DPDS Consulting Group  
Drivers Jonas Deloitte  
DTZ  
Durstons House  
Ealing Arts  
Ealing Arts Centre  
Ealing Civic Society  
Ealing Common Conservation Area Panel  
Ealing Common Society  
Ealing Community Network  
Ealing Cricket Ground Conservation Area Panel  
Ealing Cycling Campaign  
Ealing Falcons Badminton Club  
Ealing Fields Residents Association  
Ealing Friends of the Earth  
Ealing Liberal Synagogue  
Ealing Somali Community Welfare  
Ealing Transition  
Ealing Wildlife Network  
Ealing, Hammersmith and West London College  
ECVS  
European Urban Architecture  
Fields in Trust  
Firstplan  
Forge Cottages Residents Association  
Foxtons Estate Agents  
Frendcastle  
Friends of Haven Green (FoHG)  
Friends, Families and Traveller and Traveller Law Reform Project  
Frogmore Property Company  
Fusion Online Ltd  
Gareth Daniel Associates  
Gerald Eve LLP  
GL Hearn Limited  
Golden Opportunity Youth Association  
Goldsmith Area Residents Association  
Golflinks Residents Association  
Greenford Community Centre  
Greenford Gospel Church  
GSK  
GVA  
Hanger Hill Estate Residents Association  
Hanwell & Canals (West) Conservation Area Panel  
Hanwell Car Centre  
Hanwell Community Centre  
Hanwell Steering Group  
Harper Planning  
Harrow Estates Plc  
Hartwood Property Management Ltd  
Havelock Estate Residents Association  
Hayes Community Forum  
Heaton Planning  
Heynes Planning  
Hindu Youth Organisation  
Home Builders Federation  
Horn of Africa Advice Centre  
Housing For Women  
Howard J Green FRICS Chartered Surveyor  
Howard Sharp and Partners  
Hunters Solicitors  
Hynes Optometrists  
Iceni Projects  
Indigo Planning Ltd  
Inland Homes  
Inland Waterways Association  
Island Triangle Resident's Association in North Acton.  
J D Asset Management Plc  
Jay Ashall Associates  
Jehovah's Witnesses  
Jinah School of Urdu  
John Rowan & Partners  
Jones Lang LaSalle  
Kevin Scott Consultancy  
Khudamil Ahmadiyya Association  
Kings Fund  
Kingsdown Residents Association  
Kirkwells  
Landmark Information Group  
Legal & General Assurance Society Ltd c/o  
Burnett Planning & Development  
Level Ltd  
Linden Homes Chiltern  
London Anglican  
London Diocesan House  
London First  
London Motorcycle Museum & Ravenor Farm Community Association  
London Planning Practice  
Look Ahead Housing and Care Ltd  
Lynne Evans Planning  
Maddox & Associates Ltd  
Manhattan Lofts Corporation  
Mason & Partners Commercial Property Consultants and  
Mavenplan  
Mayfair Investments  
Metropolis PD Ltd  
Milap Day Centre  
Mono Consultants Ltd  
Montagu Evans  
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP)  
Neighbours Paper  
Network Housing Group



Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Peacock & Smith  
Pegasus Group Ltd  
Permission Homes North London  
Persimmon Homes Thames Valley  
Pitshanger Community Association  
PJ Planning  
Planning Perspectives LLP  
Planning Potential Ltd  
Planware Ltd  
Questors  
Rail Freight Group  
Ransome & Company  
Rapleys LLP  
Ravenocean Ltd  
Red and White Design  
Renaissance Planning  
Renewable UK  
Rex International Ltd/ Pension Fund  
Robert Brett & Sons Ltd  
Royal Bank of Scotland  
RPS Planning  
SARAG  
Save Trees In Gunnersbury  
Savills  
Scope  
Scott Brownrigg  
Scott Planning Associates Ltd  
Segro  
Selborne Society  
SHAA Road Residents Association  
Shepherds Bush Housing Group  
SHLAP (Stop Horn lane Pollution)  
Smith Jenkins Limited  
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings  
Society of Afghan Residents  
Somali Community Association - Southall  
Southall Black Sisters  
Southall Church of God  
Southall Community Alliance  
Southall Day Centre Ltd  
Southall Local History Society  
Southall Merchants Association  
Southall Rights  
Speer Dade Planning Consultants  
SQW  
SSA Planning Limited  
St Alban's Community Association  
St Catherines Court (Chiswick) Ltd  
St James  
St. James's Investments  
St. Modwen Properties Plc  
Stewart Ross Associates  
Strutt and Parker  
Taurus Developments Limited  
Terence O' Rourke  
Thames Honda Ltd  
The Boathouse  
The Brentham Club  
The Charity of William Hobbayne

The Covenant Movement Ealing  
The Ealing Club  
The Garden History Society  
The Georgian Group  
The Grove Residents Association  
The London Gypsy and Traveller Unit  
The Mill  
The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Group  
The Open Spaces Society  
The Park Community Group  
The Twentieth Century Society  
The UNITE group plc  
The Victorian Society  
Toplocks Residents Association  
TR Suterwalla & Sons Ltd  
Tramore Properties Limited  
Traveller Law Reform Coalition  
Triangle Group  
Trimmer CS  
Turley Associates  
Turnberry Planning  
Twyford Ave Sport Grnd Residents Association  
United Anglo Caribbean Society  
United Anglo-Caribbean Society  
United Development Ltd  
University of Leeds  
URPS  
Vincent and Gorbng  
W Morrison Supermarkets PLC  
Walpole Residents Association  
Walpole Residents Association & Ealing Green Conservation Panel  
Wasps FC amateur club  
West Acton Residents Association (WARA)  
West Ealing Neighbours  
West London Alliance  
West London Business  
West London Tamil School  
West London Waste Authority  
West Twyford Residents Association  
Westminster Interfaith  
Wildberry Nature Reserve Community Group  
William Hardman Associates

### Local residents

A Fraser  
A. C Pitt  
Adrian March  
Alan Murray  
Alan Taylor  
Alison Martin  
Allison Franklin  
Amanda Christine  
Amanda Hodder  
Andrew Brennan  
Andrew Caramba-Coker  
Andrew Jones  
Andrew Russell

Andy Pedley  
Angela Hailstone  
Anil Anandan  
Anna Whitty  
Avtar Uppal  
Ayesha Sengupta  
Balbir Aujla  
BKP Grabowski  
Bob Reid  
Bob Roscow  
Brian Cheetham  
Brian Grant  
C Trimmer  
Carl Cullingford  
Carol Woolner  
Caroline Greenwood  
Caroline Tahourdin  
Carolyn Brown  
Catherine Inger  
Catriona Lindsay  
Celia Roberts  
Charles Garland  
Charlotte Bubb  
Christine Lewis  
Chris Georghiou  
Chris Kenny  
Christopher Lowney  
Clara Lowy  
Clare Awdry  
Clare Lucey  
Clive Narrainen  
Colin Clark  
Colin Mckeen  
Corin Vestey  
David Averre  
David Blackmore  
David Blackwell  
David Brammer  
David Scott  
David Strachan  
David Thaddeus  
David Zerdin  
Deborah Sheppard  
Derek Pratt  
Diane Lee  
Diane Jacobs  
Dominic Jury  
Donal McGovern  
Doreen James  
Doris Ratnam  
E Cwirko-Godycka  
E D Stubner  
E. F Osborne  
Eillis Devendra  
Elizabeth Stonor  
Emma Price  
Eric Saward  
Evelin Matley  
Evelyn Gloyn  
Farah Bhatti

Faris Manshi  
Fiona Grabowski  
Fiona Sutcliffe  
Fiona Thorn  
Francesco Fruzza  
Franklyn Nevard  
Garabed Sahakian  
Gavin Heighton  
George Murphy  
Gerald McGregor  
Gill Meacock  
Gordon Chard  
Grazyna Zaczynski  
Guy Fiegehen  
Helen Atkinson  
Helen Hirst  
Ian Wootton  
Irving Jones  
J Humphreys  
J Trimmer  
Jamie Powell  
Jane Greenberg  
Jane Judge  
Jane Shirley  
Janet Sacks  
Janet Smith  
Jay Dasani  
Jeremy Goates  
Jeremy Thorpe-Woods  
Jessica Rose  
Jill Williams  
Jimmy Carroll  
Jocelyn Ridley  
John Blackmore  
John Gavin  
John Harrison  
John Hazlehurst  
John Koski  
John Krol  
John Rundell  
John Sweetman  
John Templeton  
John Winslow  
John Wright  
John Zylinski  
Johnny Rizq  
Jon Allen  
Jonathan Mead  
Jonathan Norris  
Judith Dove  
Judith Fielding  
Judith Paris  
Julie Kaiser  
Karen Maxwell  
Karine Sarafian  
Kate Woolven  
Kevin Newson  
Kieran Rushe  
Kris Juraszek  
Kulwant Singh

Laura Brennan  
Leslie Mostkow  
Linda Harakis  
Lindley Mortimer  
Lorraine Dennis  
Lorena Martin  
Lorna Dodd  
Louise Murray  
M Hartley  
Maggie Maguire  
Maggie Wilson  
Margaret Sherrin  
Maria Martinez-Orantes  
Marisa Merry  
Mark Langley - Sowter  
Mary Mecook  
Matthew Winslow  
Maureen O'Sullivan  
Michael King  
Michael Kuaffmann  
Michelle Everitt  
Mike Jordan  
Miss Swan  
Mohamed Bennadi  
Mohinder Singh  
Mr Bhasin  
Mr Irwin  
Mrs Gratus  
Nancy Duin  
Neal Wills  
Neville Smith  
Nicholas Henderson  
Nick Blong  
Nick Woolven  
Nicola Kavanagh  
Nicola Smith  
P Davies  
Paola Turner  
Pat McNair  
Patricia Bench  
Paul Gibson  
Paul Smedley  
Paul Tierney  
Paula Firstbrook  
Pete Grist  
Peter Eversden  
Phil Kinn  
Philip Bubb  
Philip Thomas  
Philippa Bird  
Philippe Bruyer  
Phill Martin  
R Taylor  
Rachel Westall  
Randall Wright  
Ray Goodearl

Ray Wall  
Rebecca Daniels  
Richard Barnett  
Richard Chilton  
Richard Johns  
Rik Deadman  
Robert Balaam  
Roger Collins  
Ron Thorp  
Rosalind Lister  
Rosanna Fullerton  
Rupert De Barr  
S Deans  
S Turceniuff  
Safi Ferrah  
Sarah Eyre  
Sarah Hamilton-Fairley  
Sarah Maynard  
Sarah Mitchell  
Shao-Ying Ben-Nathan  
Sheela Selvajothy  
Sheila Diviney  
Shireen Alsalti  
Simon Tuke  
Siobhan Martin  
Stefan Krok- Paszkowski  
Stella Dinenis  
Steve Paynter  
Subhash  
Susan New  
Susan Kendrick  
Susan Loughe  
Susan Riddiough  
Susie Thorpe-Woods  
Suzanne Edwards  
Tanya Maynard  
Thomas Bonasera  
Tim Carpenter  
Tim Poulston  
Tina Learmonth  
Tony Miller  
Tony Sever  
Tonya Gillis  
Trevor Sharman  
Trisha Stewart  
V L Corani  
Veronica P Currie  
Vib Patel  
Vlod Barchuk  
Waclaw Gasiorowski  
Will Chung  
Will French  
Yvette Easton  
Zoe Archer  
Zoran Murphy

## APPENDIX 2: CONSULTATION MATRIX

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (1 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> We welcome the four 'design concept and vision' points on p. iv and their restatement as 'overarching objectives' in section 4 of the SPD	
<b>Council response:</b> Support welcomed.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (2 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> We strongly endorse the 'no piecemeal / ownership-driven schemes' approach on p.10 para 4.6. We would recommend that the same approach be adopted for the sites to the south, and in East Southall as well.	
<b>Council response:</b> Support welcomed. Comments on East Southall noted.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (3 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> We welcome the positive approach to new public space on p.13, para 5.5: although we note below some missing elements, and we regard its expression in Figure 4 as inadequate (see below).	
<b>Council response:</b> Support welcomed.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>	

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (4 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

We are pleased that the SPD expresses the Borough's growing perception of the location as a major opportunity to be more than a 'gateway' that people pass through, so amplifying the OAPF perception of it.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (5 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

We think that the Draft does not yet clearly express its function and importance - what is it for, what is its special role in Southall Town Centre, and importantly the Gateway's contribution to Southall's economic development and place making.

**Council response:**

Noted. The role of this site within the broader regeneration plans for Southall is largely articulated through the Southall OAPF to which this SPD forms a minor revision.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (6 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

We recommend that this is clearly stated at the introduction – by emphasizing its public realm and connectivity function, its religious function and its development function – as a

focus for high buildings.

**Council response:**

These points are considered to be adequately explored through the design principles.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (7 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

Para 4.2 says that an overarching objective is comprehensive redevelopment: but no further guidance is given for the key site (the current Gurdwara site), other than what one can infer 'Principle' by 'Principle'. This is an important gap, and could be rectified with a coherent exposition (mini-brief) about the site. This aspect is also one of the things wrong with Figure 4.

**Council response:**

Noted. This is a constrained site and the principles which form the substance of the SPD will serve to further refine the types of scheme which would be acceptable on this site, the sum of planning policy and guidance which covers the Gateway is considered to be quite sufficient to realise the planning aims for the site, central among which is the prompt delivery of a scheme. We do not believe the local authority is best placed to design the detail of a new scheme nor is it the role of an SPD to do this.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (8 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

Connected with this, the wording of the final sentence at p.12 para 5.3 should be reviewed. It needs to be stronger and more positive about the linkage through the Gurdwara site. Otherwise the opportunity to create a network of linked spaces and routes will be missed, and the reopened footbridge will be irrelevant to station access from East Southall.

**Council response:**

Linkage through the Gateway is clearly set out as an integral objective in Principle 1.

<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	
<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (9 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b>  By the same token, the last sentence at p.12 para 5.4 should be revised. It needs to be much clearer about integration with the Gurdwara site - not just raising the faint possibility of revised station access some time in the future.	
<b>Council response:</b>  The form of station access is an important factor in the success of development at Southall Gateway and the broader OAPF area. LBE will continue to work with the railway and applicants to secure the best form of access possible.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (10 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b>  On the approach to new public space (p.13 Para 5.5), we noted above our support. But whilst this is fine, so far as it goes, Figure 4 does not show it; nor do the text or drawing add opportunities elsewhere, notably at the SE (Merrick corner) and SW (Workspace 'tower' site) corners of the SPD area - which are also important public realm opportunities. The Draft should be amended to overcome this deficiency.	
<b>Council response:</b>  The indicative key principles do not aim to define the locations of all public spaces. Principles 1, 2 & 3 are all intended to work together to build a fine grained and high quality of public spaces and routes through and around the Gateway.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (11 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b>	



This also applies to p.19 para 6.12. The draft needs to add reference to new public realm and pedestrian linkage. The SPD picks up (para 6.17) the wish for 'visual connection' here, but is not explicit on pedestrian connection. Yet as we have argued in earlier responses, this is THE key place where you can greatly improve access on foot between the station and East Southall. Para 6.18 (p.21) should also be amended to recognise this potential.

**Council response:**

These are already noted in Fig 4

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (12 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

Fig 4: the need is to show the key linkages, urban blocks, spaces and views that the SPD is seeking to define, protect and encourage. At present Figure 4 is inadequate for this purpose - not only is its content limited, but it could be misleading and be used to undermine the SPD objectives.

**Council response:**

Fig 4 is deliberately indicative but it is considered already to meet these needs.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (13 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

It does not however need to (and should not, in our view) define or illustrate built forms block-by-block (which Figure 5, the now-outdated 2013 'Southall Gateway Masterplan' sought to do).

**Council response:**

Delete fig 5

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/01 (14 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

The existing Gurdwara site: the reopened pedestrian/cycle footbridge will not achieve its aim (ref. SPD p.12 Principle 1 "...facilitating access to the rail hub") without the Gurdwara site showing access across it as a 'Key Principle' (which is what this map could do). We have already argued above that without that, the new link will not improve station access for Southall East & Havelock - people will simply not use it for that purpose.

**Council response:**

The form of station access is an important factor in the success of development at Southall Gateway and the broader OAPF area. LBE will continue to work with the railway and applicants to secure the best form of access possible.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (15 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

Same site, southern edge: shows a "service road", raising the prospect of nothing more than a yard / back lane, along this potentially important facade of the site.

**Council response:**

Noted. The service road may be an operational requirement of the railway, however, there is limited planning value in referring to it in this figure.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/01 (16 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

SW corner (angle Merrick/ South Rd): the orange oval at this SW corner should add new public realm and pedestrian linkage.

**Council response:**

The indicative key principles do not aim to define the locations of all public spaces. Principles 1, 2 & 3 are all intended to work together to build a fine grained and high quality of public spaces and routes through and around the Gateway.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (17 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

General problem with Figure 4 is that even where it is not wrong, it does not adequately express what's in the text: e.g. see note above on para 5.5, re 'public space'.

**Council response:**

The indicative key principles do not aim to define the locations of all public spaces. Principles 1, 2 & 3 are all intended to work together to build a fine grained and high quality of public spaces and routes through and around the Gateway.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/01 (18 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

The drawing as presented is not complete : the 'new Crossrail station' legend is not clear and carries mistakes. The term 'forecourt' is not positive: it should say 'new high-quality public space', or similar.

**Council response:**

Station labelling will be corrected.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (19 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Fig 1 (p.3): shows 'new SME workspaces' for East Southall – this is too specific and prescriptive, given the absence of economic analysis and economic development strategy. This also applies to para 6.12, re Merrick Rd. This could be improved by a legend explaining “new employment spaces for mixed use areas which will be defined through a new economic development study and strategy”.	
<b>Council response:</b> This reference is unaltered from the adopted Southall OAPF.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (20 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Fig. 1 also refers to 'emerging master plans' south of the station, which contrasts with the welcome insistence (para 4.6) on 'no piecemeal' plans. This legend is therefore not helpful and needs to support our recommended form of urban design plan setting out key public realm and connectivity issues.	
<b>Council response:</b> This portion of the diagram represents the content of the adopted OAPF. Southall East is outside the boundary of the SPD.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/01 (21 of 24)	<b>Name:</b> Mr David Tannahill
<b>On behalf of:</b> Catalyst Housing Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Fig 5 - this should not now be used, as it is misleading, especially in relation to the existing Gurdwara site (built form and routes). The diagram which ought to be definitive and	

attractive (Figure 4) is so inadequate. If Figure 5 is retained, it should be stated that it is illustrative only and now out of date.

**Council response:**

Delete fig 5

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/01 (22 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

Southern edge of the Gurdwara site: we would urge that the text be revised at p.23 para 6.24. The current formulation is "This should be achieved by a new service road along the north side of the railway, which would allow access from the east of the area to service and parking provision for new development as well as service access to the station itself." This places too much constraint on the redevelopment of the Gurdwara site. And as noted above, it raises the prospect that nothing more than a yard / back lane for Transit vans is envisaged.

**Council response:**

Noted. The service road may be an operational requirement of the railway, however, there is limited planning value in referring to it in this figure.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/01 (23 of 24)

**Name:** Mr David Tannahill

**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited

**Representation:**

The text should be revised to clearly raise aspirations for the whole south-facing frontage of the site, whilst recognising the need to make provision for Network Rail's access needs. Its proximity to the railway inevitably imposes design constraints, but rear access should not be its only role. Specifically, the requirement for "a new service road" should be replaced by a more general formulation about "NR and retail access needs".

**Council response:**

Noted. The service road may be an operational requirement of the railway, however, there is limited planning value in referring to it in this figure.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/01 (24 of 24)**Name:** Mr David Tannahill**On behalf of:** Catalyst Housing Limited**Representation:**

There is also one point requiring clarification; and one typo:

At p.16 (cycling quietway', etc): the reference to "this crossing" could either be to South Road (the subject of the preceding sentence), or to the reopened footbridge /cycle bridge. We assume, by reference to OAPF Fig 3.6 (and 6.22), that the latter is meant, but it is not clear.

At p.10, para 4.2, the end of the last sentence needs to be corrected.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/02 (1 of 1)**Name:** Anup Shrestha**On behalf of:** Highways England**Representation:**

We have no comments to make on the consultation at the present time.

**Council response:**

Noted.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/03 (1 of 4)**Name:** David English**On behalf of:** Historic England**Representation:**

Historic England welcomes the production of this SPD and the references to heritage within it, notably paragraphs 6.13 and 6.17 and the figure 4. We hope the following comments will strengthen the SPD with regard to the historic environment.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/03 (2 of 4)

**Name:** David English

**On behalf of:** Historic England

**Representation:**

Historic England notes that the Southall Gateway Character Area has tightly drawn boundaries and that there are heritage assets in the character area and those surrounding it, which are likely to be affected by development in the Gateway Area. We also note that the SPD calls for a new landmark building, and suggests there are opportunities for tall buildings around the new station. In order to optimise the development of this site in a sustainable manner, as defined by paragraphs 7 and 8 of the NPPF, we recommend that the Southall Characterisation Study which informed the Opportunity Area Planning Framework should be clearly referenced in this document. This is because it provides details on how the different character areas in the opportunity area relate to one another, making it a helpful guide when considering both the location and the design of new buildings. Paragraphs 1.1; 2.13; 3.1; 5.10 would all be appropriate locations to insert such references. In our view the characterisation study is a useful reference point for developers and decision makers, and could help ensure that new developments enhance the overall character of Southall as set out in the Executive Summary.

**Council response:**

Noted. The SPD forms an update and partial revision to one chapter of the existing Southall OAPF which is intended to provide greater detail and certainty of LBE's intentions for this site and to deliver built development sooner in the regeneration cycle. It is important that the rest of the OAPF and its supporting evidence is understood as continuing to form the wider context and policy framework for Southall. The text will be updated to reflect this.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/03 (3 of 4)

**Name:** David English

**On behalf of:** Historic England

**Representation:**

A recurring matter when considering the siting of new landmark buildings is their impact on the setting of heritage assets, which are often landmarks themselves. This is particularly true in Southall where the Grade II\* Southall Manor and Liberty Cinema, and the Grade II Water Tower are important local landmarks. To ensure that new landmark developments have an appropriate relationship with existing heritage landmarks we recommend that you include a reference to new development protecting the setting of heritage assets in the SPD text. This is supported by paragraphs 128, 132 and 137 of the NPPF, which highlight the importance of setting when considering the impact of development on the historic environment. This could be done by adding the following bullet point to the Building Form points between paragraphs 6.12 and 6.13:

- New development in the Southall Gateway character area should respect the setting of heritage assets, including those in other character areas.

A reference to the setting of heritage assets would also be appropriate in paragraph 5.10 (Design Principle 7).

**Council response:**

The SPD forms the site specific elements of Ealing's planning framework for this location. Ealing developed its heritage and tall buildings policies in close co-ordination with the former English Heritage and these are considered to be quite sufficient to cover the issues raised.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/03 (4 of 4)

**Name:** David English

**On behalf of:** Historic England

**Representation:**

In terms of developing design principles and strategies to guide the location and design of a landmark building, we consider that the SPD would be strengthened by the identification of local views to be protected and enhanced with new development. These should be shown on a plan and accompanied by some explanatory text setting out the key townscape features that could act as design cues for urban designers and architects.

**Council response:**

Noted. The SPD forms an update and partial revision to one chapter of the existing Southall OAPF which is intended to provide greater detail and certainty of LBE's intentions for this site and to deliver built development sooner in the regeneration cycle. It is important in considering views that the rest of the OAPF and its supporting evidence is understood as continuing to form the wider context and policy framework for Southall. The text will be



updated to reflect this.

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/04 (1 of 1)

**Name:** Angela Gemmill

**On behalf of:** Marine Management Organisation

**Representation:**

Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation.

**Council response:**

Noted

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/05 (1 of 3)

**Name:** Brittany Williams GL Hearn Limited

**On behalf of:** Michael Hunt

**Representation:**

Figure 4: Southall Gateway: Indicative Key Principles

We generally support the indicative key principles contained within Figure 4, in particular the proposed location for the 'Green / walking and cycling route'. However, we would suggest that in addition to this new link that consideration is given to the ability of the road network and existing bridge to the west of The Arches to provide for cyclists and pedestrians. This would ensure a comprehensive network for pedestrians and cyclists to access the station from this area of Southall; particularly as the amount of planned development in the vicinity will increase the number of residents. The new Crossrail link proposed for 2019 will also intensify the need for the station to be easily accessible.

**Council response:**

Noted. This constitutes part of the package of transport improvements already planned for Southall, however, the volume of traffic and difficult contours on South Road are partly what drive the need for a quietway to the East.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/05 (2 of 3)**Name:** Brittany Williams GL Hearn Limited**On behalf of:** Michael Hunt**Representation:**

We note that Figure 4 anticipates East Southall Park being located within our client's site. Whilst we acknowledge the benefits of providing such open space, this is at odds with the illustrative masterplan and Landscape Strategy prepared in support of our client's proposals at the Middlesex Business Park which seeks to provide just under 1ha of open space. This will include a new public park along the southern boundary and improved public realm across the site. As proposed we believe the suggested allocation is too prescriptive and should recognise the need for flexibility in light of the current Middlesex Business Park application. Failure to do so could result in the allocation becoming out of date.

**Council response:**

The proposed changes are outside of the SPD boundary.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/05 (3 of 3)**Name:** Brittany Williams GL Hearn Limited**On behalf of:** Michael Hunt**Representation:**

Paragraph 6.12

The SPD states in paragraph. 6.12 that Merrick Road is suitable for retail and commercial uses on its northern side within the retained railway arches; however the same paragraph also states that the road itself, is not appropriate for 'conventional retail'. This term is not defined and there does not appear to be any justification for this statement. As part of the Middlesex application we considered the inclusion of retail in the area and concluded that this would not result in an adverse impact upon Southall's health or vitality and viability. We would therefore request that reference to the line "is not appropriate for conventional retail" is omitted from the SPD so as to not prejudice the siting of retail proposals in this location.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/06 (1 of 1)**Name:** Mr Julian Austin Amec Foster Wheeler**On behalf of:** National Grid**Representation:**

The following sites has been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to High Pressure

apparatus:

North of the railway- two mixed used sites crossed by HP line 2279 Southall to Richmond

**Council response:**

Noted, this is not material to the content of the SPD, but applicants will be made aware of this information as a design and construction constraint.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (1 of 19)**Name:** Emma Beardmore**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited**Representation:**

"The area shown in Figure A and is located between the main South Road/Southall Broadway shopping area and the subsidiary centre at Southall Green forming the crucial linking point in Southall."

Suggest - Fig A is not defined within the draft SPD. We assume that the plan referenced should be Fig 1: Southall Opportunity Area and Southall Gateway and the text set out in para 2 should be amended accordingly.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (2 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> The Gateway comprises two main parts, a northern part including the Gurdwara, and a southern part largely occupied by the Arches business centre.  Suggest - The Southall Gateway extends further west than is suggested by the text. It is suggested that within the Executive Summary additional text is included to explain the proposals for these areas which are being brought forward as part of the Southall Gasworks development proposals and improvements to the Crossrail Station.	
<b>Council response:</b>  Accepted	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  Amend	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (3 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Support - It is considered that these are in keeping with the objectives as set out in the adopted OAPF and are supported.	
<b>Council response:</b>  Support welcomed.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (4 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Suggest - After para 1.1 for ease of reference it would be useful if all of the character areas are identified.	
<b>Council response:</b>	

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/07 (5 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Suggest - In para 1.2 the word "in" is missing.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:** Amend

**Rep:** SG/07 (6 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Suggest - "Southall Gateway was identified in Southall OAPF, again as the location key to unlocking development in Southall as a whole and overcoming the profound physical severance that is created by the railway line and road infrastructure.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/07 (7 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Whilst the Southall Gateway is defined by the redline in the figure, the extent of the land is described as the "northern gateway is not.

Suggest - It is considered it would be useful to update the extent of the northern gateway.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/07 (8 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Suggest - The vision plan should explicitly note that there is flexibility in its parameters. The plan should show less restrictive and more generic boundaries for items such as green spaces and commercial areas.

**Council response:**

Noted. The title of the plan as 'Indicative Key Principles' is already considered quite explicit as to its flexibility. The green spaces identified are outside the boundary of the SPD and are not therefore subject to change here. The existing OAPF forms necessary context to the SPD and it is not the intention of these proposals to revise the fundamental aims of the Southall OAPF.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (9 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Suggest - Green walking/cycling route is identified between Southall Station and Southall West

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (10 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Create a network of pedestrian and cycle routes through the site facilitating access to the rail hub.  Suggest - Create a network of pedestrian and cycle routes through the Gateway facilitating access to the rail hub	
<b>Council response:</b>  Accepted	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  Amend	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (11 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Improve circulation around the site including provision necessary for public transport interchange  Improve circulation around the Gateway including provision necessary for public transport interchange	
<b>Council response:</b>  Accepted	
<b>Proposed changes:</b>  Amend	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (12 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Create high quality new public spaces  Support - It is considered that this is in keeping with the objectives set out in the OAPF and is supported.	

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (13 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Suggest - the aim should be to create a sequence of linked public spaces that would provide benefit throughout the area.

**Council response:**

Accepted

**Proposed changes:**

Amend

**Rep:** SG/07 (14 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Create a new gateway to Southall

Support - It is considered that this is in keeping with the objectives as set out in the adopted OAPF and is supported.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (15 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited



**Representation:**

Clarification - Is the Gurdwara site the largest landholder in the whole gateway or in the "northern gateway"?

**Council response:**

The Gurdwara is the largest landholder apart from railway uses.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (16 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Encompass a mix of uses and activities on the Gateway site

Support - It is considered that this is in keeping with the objectives as set out in the adopted OAPF and is supported.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/07 (17 of 19)

**Name:** Emma Beardmore

**On behalf of:** St James Group Limited

**Representation:**

Integrate with the urban 'edges' of the Gateway site

Support - It is considered that this is in keeping with the objectives as set out in the adopted OAPF and is supported.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (18 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Suggest - the underused land in Southall may be able to accommodate a greater number/density of new homes with careful design and investment in infrastructure. The SPD should therefore seek to maximise the number of homes identified on site by saying 'at least' 400 new homes. This is in keeping with the 'minimum' housing numbers identified in the London Plan. With regard to the level of retail provision the market will determine demand for retail space of this nature particularly in light of the changing trends in retailing.	
<b>Council response:</b> Noted. The SPD is not currently backed by detailed urban design and viability studies and it is not proposed to compromise any design principles by prioritising housing delivery over any other considerations on this key site. The figure of 400 units is neither a minimum nor a maximum number and is subject to the stated policy objectives being met.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/07 (19 of 19)	<b>Name:</b> Emma Beardmore
<b>On behalf of:</b> St James Group Limited	
<b>Representation:</b> Suggest - the proposed masterplan should be labelled indicative.	
<b>Council response:</b> Noted. The diagram isn't considered indicative but represents past work undertaken on this site. It is considered clearer to remove it from the SPD.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> Amend	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/08 (1 of 6)	<b>Name:</b> Rachel Yorke
<b>On behalf of:</b> Transport for London	
<b>Representation:</b> The Gateway area is located between the main South Road/Southall Broadway shopping	

area and the subsidiary centre at Southall Green. TfL recognises the physical severance that is created by the railway line and has been a firm supporter of building a new bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across this barrier, partly funded by development. There is reference to this infrastructure in the text and figures however it is not clear what is the timescale for the delivery of both the vision and the bridge in real-terms, and whether/how these are to be funded. On the issue of transport infrastructure funding, please note also that commercial development in this area may be subject to Mayoral CIL and Crossrail SPG'

**Council response:**

Noted. The bridge funding and delivery package is the subject of separate work and should be in place before the adoption of the SPD.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

<b>Rep:</b> SG/08 (2 of 6)	<b>Name:</b> Rachel Yorke
----------------------------	---------------------------

**On behalf of:** Transport for London

**Representation:**

Para 5.3 describes an aim to make “passive provision for an eastern entrance for the [Crossrail] station...”. As the planning permission has been determined for the station and does not feature this reasonable aim, the document could explain how this is to be achieved.

**Council response:**

The form of station access is an important factor in the success of development at Southall Gateway and the broader OAPF area. LBE will continue to work with the railway and applicants to secure the best form of access possible.

**Proposed changes:** No change

<b>Rep:</b> SG/08 (3 of 6)	<b>Name:</b> Rachel Yorke
----------------------------	---------------------------

**On behalf of:** Transport for London

**Representation:**

Para 6.12 says the “highly visible junction of Merrick Rd and South Rd is an ideal location for retail...” In urban design terms this may be the case, but TfL queries whether this is supported by parallel analysis on the traffic impacts, specifically the potential for congestion from servicing activities. Whether deliveries are intended to be undertaken on street (where there appears no space to do so), or alternatively off-street through the addition of an access the impact on the junction’s efficiency should be borne in mind, depending on the scale and type of retail use. TfL suggests the addition of the following caveat “subject to analysis of acceptability of impacts of the development on the safe operation of the junction”.

**Council response:**

This is considered to be an urban design principle necessary to the success of the SPD, so any technical issues such as those raised here will need to be resolved through detailed work at the application stage.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/08 (4 of 6)**Name:** Rachel Yorke**On behalf of:** Transport for London**Representation:**

TfL notes and supports the assertion in para 6.3 that widening the South Road Bridge is fundamental to the delivery of a new cycling 'quietway' from Southall to Hounslow.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/08 (5 of 6)**Name:** Rachel Yorke**On behalf of:** Transport for London**Representation:**

The promotion of sustainable modes of travel through provision of cycle parking and car club spaces whilst permitting redevelopment with minimal car parking provision (proposed in Para 6.26) is a balance and sustainable aim which is welcomed by TfL. No specific range is given but it is assumed that the 'minimal' parking sought will be commensurate with or lower than the OAPF's levels.

**Council response:**

Support welcomed.

**Proposed changes:**

No change

<b>Rep:</b> SG/08 (6 of 6)	<b>Name:</b> Rachel Yorke
<b>On behalf of:</b> Transport for London	
<b>Representation:</b> Lastly, there is a small typographic error at the end of para 4.3 where the sentence ends inconclusively with 'to'.	
<b>Council response:</b> Noted.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> Amend	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/09 (1 of 1)	<b>Name:</b> Stewart Murray
<b>On behalf of:</b> Greater London Authority	
<b>Representation:</b> The draft SPD provides updated guidance for the Southall Gateway character area identified in chapter 4.2 of the Southall Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF). The SPD broadly reflects the strategic principles of the Southall OAPF and the guidance for the Southall Gateway area. The SPD will aid the implementation of the Southall OAPF and it is supported in principle.	
<b>Council response:</b> Support welcomed. It is agreed that the SPD will help the delivery of LBE's and GLA's shared plans for development at Southall including the broader Southall OA.	
<b>Proposed changes:</b> No change	

<b>Rep:</b> SG/10 (1 of 1)	<b>Name:</b> Gillian Fensome
<b>On behalf of:</b> Natural England	
<b>Representation:</b> Natural England does not consider that this Southall Gateway draft SPD poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment <sup>1</sup> for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.	

**Council response:**

Noted

**Proposed changes:**

No change

**Rep:** SG/11 (1 of 1)**Name:** Simon Vince**On behalf of:** Heathrow Airport Limited**Representation:**

The Southall Gateway draft Supplementary Planning Document has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and have no safeguarding concerns.

**Council response:**

Noted

**Proposed changes:**

No change