

# Written Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017



## **CONTENTS**

<b>Page</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Chapter 1: Planning London's Future - Good Growth Policies</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Chapter 2: Spatial Development Patterns</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Chapter 3: Design</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Chapter 4: Housing</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>Chapter 5: Social Infrastructure</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>Chapter 6: Economy</b>
<b>33</b>	<b>Chapter 7: Heritage and Culture</b>
<b>35</b>	<b>Chapter 8: Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>Chapter 9: Sustainable Infrastructure</b>
<b>54</b>	<b>Chapter 10: Transport</b>
<b>59</b>	<b>Concluding Remarks</b>

## SUMMARY

1. I am writing on behalf of Ealing Council in response to “The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: Draft for Public Consultation, December 2017.” published by the Mayor of London on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. This document seeks to replace the existing version of the London Plan consolidated with alterations since 2011.
2. The plan is intended to be more ambitious and more focused than any previous London Plans and in principle the Council is generally supportive of the direction of travel and acknowledges that it requires a ‘step-change’ in approach and the need for ‘concrete plans for action.’ We do appreciate the Mayor’s realism that: “There are no quick fixes to the housing crisis London faces...that it is going to be a marathon, not a sprint” (Foreword, P.XV).
3. We enthusiastically embrace the Mayor’s concept of ‘Good Growth’ and this is underpinned by the inclusion of an entire and new chapter on design which is the key to successful place making.
4. We also welcome and support the greater emphasis on providing more genuinely affordable homes, his efforts to reverse the rapid and unplanned loss of industrial land and his acknowledgement of the challenges that the levels of growth and development poses for London’s infrastructure and the environment.
5. We also welcome and support the greater prominence to and additional policies on housing quality and standards, fire safety, mitigating the impact of noise, meanwhile uses, housing size mix, build to rent, large scale purpose built shared living, public toilets, low cost business space, the presumption against hot food takeaways, culture and creative industries, protecting pubs, urban greening, improving air quality, digital connectivity, opposition to fracking, cycling, car parking and freight and servicing.
6. Whilst we support the need for increasing housing supply, our main concern relates to whether or not the Mayor’s ambitious targets can be actually delivered in practice. Even the Mayor acknowledges that “the level of growth we must plan for will require significant investment – both from businesses and the public sector – in transport, infrastructure and affordable housing” and that to deliver the fundamental changes we need in the long-term that: “the Government should step up and give more powers and investment in London” (Foreword, P.XVI). We are wholly sympathetic and supportive of these sentiments and would be more than willing to support the Mayor in his endeavors to achieve this aspiration.
7. However, in the absence of ‘significant’ investment there must be grave doubts as to whether the ambitious housing supply targets can be delivered especially given our additional misgivings about the methodology used to underpin target setting for housing supply and the complete lack of tangible and authoritative evidence to demonstrate deliverability, in particular, for small sites.
8. We welcome new policies promoting the intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services but again our main concern is about the practicalities of deliverability.

9. We understand and appreciate the policy imperative of protecting London's green infrastructure but we believe that the Mayor policies are far too inflexible and they do not deal with the practical realities on the ground. The recommendations of the Outer London Commission in their sixth report 'Removing the Barriers to Housing Delivery', March 2016' to conduct a strategic, London wide review of Green belt and Metropolitan Open Land have not been followed through and this presents perhaps a missed opportunity. The conflation of these two policy designations also creates clear anomalies and the plan should provide greater clarity about their respective roles and functions that also take into account a qualitative assessment.

10. We fully support the Mayor's commitment to reducing waste and achieving net self-sufficiency but we profoundly disagree with the borough's waste apportionment target and believe that the methodology used to justify the approach taken in the draft plan is both crude and fundamentally flawed.

11. We are keen advocates of a strategic London wide spatial plan and believe that the adoption of a more 'development management' minded approach will obviate the need for us to repeat and regurgitate many policies in our own local development plan. Therefore, many of our more specific comments are about strengthening the wording of the draft plan to achieve better clarity and utility from a DM perspective. But to address more significant issues and concerns raised by the Council we have provided some additional general commentary that addresses any concerns with the specific policy approach and the evidence that underpins it.

12. Finally, our comments should also be read in conjunction with a separate joint submission prepared under the auspices of the West London Alliance (WLA) comprising seven West London boroughs. In particular, this seeks further dialogue with the Mayor and the GLA before the draft plan is independently examined to consider the potential for jointly agreed modifications to the plan that could be presented that would address some of the LPA's concerns about practical deliverability.

## **CHAPTER 1: PLANNING LONDON'S FUTURE – GOOD GROWTH POLICIES**

13. London is to be developed according to the principles of 'Good Growth' (Policies GG1-8). These are all clearly very laudable objectives.

14. However, there is an anomaly in the quoted demographic projections for London which suggests growth towards 10.8 million by 2041 (Paras 1.0.5 and 1.2.1) which is the true figure but this is contradicted by the Mayor's Foreword (third para) which refers to 10.5 million.

## **CHAPTER 2: SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS**

15. We acknowledge the greater role to be played by boroughs like Ealing in delivering growth. The draft plan says that: "If London is to meet the challenges of the future, all parts of London will need to embrace and manage change. Not all change will be transformative – in many places – change will occur incrementally. This is especially the case in outer London, where the suburban pattern of development has significant potential for appropriate intensification over time, particularly for

additional housing” (Para 2.0.3). In this respect Ealing has already embraced change and takes a highly pro-active and positive stance on growth.

16. We are indeed fortunate that our borough presents huge potential and opportunities for growth and development across a multitude of neighbourhoods and development sites. We have always sought to optimise the potential for development embracing the possibilities of high quality mixed use developments built at levels that often exceed the existing London Plan density matrix yet are still sustainable.

17. We are also proud of our successful track record in delivering small scale developments on sites that have not been formally allocated in our development plan. Historical development monitoring data for the past decade is proof of our efforts to support appropriate intensification in the suburbs particularly in areas of high public transport accessibility (either now or in the future). We look at each development proposal on its individual merits and we do not have restrictive policies that, for example, seek to prevent conversions of larger dwellings or build on gardens or on back-land sites.

18. We have also sought to use our powers both as a land and property owner to break down the barriers to housing delivery by being pro-active about land assembly. We are not afraid to resort to compulsory purchase, if there is no viable alternative.

19. We acknowledge that some of the most significant changes are identified as **Opportunity Areas** (Policy SD1) and the Mayor will be fully aware of the positive, joint collaborative work already undertaken with the wider GLA family in relation to both the Southall and Park Royal and Old Oak Opportunity Areas. We note that the draft plan increases the target for housing capacity for the Southall OA from the current 6K to 9K and we are fully supportive of this proposal. Indeed Southall was one of the first Housing Zones to be formally designated and the funding secured has been a huge catalyst in accelerating development schemes in the pipeline and providing necessary investment in infrastructure. We have been working closely with your colleagues and have shared potential local housing trajectories that show how the future growth targets may even be exceeded and what further investment is needed for successful place shaping.

20. We acknowledge that the old concept of the ‘Western Wedge’ growth corridor has been replaced with ‘**Heathrow/Elizabeth Line West**’ and that this has a good fit with the approach to spatial development corridors that we have taken in Ealing. However, we disagree with the rather cautious approach taken with regards the potential expansion of Heathrow Airport where the Mayor says he will only “review and clarify the area’s potential contribution to London’s growth when expansion proposals and their spatial and environmental implications are clearer” (Para 2.1.63). Whilst we share his concerns about the economic, social and environmental impacts and the need for improved infrastructure we recognise that these problems already exist and will become growing concerns even if plans for Heathrow expansion were to be shelved. The London Plan needs to address these issues in a robust yet flexible way.

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

21. This is why Ealing is working closely with other local authorities and relevant agencies in close proximity to the airport (going well beyond the boundaries of Greater London) through the 'Heathrow Strategic Planning Group' (HSPG). Participating authorities have agreed an 'Accord' and a 'Statement of Agreed Outcomes' as the basis of any continuing participation. We would urge the Mayor to also get much more involved in assessing both the opportunities and challenges posed by the airport – both now and in the future – and to work collaboratively with the HSPG too.

22. We acknowledge the Mayor's pioneering work on **Collaboration with the Wider South East** (Policy SD2). He accepts that: "London is not an island" (Para 2.2.1) and that its economy is intrinsically linked with that of the Wider South-East. It clearly recognises that implicitly London's Housing Market Area does extend beyond the GLA boundary and that the continued growth and prosperity of the capital requires a wider spatial framework. The Mayor wants to work with willing partners in the Wider South East to explore the potential for more growth in sustainable locations outside the capital. Furthermore, thirteen Strategic Infrastructure Priorities are identified including the GWR between London and Reading and Western Rail access to Heathrow (SD3) both of which we would support. Whilst this work has progressed at a painfully slow pace the Mayor is to be encouraged to continue this endeavour.

23. We note that **Town Centres** (Policies SD6-9) remain the primary locations for commercial activity in London. We welcome the strong 'town centre first' approach and the resistance to out of centre development of town centre uses. We also acknowledge and support the policy that many town centres have the potential to accommodate significant quantities of new housing through higher density mixed use or residential development. Encouragement of the use of Article 4 Directions to remove PD rights for office to residential conversions, where appropriate and justified, is also supported.

24. We note that there are no changes to the London Borough of Ealing's **Town Centre Network** set out in Annex 1. However, we note that Figure A1.3 identifies the potential for residential growth within existing town centres. Whilst the potential for significant (high) growth within some of these centres (Ealing and Southall) is accepted, the potential for significant growth occurring within the other centres (Greenford, Hanwell and Acton), is improbable. We understand that these growth categorisations were informed by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and yet this exercise identified significant variations in the extent of potential development opportunities (approvals, potential development and allocations) within our town centres. For example, the SHLAA did not identify significant capacity with Greenford or Hanwell town centres. It is unclear therefore how these categorisations have been determined. We can only assume that either very low thresholds have been used, in terms of the potential capacity which might be yielded within these centres, or opportunities beyond the town centre boundaries have factored into this classification. This needs to be urgently clarified.

25. We note that some parts of London have not benefitted from the advantages of the growth of London and are still experiencing deprivation and there is a strong focus on sustainable and inclusive regeneration for the most deprived areas defined as **Strategic Areas for Regeneration** (Policy SD10).

We welcome the inclusion of, for example, parts of Northolt, Southall and South Acton within the scope of this policy.

26. Finally, we note that references to the old **London Sub-Regions** have been deleted. Whilst there is perhaps little utility in their inclusion in a development plan we would point out that in West London we have a successful track record of working together across borough boundaries with a series of well- established practitioner, director-level and member- level networks under the West London Alliance. Spatial planning matters have been and continue to be important matters for discussion. Indeed, we have commissioned joint plans (e.g. waste) and several joint evidence base studies. This track record was also recognised by the MHLGC by their recent award of a substantial Planning Delivery Grant for existing and planned joint planning work. The WLA would therefore welcome continuing high level dialogue with the Mayor and GLA.

### **CHAPTER 3: DESIGN**

27. We acknowledge and support the fact that good design and good planning are intrinsically linked and welcome the inclusion of a new and entire chapter on design. Specific comments are summarised below:

<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>London's Form and Characteristics (D1)</b>	<p>This policy is supported and forms part of a welcome shift to including general development management policies in the new Plan. These policies were present in part in the previous plan and are now much more comprehensive. There should be no need to replicate generic policies across all London Planning Authorities and this policy will form part of a practical framework for development management.</p> <p>As a general note it may make sense to expand on some parts of the policy in supporting wording. For example, to signpost housing design guidance on 'appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity'.</p>
<b>Delivering Good Design (D2)</b>	<p>This policy on the design process is supported and provides a welcome emphasis on the information and evaluation process which underpins the development management process.</p> <p>However, we are concerned about the independent design review process and how this will work in practice. We note that Mayor plans to issue guidance in due course. At Ealing Council we operate a robust enhanced service for large developments including a significant emphasis on pre-application work and pre-submission consultation. We also have surgeries with key stakeholders such as schools and housing regeneration. A key focus is design quality. We will also often meet with GLA officers on referable schemes at an early stage to ensure early</p>

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>engagement and consistency of approach.</p> <p>The addition of other channels poses the risk of further delay, additional cost and duplication of effort and therefore any mandatory requirements need to be both appropriate and proportional. In a period of constrained funding for LPAs policy should be designed to bring design expertise into planning departments, as is encouraged by the GLA funded Public Practice initiative, rather than farm it out. We would welcome an opportunity to be consulted on any guidance before it is adopted.</p>
<p><b>Inclusive Design (D3)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy, in particular, the requirement that in developments where lifts are installed, a minimum of one lift per core should be installed that is suitable for fire evacuation for people requiring level access from the building.</p>
<p><b>Housing Quality and Standards (D4)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and the space standards which it implements. These have been well tested over the last plan period and have played a crucial role in driving up the standards of residential development in London.</p>
<p><b>Accessible Housing (D5)</b></p>	<p>The application of this policy is limited to new build developments only, which it is assumed means newly erected dwellings, as distinct from new dwellings created through conversion or change of use. Whilst this focus on new builds is understood, all developments involving the creation of new residential units have a role to play and should seek to incorporate inclusive design principles.</p> <p>The supporting text should advise that new units created through conversion or change of use, should also seek to comply with this policy so far as is practicable.</p>
<p><b>Optimising Housing Density (D6)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and, in particular, welcomes the removal of the old SRQ density matrix and the new requirement for management plans being mandatory if certain density thresholds are met.</p>
<p><b>Public Realm (D7)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and welcomes the encouragement of free drinking water in new or redeveloped public realm.</p>
<p><b>Tall Buildings (D8)</b></p>	<p>This policy is generally supported but it is unclear why there has been a change of direction over the prevailing definition of a tall building. The formula 'taller than its surroundings or which significantly impacts upon</p>



## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>the skyline' has been shown to work and the requirement for LPAs to produce a generic policy that recreates this is a retrograde step. Arguments over what constitutes a tall building are not an effective way to address design debates about where and when a tall building is appropriate.</p> <p>Other than this the policy presents a good range of management tools which should reduce the need for repetitive generic policies.</p> <p>The Council welcomes an opportunity to work with the GLA on 3D virtual reality modelling to help assess impacts and assist with public consultation.</p>
<p><b>Basement Development (D9)</b></p>	<p>It seems unproductive to write a policy simply to direct LPAs to address the negative impacts of basement development. This policy should be redrafted to identify the potential negatives and minimise the number of generic DM policies in London. It will still be open to boroughs to prohibit this form of development if it proves problematic in particular areas.</p>
<p><b>Safety, Security and Resilience to Emergency (D10)</b></p>	<p>The topic of resilience is much broader than the narrow design and contingency considerations covered in the policy. The plan should commit to a programme which co-ordinates the large emergency response infrastructure already extant in London with strategic and local plans. This will improve the resilience of the built environment and reduce exposure to sequential failure when this infrastructure comes under pressure.</p>
<p><b>Fire Safety (D11)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and, in the light of the Grenfell fire, the mandatory requirement for an independent Fire Statement.</p>
<p><b>Agent of Change (D12)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports the agent of change principle as a rational measure for managing the change brought about by development and acknowledges the benefits this may afford in protecting cultural venues such as theatres, pubs and live music venues.</p>

### **CHAPTER 4: HOUSING**

28. Of the policy challenges emerging from the draft London Plan the one which probably raises the greatest concern for Ealing Council is the new housing supply targets outlined in policies H1 and H2. The Council does not consider that these targets are justifiable, effective or deliverable.

29. **Increasing Housing Supply** (Policy H1) sets challenging targets for all London Planning Authorities (as detailed in Table 4.1) and for the London Borough of Ealing this represents a significant uplift from the current one, increasing from 1,297 units to 2,807 units per annum in the emerging London Plan, a rise of 116%. In reality the increase is even greater as, unlike the previous target, the emerging one now excludes that part of the borough covered by the Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral Development Corporation (OPDC). Factoring in the OPDC's share of the target, the borough will be expected to accommodate at least 3,419 units per annum, which is wholly unrealistic.

30. Relative to the rest of London, this represents a disproportionate increase compared to the London average (a 53% increase from the current target of 42,388 homes per year to 64,935 homes per year). In respect of the revised targets it is noted that there are also huge spatial variations in London both in absolute terms and in respect of the percentage change, with Inner London generally fairing much better from the revised targets, seeing on average only a 12% increase, which contrasts sharply with a 119% increase in Outer London. Even the government's emerging methodology for setting housing targets recognises that such targets should not be increased by more than 40% at a time.

31. Numerous barriers to delivery are identified in the Housing White Paper, by the GLA and the Outer London Commission, but as yet nothing of significance has been identified nationally or through the London Plan which is likely to be effective in overcoming these issues.

32. Ealing Council is a pro-growth borough and is actively working to deliver additional homes and, specifically, more affordable ones. Whilst the Council therefore would support the introduction of a challenging target, such a target must nonetheless be attainable. As it stands however the revised target is considered to be purely aspirational, and there is no realistic prospect of it being delivered.

33. The Council's positive approach to planning is reflected through its historic rates of delivery, which have been high relative to many other Outer London Boroughs and the pro-active stance towards local plan making and collaboration with the GLA family on the identification of potential development sites.

34. The Council recognises that the housing market is currently beset by uncertainty and it may be difficult to sustain even the current rates of delivery indefinitely, never mind achieving a more than doubling of housing completions. The housing market is cyclical and looks to be coming to the end of a boom period in London which could affect buyer appetite and therefore housing developer activity. In such a market housebuilders will likely be reluctant to significantly step up output as an oversupply of houses may result in lower sales values.

35. Moreover, the skills shortage and uncertainty caused by Brexit provides no assurance that there will be the capacity within the construction sector to provide for the level of additional homes required across London.

36. In this context even if capacity were identified it is difficult to see how a more than doubling of the Council's housing supply target could be achieved within the timescale envisaged. The lead in

times for development effectively means that delivery for some years of the ten year period would have to be a lot more than the current doubling of delivery which again casts doubt on the likely achievement of these targets.

37. An analysis of the current pipeline shows that London is heavily reliant on very large schemes which inevitably will take a considerable number of years to complete. Furthermore, this dependence on large sites to achieve the targets, and with no headroom in capacity, is also inherently risky, as slippage (which is likely to entirely beyond the control of a LPA) in only few sites would make it impossible for a local planning authority to catch up and meet the targets.

38. Given the step change in housing delivery that is required and the fact that the SHLAA has primarily recycled known large brownfield sites it is therefore necessary to diversify sources of housing supply. The Council therefore accepts and recognises the important contribution that small sites (including existing stock) may play in meeting housing need. However, as is the case for the overall housing supply targets, the new **Small Sites** (Policy H2) target set out in Table 4.2 also significantly over estimates what might be realistically achievable within the London Borough of Ealing.

39. Whilst this is the first time that separate targets have been set for large and small sites, as they did form a component of the existing housing supply target (as detailed in the 2011 SHLAA) it has been possible to compare the extent of the change. For the Council the contribution now assumed from small sites has increased to 1,074 units per annum from 301 units calculated in the earlier SHLAA (2011), representing a 257% increase.

40. Of the different components feeding into the SHLAA, the small sites figure represents the most significant gain proportionally and in absolute term for the Council. Proportionally the small sites component now represents 38% of the total capacity (up from 23%). This balance between these two components represents a marked shift from the previous SHLAA outputs and historic trends. As with the overall targets, there are also notable differences across London, with the Inner London authorities being set lower targets relative to Outer London and in some cases actually being set reduced targets relative to earlier plan targets. The small sites target poses a significant challenge for the Council and was also completely unexpected.

41. The methodology employed in this SHLAA to determine capacity from small sites departs (in part at least) from that utilised previously for the earlier SHLAA. Significantly, a hybrid approach was adopted employing historic trend data for windfall sites and modelling. Previously SHLAAs have relied solely on historic trend data to determine future supply, and this reliance on historic delivery rates to determine future supply from windfall sites is consistent with the advice contained in the NPPF and NPPG.

42. The GLA had initially advised that this trend based approach would also be employed for the 2017 SHLAA, although the GLA advised that it also intended to undertake some scenario testing of alternative methodologies which had set out to measure the potential to drive up housing delivery

through new policy changes (notably policy H2). Despite indicating that this would happen, there was no consultation on the alternative approaches, including the hybrid approach adopted by the GLA which incorporates modelling, alongside trend based analysis. This is not acceptable, and any suggestion that the SHLAA was a collaborative effort is therefore highly misleading.

43. As we understand it, although these have not been published in full, the scenario testing for the different options, highlighted that the continuation of the trend based approach (analysing either an 8 or 12 year period) would not demonstrate the significant uplift desired by the GLA, or in their view reflect what is achievable from their new policies. In fact for London as a whole, if the GLA continued to adopt the historic trend approach (based on an 8 year average), the supply from small sites would be down in absolute terms on that calculated for the 2011 SHLAA, and only marginally up (by a meagre 2 units) in Ealing.

44. In recent years Ealing Council has also experienced an increasing number of de-conversions - where flats are amalgamated into the original larger house. It is questionable then whether a significant incentive exists for existing homeowners to release their assets for intensification. In the light of this evidence what has the Mayor/GLA done to understand why small site output has declined, and how does the policy seek to reverse this trend? Despite this challenging base position, the GLA have opted to base the targets on an alternative scenario which also utilised modelling to represent the effect of emerging policies.

45. Whilst the policy identifies a range of measures/tools intended to increase supply, the modelling itself fails to actually measure the effect of such interventions, but it focuses instead is on attempting to come up with a theoretical estimate of capacity deriving from the existing stock. There is no precedence for this approach and therefore this must cast doubt on its efficacy.

46. The draft policy promotes a number of measures aimed at increasing the planning certainty on small sites, including the identification/allocation of such sites through Local Plans and the brownfield register. Whilst such tools may have a small role to play, their utility is likely to be extremely limited, given the nature of such developments which are likely to yield capacity from this source. Specifically, the modelling assumes that additional capacity can be secured from intensifying existing individual units. Whilst such intensification already occurs (albeit on a much smaller scale), it is neither practical, realistic or appropriate to think that local planning authorities can identify individual units suitable for intensification at the scale assumed by the modelling.

47. Given that there are limited tools available to actively promote the intensification of our existing housing stock through the forward planning process it is clear that such capacity will continue to principally take the form of windfall opportunities. For good reason the NPPF/NPPG advises that capacity arising from unidentified (windfall) sites should be based on historic delivery rates and there must be compelling evidence available to demonstrate that such sites will continue to provide a reliable source.

48. Whilst historical data does feature in the small sites assessment, its use is partial and only applies to certain development types. The decision to rely on modelling for some development types and use trends for others is not explained at all in the SHLAA report and so its application appears to be somewhat arbitrary. It is therefore assumed that this decision may have been driven more by the availability of data as opposed to there being any sound planning reasons. Whilst it is acknowledged that sometimes it will be necessary to use the best available data, if such data does not exist or is not fit for purpose, then that limitation should at least be acknowledged and accepted. In light of this decision and in spite of the advice given in the NPPF and the NPPG the weight attached to historical performance is significantly downplayed.

49. The SHLAA also cites the impact of existing planning policy restrictions in certain boroughs on the delivery of capacity on small sites, and therefore the policy introduces 'a presumption in favour of small housing developments.' The impact of such a policy is likely to be limited in Ealing in driving up delivery. The Council already takes a permissive approach to many forms of small scale intensification including change of use, the sub-division of existing family sized dwellings, upward extensions, rear extensions and additional dwellings within existing residential plots.

50. Further issues are also noted with the modelling methodology itself, which place in question the reliability/credibility of the model and its outputs including:

- The model does not include an assumption for increases in density on existing flats, maisonettes or apartments, which is curious when the policy itself, promotes the intensification of existing flats. The consequence of this decision unfairly penalises the Outer London boroughs, and moreover appears to have little regard to historical patterns of intensification.
- Despite attempting to avoid it, double counting does occur between the modelled and trend based elements of the assessment, and therefore the combined capacity from both represents an overestimate.
- The model assumes that different housing types have potential to yield different levels of capacity, and whilst the approach of relying on historic rates to determine the growth factors for differing housing typologies appears on the face of it to be logical, it does pose the question as to whether the same level of densification will continue to occur in the future, or if opportunities (and specifically the easier ones) are depleting.
- Of the assumptions feeding into the model the 1% growth assumption raises greatest concern. Relative to past trends this 1% figure assumes a significant step change in the delivery of completions on small sites. For Ealing this would represent a more than 3 fold increase in the rate of delivery. The SHLAA report advises that 1% is considered to provide a reasonable estimate for the level of additional housing that could be provided in view of the potential impact of the proposed policy changes in the new London Plan. This implies then that the methodology for the small sites assessment was designed in order to

determine/estimate the impact of policy changes in the new London Plan. However it merely represents an estimate of potential capacity only. But understanding of physical ‘notional’ capacity only provides part of the picture. No attempt, in particular, has been made to measure the impact of these policy tools on the rate of delivery. Relying solely on these capacity figures to derive the target is in our opinion fundamentally flawed. In the absence of such evidence, and any further explanation in the background report, the basis for the 1% figure remains a mystery to Ealing, and we are therefore highly sceptical that this level of intensification can be achieved. Despite raising such concerns with officers at the GLA no further explanation has been given to support this assumption.

51. The SHLAA should be designed and applied objectively. From our perspective it looks like the methodology has been engineered in order to produce the result that are needed to close the gap between supply and demand, rather than properly grappling with the issue, which in fact may ultimately involve accepting the limitations of what is possible. The SHLAA itself should not be seen as a solution, but rather a means of measuring what might be achievable. More detailed comments on technical aspects of the SHLAA methodology are set out in the table below.

52. In spite of the emphasis in the policy, the proposed housing supply targets are not credible in any shape or form. Failure is almost inevitable and is likely to undermine the plan led system (including our ability to be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing and to meet the Government’s proposed new Housing Delivery Test), which may potentially make it difficult to resist poor quality ad hoc development to the detriment of achieving ‘Good Growth’.

53. Further specific comments on policies in the Policies H1 and H2 are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<p><b>Increasing Housing Supply (H1) and the SHLAA</b></p>	<p><b><u>Large Sites</u></b></p> <p><b>Phasing assumptions and rate of delivery</b></p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that there is less certainty around capacity arising in later phases, and therefore the capacity identified for the full SHLAA may down play what may be delivered over a 25 year period, the overall 25 year capacity figures generally provide a more realistic estimate of supply and so perhaps the target should have been annualised from this figure. For most boroughs however capacity is unevenly distributed across the full SHLAA period, with significant bunching occurring in phases 2 and 3. For London as a whole these two phases account for 59% (69% for Ealing) of the total large site capacity over the 25 year period, despite only relating to 40% of the time period, and significantly it is these two phases which determine the borough’s 10 year housing supply target.</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>The uneven distribution of capacity over the SHLAA period has principally arisen from the default phasing assumptions. The default phasing assumptions have clearly been engineered to ensure that the bulk of capacity is distributed into the first 3 phases and yet this appears to have little regard to past trends in delivery (or any infrastructure requirements). No explanation is given for the percentage splits given in the phasing defaults, and in the absence of any supporting evidence they appear to be somewhat arbitrary. Whilst there clearly will be a correlation between probability and phasing, probability is not the only determinant. It is perhaps a reasonable measure of whether permission will be sought and secured, but its influence is perhaps less strong in relation to delivery. Many of the constraints will have either been overcome, or a mechanism identified to mitigate them by the time permission has been secured, and so they are not necessarily the key factors/barriers influencing delivery. The phasing assumptions must therefore be informed by past trends. Scale is probably a stronger determinant of phasing, and it is acknowledged that this does factor into the phasing assumptions.</p> <p>According to the OLC's report 'Removing the Barriers to Housing Delivery', March 2016' London boroughs have consistently granted planning permission for over 50,000 homes a year and have built up a pipeline of around 260,000 approvals, with this pipeline more than doubling over the past 10 years. Such approvals however do not always translate into completions, or at least not at the rate needed. London has generally been approving around 1.5 to 2 times the number of average annual completions. The evidence does not therefore suggest that there is a clear causal effect between approvals and completions, as increases in approvals during certain years has not been matched by subsequent increases in annual completions.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the system did give authorities the ability to adjust the phasing of delivery for individual sites, where further information was available (i.e. phasing plans), this cannot account for unexpected delays, or even the applicants readiness or intention to implement a permission, and so for many sites it is impossible to determine with certainty whether a site is likely to be delayed or even lapse beyond the plan period. Molior's second barriers to delivery report in 2014 showed that a third of all permitted large sites were owned by non-developers. Based on past trends for</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>permissions, starts and completions it is fair to assume that delivery of some of this capacity will inevitably drift.</p> <p>A reasonable proportion of the capacity attributed to phases 2 and 3 derives from the approvals pipeline, with much of this capacity arising and dependent on particularly large schemes. Moreover when looking at approvals, allocations and potential development sites 50% of the capacity arising from large sites assigned to the 10 year target period derives from sites with capacity yields in excess of 500 homes (with 30% arising from sites over 1,000 homes in size). Such opportunities will inevitably take a considerable number of years to complete, and this also explains why the pipeline has more than doubled over the past decade, without there being a comparable increase in completions during this period. Moreover it would only take the delivery of 1 or 2 of these sites to slip in each borough, pushing delivery (even in part) beyond phase 3, to make the situation irretrievable for an authority in respect of complying with its housing targets. The ability to find replacement (windfall sites) of a comparable scale, or to fast-track other larger sites presently attributed to phases 4 and 5, would be virtually impossible, and thus authorities would likely fail to deliver on their housing targets for the full duration of the monitoring period. This perhaps points to the need to identify an over-supply of capacity (should it exist), to provide greater headroom to deal with the issue of non or sluggish delivery. A failure to build in some contingency into the figures, represents a particularly high risk strategy, and could have significant detrimental consequences for the boroughs.</p> <p>Ideally the default phasing assumptions would have been adjusted to better reflect historical trends in the rate of delivery. As we are unable to predict which sites might be affected by delay, it might be better to adjust the phasing assumptions for all sites. One possibility would have been to redistribute a proportion of the capacity (perhaps a third) into phases 4 and 5 where capacity at present exclusively falls within phases 2 and or 3. Whilst it is accepted that this may appear inaccurate in relation to an individual site where greater intelligence exists, as the capacity is aggregated this should not matter. Although LPAs had the ability to make adjustments to phasing as noted above, the need to start with a robust methodology and assumptions is crucial in maintaining/enforcing consistency between boroughs, and we are not confident that this has been done.</p>



Policy/Para	Comment
<p><b>Increasing Housing Supply (H1) and the SHLAA</b></p>	<p><b><u>Large Sites</u></b></p> <p><b>Level of delivery</b></p> <p>The 10 year housing target represents a substantial increase (+53%) on the current 2016 London Plan target. The SHLAA report cites a number of factors which might explain the uplift in absolute terms. This includes the identification of a record number of sites. 2,000 additional sites were assessed as part of the 2017 SHLAA compared to the 2013 SHLAA study. Whilst this is not disputed, many of these previously unidentified sites will have been discounted. It is unclear then how many genuinely new sites yield capacity. It is our impression that much of this yield arises from sites already identified, through squeezing more out of these sites.</p> <p>Where past trends have informed the methodology, for example in relation to establishing the probability percentage for ‘low probability sites’, this evidence has been based on approvals only, as opposed to completions, and it is well established that not all approvals will translate into completions.</p> <p>The SHLAA is also supported by a separate independent viability assessment which assists in understanding likely future rates of delivery. This study shows that some types of development and built forms are more viable than others and this varies between value bands. Broadly speaking the higher density schemes are more viable in the higher value bands, and the lower density schemes are more viable in the lower value bands, based on current day values. Whilst some exceptions will exist to this general rule, this position does not support the large uplift envisaged through the target for outer London boroughs which geographically typically fall within the lower value bands.</p>
<p><b>Increasing Housing Supply (H1) and the SHLAA</b></p>	<p><b><u>Large Sites</u></b></p> <p><b>Methodology for defining settings</b></p> <p>The robustness and utility of the setting maps, a key input into the SHLAA, also raises particular concern. The updated SHLAA character map drew on the notes in the 2016 London Plan density matrix, which described a range of attributes/features of a place which together assist in defining the setting of a site. Having reviewed the default settings for each of the sites, it was evident that the character map was</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>fundamentally flawed and this has required officers to adjust the density for many sites to more accurately reflect the existing/potential setting. The methodology used to define the SHLAA character map is overly simplified and the limited choice of parameters and the appropriateness of these parameters as a measure/proxy of setting provides a crude and inaccurate measure (further commentary on the appropriateness of these is provided below).</p> <p>As noted above in relation to the phasing assumptions, it is neither ideal nor appropriate to have to redress such flaws on a site by site basis and these should have been addressed at the outset. The need to start with a robust methodology and data sets is crucial and is essential in maintaining and enforcing consistency between boroughs.</p> <p>The following issues were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision to employ two very similar proxies (PTAL and proximity to a town centre) is highly questionable. Arup themselves identified this as an issue when reviewing the methodology, although unfortunately this was not reflected in the final character map. Proximity to a town centre is essentially a measure of accessibility and accessibility is already measured through PTAL. The consequence of factoring in location into the determination of settings is that accessibility is effectively being double counted, as PTAL already forms the other determining half of the density calculation. There already is a strong correlation between higher PTALs and proximity to town centres and so doubling these up disproportionately weights location as a determinant of density.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding the above, this might push to omit proximity to town centres as a measure for this exercise, the approach to defining this proxy also raises concern. A 1km buffer from all town centres is excessive and fairly crude. The extent of the buffer should reduce relative to where a town centre sits in the retail hierarchy. Moreover, 'Central' settings should probably be defined based on proximity to International and Metropolitan Town Centres and not Major Centres. Settings should be defined based on the existing building form (or potential if this is yet to be established) and independent of</li> </ul>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>location and PTAL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst there may be a correlation between location and building form, it does not automatically determine it, and its zone of influence dependent on the status of the centre (within the hierarchy) may not extend that far beyond its boundary.</li> <li>• The use of housing typology by itself, independent of other physical characteristics, does not provide an accurate indicator either. As we understand it the proportion of a housing type is determined at a super output area based in the 2011 census data. The spatial extent of these super output areas can vary considerably dependent on the density of population, and the character of the area might vary significantly across its extent. Perversely a geographically large SOA, with a predominance of flatted development, and where density overall is low if measured across the SOA, might be recorded as a central setting. This reliance on such data then is clearly flawed.</li> <li>• The decision to apply the parameters independently, but in combination, when defining the final character map is also not supported (i.e. an area needs to only fulfil one of the criteria for it to be classified as central, urban or suburban). The parameters should be applied cumulatively as no one parameter alone can be said to define a setting. Ideally then the setting map would have been defined based on a range of other factors in combination (including for example building form, massing, plot coverage etc.), and independent of location and PTAL.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Small Sites (H2) and SHLAA</b></p>	<p><b><u>Small Sites</u></b></p> <p>The modelling was applied to select development types only covering conversions of houses to flats and new build infill developments of 10 homes or fewer. The capacity estimate for the remaining development types including change of use and new build developments yielding more than 10 units was based on historic trend data. The decision to rely on modelling for some development types and trends for others is not explained at all in the SHLAA report, and so this decision appears to be somewhat arbitrary. It is assumed that this decision has been driven more by the availability of data as opposed to there being any sound planning reasons. In light of this decision and despite the advice given</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>in the NPPF and the NPPG the weight attached to historical performance is significantly downplayed.</p> <p>Further issues are also noted with the modelling methodology itself, and these put into question the reliability and the credibility of the model and its outputs.</p> <p>The model does not include an assumption for increases in density on existing flats, maisonettes or apartments. The decision to exclude flats is curious however when the policy itself (H2 clause D3) promotes the intensification of existing flats. It is acknowledged however that establishing net growth factors from flats is challenging, as the data in the London Development Database (LDD) for past developments in relation to the recorded number of existing units, may be incomplete/partial. Nonetheless it is worrying that such challenges have factored more strongly in defining the methodology, than any other sound planning reasons.</p> <p>The decision to distinguish between flats and houses highlights further issues with the reliability of data informing the modelling. The housing typology captured in the census may not always be accurate with some houses actually existing as flats. Intensification may therefore have already occurred, although such units may not have been regularised, and so factoring these into the modelling over plays the existing stock which might have potential for intensification. Ideally some adjustment would have been made to account for concealed flats.</p> <p>The model assumes that different housing types have potential to yield different levels of capacity, and whilst the approach of relying on historic rates to determine the growth factors for differing housing typologies appears on the face of it to be logical, it does pose the question as to whether the same level of densification will continue to occur in the future, or if opportunities are depleting. The use of borough specific growth factors might also have been explored as opposed to taking a London average.</p> <p>In designing the methodology, officers at the GLA had also sought to avoid double counting occurring between the modelled component and the windfall analysis. To avoid double counting occurring within the windfall analysis, those development types modelled (i.e. new build developments yielding 10 homes or fewer, residential conversions, infill development within a residential curtilage) were correctly removed</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>from the windfall analysis. Whilst the decision to remove the above from the trend based analysis is logical, it highlights the potential for double counting occurring in reverse through the modelled element.</p> <p>For double counting to not occur through the modelled element of the assessment it must be assumed that the existing units (intensification opportunities) will only generate 10 homes or fewer, when in reality some units/sites will inevitably yield more than 10 units, and therefore this (albeit an unknown) proportion should be discounted as they already inform the windfall analysis and so they cannot also factor in the modelling of sites yielding 10 or less homes.</p> <p>Accordingly it is inevitable then that the same sites will therefore factor twice in both the modelling and windfall trend analysis. The combined capacity from both elements of the study must therefore represent an overestimate.</p>
<p><b>Small Sites</b> <b>(H2 B 2)</b></p>	<p>Design codes are hugely onerous pieces of work and seem entirely misconceived as a delivery tool for a policy that is about encouraging bespoke design solutions and unconventional sites. This requirement should therefore be rephrased as an optional measure for Boroughs to employ as they see fit.</p> <p>This clause should be revised; 'Boroughs should consider...'</p>
<p><b>Small Sites</b> <b>(H2 D)</b></p>	<p>Leaving aside the issues of capacity that are set out above, the small sites target should not be binding. Even if it is found sound then small sites should only form an advisory part of an overall housing figure for each borough to meet as they choose. The RSS should not dictate how housing allocations will be met spatially, that is a choice for each local planning authority in their own development plan.</p> <p>It is also very difficult to see what the presumption in favour of small sites will materially add to the extant and well established NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>In fact, given the limitations of the policy in relation to design (discussed below in H2 E) its purpose seems only to encourage development that is in fact not sustainable. Reference to the presumption in favour should be removed from all sections of the policy.</p> <p>The first part of Clause D should be revised as follows; 'Indicative figures for small sites are set out in Table 4.2. Boroughs are encouraged to plan for the following types of small housing development which provide between 1 and 25 homes;'</p>

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Small Sites (H2 E)</b>	<p>Despite the commitment to providing ‘well-designed’ small homes in the first sentence of the policy, design is largely absent from the rest of the text. Design must be included as a decision-making criterion and as part of the scope for refusal. It is also unfortunate that this policy is negatively phrased in terms of ‘unacceptable levels of harm’ instead of making a positive case for the contribution that well designed and appropriately located small housing development can make.</p> <p>The second part of Clause E should be redrafted as follows;</p> <p>‘Where there is no such design code, small housing development should demonstrate that it achieves a good design solution to the site and preserves or enhances residential amenity, designated heritage assets, biodiversity and safeguarded land uses.</p>
<b>Small Sites (H2, Para 4.2.9)</b>	<p>This paragraph needs to be clarified in light of the points raised on point H2 E. It must not be taken to mean that loss of designated green space or sites of importance for nature conservation is made acceptable by the provision of small site housing.</p>

54. Specific comments on other policies in the Housing chapter are summarised below:

<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Meanwhile Use (H4)</b>	<p>The Council supports this policy, in particular, the encouragement for the use of precision manufactured homes.</p>
<b>Affordable Housing (H5-H8)</b>	<p>The Council supports these policies which are largely based on the previously published Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), August 2017.</p>
<b>Vacant Building Credit (H9)</b>	<p>The Council supports this policy and, in particular, agrees with the assertion that: “in most circumstances, its application will not be appropriate in London.”</p>
<b>Redevelopment of Existing Housing and Estate regeneration (H10)</b>	<p>The Council supports this policy. We recognise the need to protect existing tenants’ ability to remain on site in relation to their affordable housing needs.</p> <p>However, some flexibility does need to be exercised to reflect local circumstances. Such regeneration schemes are often a very</p>

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	complicated process balancing up a wider range of issues than the affordable housing provision element.
<b>Ensuring the Best use of Stock</b>  <b>(H11)</b>	The Council supports this policy, in particular, the new provisions about 'buy to leave' and short-term holiday rentals.
<b>Housing Size Mix</b>  <b>(H12)</b>	The Council supports this policy and confirms that we have no policies in our existing local plan that sets prescriptive requirements on dwelling size mix in terms of the number of bedrooms.
<b>Build to Rent</b>  <b>(H13)</b>	The Council supports this new policy and acknowledges the increasingly important role this sector plays in meeting housing delivery.
<b>Specialist Older Persons housing</b>  <b>(H15)</b>	<p>The Council supports this policy.</p> <p>However, the policy only covers new provision and provides no protection for existing housing of this type. The policy should be amended to secure the retention of existing provision where this is supported by evidence of local need.</p>
<b>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</b>  <b>(H16)</b>	<p>The Council notes that the draft London Plan introduces a new and broader definition for Gypsies and Travellers which differs from the existing Government definition. A joint evidence base report (GTANA) is currently in preparation in association with a number of other West London boroughs and this suggests that if the new definition were to be applied there would be a shortfall of 26 pitches for the London Borough of Ealing and 200 over West London. This currently excludes any assessment of need from households living in bricks and mortar which is likely to increase the levels of need by some margin. This will have serious financial and land use implications for the Council and neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Land that is suitable for residential development is at a premium and more housing need could be met by high density housing developments rather than caravan pitches. Our estimate is that it costs approximately £100k to put in place a new public pitch and in the region of £5m per hectare for land purchase in West London. Therefore the financial implications are huge if the London Plan definition were to be adopted. Whilst it is noted that Mayoral funding will be available</p>

<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
	through the Affordable Homes Programme to help meet such needs, this is likely to be oversubscribed and insufficient.  A definition that includes gypsies and travellers who live in bricks and mortar is therefore not considered appropriate.
<b>Purpose Built Student Accommodation (H17)</b>	The Council supports this policy.
<b>Large Scale Purpose Built Shared Living (H18)</b>	The Council supports this new policy and, in particular, welcomes the fact that these developments will continue to be classified as 'sui generis' and the introduction of new design criteria when considering planning applications for such developments.

## **CHAPTER 5: SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

55. Specific comments are summarised below:

<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Developing London's Social Infrastructure (S1 F)</b>	The greater flexibility regarding loss of social infrastructure in circumstances where proposals are part of a wider public service transformation plan or to sustain and improve services is welcomed and reflects the difficult choices faced by many LPAs in balancing the budgets of public authorities.
<b>Developing London's Social Infrastructure (S1 5.1.1)</b>	Clarity is sought. Why single out policies G3 and G4? Other green space types/designations might also constitute social infrastructure.
<b>Health and Social Care Facilities (S2)</b>	The Council supports this policy but laments the difficulties in planning for future needs and requirements given the reduction in resources for health and concerns about whether needs are being truly met.
<b>Education and Childcare Facilities (S3)</b>	The Council supports this policy and the Mayor will be aware of our innovative approach to the identification of new school sites in a recently adopted bespoke Planning For Schools DPD.



Policy/Para	Comment
	The encouragement for the co-location of schools (Para 5.3.12) is welcomed but it would be more helpful if this was incorporated into actual policy and not just the supporting text.
<b>Play and Informal Recreation</b>  (S4)	The Council supports this policy.
<b>Sports and Recreation Facilities</b>  (S5 C)	Clarity is sought. Why single out Policy G3? Other policy designations such as Green Belt and Public Open Space might also accommodate facilities for recreation/sports.
<b>Public Toilets</b>  (S6)	The Council supports this new policy.
<b>Burial Space</b>  (S7 5.7.3)	<p>The advice that the provision of facilities for cemeteries may not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt or on Metropolitan Open Land may be misleading. Whilst this may be the case if no change of use has occurred (i.e. the site were previously occupied as a cemetery), where the cemetery use represents a new use (i.e. a material change of use has occurred), it would represent 'inappropriate development', even if it does not obviously conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>It should be noted that the exceptions outlined in the NPPF relate only to buildings and not to use. Thus the second bullet point under Paragraph 89 covers the construction of a building (for example a café) as an appropriate facility for an existing cemetery, but it does not cover a material change in the use of land so as to create a new cemetery. See <i>Timmins v Gedling BC</i>.</p>

## **CHAPTER 6: ECONOMY**

56. The Council's comments are divided into two parts and deal with policies on land for industry, logistics and services (Policies E4 to E7) and other policies on the economy.

**(a) Policies on Industry, Logistics and Services**

57. While there is much to recommend the draft London Plan's more flexible approach to the economy, the Council has similar concerns about industrial policy as with housing policy; that there is insufficient evidence to support current policy assumptions and these will therefore fail to deliver the new land supply targets. Ealing is greatly enthusiastic for the opportunities offered by industrial intensification. However, our work on pilot projects calls into question several aspects of the draft policies.

58. The draft plan proposes a new approach to employment land which requires much more detailed and sector-specific planning than has hitherto been the case. This is particularly demanding for West London Boroughs which have a large existing stock of industrial land that is characterised by low vacancy, declining employment levels, and a key strategic location between Central London, Heathrow and the Thames Valley, and as part of the High Speed 2 and Elizabeth Line West corridors in the draft London Plan.

59. Draft London Plan policies make key assumptions about halting the loss of industrial land, intensifying its use, repurposing existing sites for new occupiers, and in particular about the future pattern of logistics operations, which will account for 100% of net projected industrial need.

60. Based upon local knowledge of the West London industrial stock and development pipeline it seems likely that intensification and reuse of existing industrial sites will be much harder to achieve than GLA seems to assume. Industrial occupiers often rent rather than own their sites and so have limited desire to invest and considerable aversion to any development activity that will disrupt their business operations.

61. Most industrial uses are based upon cheap land and premises and policy is deliberately designed to help secure these low land values meaning that there is limited financial incentive to intensify and many businesses are dependent on what is in effect decaying stock. Conversely, industrial land faces a paradox in that the nature of current industrial operations militates against stacking, and rising values therefore often mean a diminished interest in redevelopment of assets that already represent a large sunk cost relative to their commercial return.

62. The proposed policy approach therefore, while entirely laudable, represents a level of transformation in industrial operations, culture, and economics that calls into question the proposed yield and timetable. A far greater strategic lead from GLA and provision of complementary measures and funding are needed to deliver this approach.

63. A particular concern is logistics. Despite repeated calls from Ealing throughout the evolution of the new draft plan there is no overarching or strategic approach to the provision of logistics uses, and the Logistics Sounding Board now in operation is too little too late to evidence the draft policies. Logistics uses make up the entire net requirement for industrial land, and constitute the most

rapidly changing industrial use in respect of type of premises and nature of operations. In the absence of significant new evidence base it is an entirely open question how London's logistics needs will be met in future.

64. 'Substitution' of industrial uses is envisaged by the draft plan but this is left up to LPAs and is envisaged as primarily an arrangement within London. This provides no realistic assessment of the suitability of those sites freed up by the loss of manufacturing uses for new industrial uses and no evidence to assist in the management of small and non-designated industrial sites which is a longstanding problem, and which may be crucial to last mile deliveries.

65. Logistics needs which make up the vast bulk of the headline demand figures, and which crucially are pre-let before construction, should not be conflated with the much more complex and intricate needs of small scale manufacturing and distribution, which has far smaller requirements for land, is more locationally sensitive, and in which there exists little speculative provision.

66. Industrial policy is not an area which has ever had to cope with the burden of very tight management of land in the way that is now normal in housing. Given the rate of unplanned loss monitored over the last plan period it seems highly unlikely that net loss of industrial land will be brought under control as quickly or as completely as the Plan would now require. Local knowledge of the West London industrial stock still indicates a legacy of small non-designated sites that will be very difficult to repurpose and which will probably necessitate some continued release from industrial use.

67. The task for the policy therefore needs to be to introduce some strategic flexibility and resilience in industrial land supply by generating efficiencies in the key sector of logistics, which is projected to make up 100% of net demand during the plan period. This should be by a combination of intensification, consolidation, and substitution but crucially these will need both a strategic lead from the GLA and a large number of complementary measures that go beyond planning policy. This latter is essential to generate new business and funding models that at present simply do not exist.

68. Our comments are logistics can be summarised thus:

- Demand from logistics makes up 100% of London's net need for industrial land and forms the central policy problem of industrial planning.
- There is very little speculative provision for industrial sectors other than largescale logistics, and much of London's stock is based on repurposing a decaying stock to new uses and occupiers.
- Industrial land designations have inadvertently become more like conservation designations with the peculiar economics of industrial uses reducing development interest in areas where the market signal of high land values indicate the greatest need for change. There is a pressing need to generate more development activity in industrial areas in order to deliver intensification.

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

- There is need for a more strategic approach to the main industrial land use requirement of logistics, and the GLA needs to undertake further work on options and strategies for logistics provision, substitution and last mile.
- Much of the land freed up by loss of manufacturing uses will be difficult to repurpose for the identified needs due to the smaller scale and distributed nature of sites. Similarly, opportunities and policy incentives for intensification of existing sites are probably more limited than assumed by draft London Plan policy.
- Industrial occupiers often rent rather than own their sites and so have limited incentive to invest and considerable aversion to any development activity that will disrupt their business operations. Most industrial uses are based upon cheap land and premises, and policy is deliberately designed to help secure this meaning that there is limited financial incentive to intensify and many businesses are dependent on what is in effect decaying stock.
- Undesignated sites are extremely difficult to manage and may have a key role in last mile logistics. Further work is needed on demand and design strategies.
- Much of the capacity for intensification is on large sites where there is scope for enabling development of higher value co-located uses especially residential. Further work is needed on the nature of the opportunity, including flexibility for pilot schemes, such as those already underway in Ealing, to help the development of a commercially viable business model for this type of scheme.
- Many of the key policy assumptions are speculative, particularly the 65% baseline for intensification and the 50% affordable housing target for intensified sites, and will need to be further tested in practice.
- While the LP change to monitor by floor area rather than site area is an improvement it remains too crude a measure to deliver efficient use of industrial land. An approach needs to be found that recognises and drives the utilisation of sites, this is also essential to the development of effective policy on affordable workspace provision.
- The need for measures needed to deliver intensification, such as innovation funding, and joint working by planners and industry, are so fundamental to this policy approach that greater commitment to them must be shown in the policy for it to have any credibility as a land use strategy.
- There is a clear need for engagement and partnership with industry to build the legitimacy of and demand for new forms of industrial premises.

Given the need to address the headline problems of industrial land supply, the comments below have largely been written to close gaps in the proposed policies such as lack of control over non-designated sites. However, a much preferable strategy would be to create more flexibility in management policies by addressing the strategic issues set out above.

69. Specific comments on Policies E4 to E7 are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Land for Industry, Logistics and Services</b>	The wording of this policy is unclear and it seems, despite the introduction of the principle of no net loss, to continue the confusion

Policy/Para	Comment
<p><b>to Support London’s Economic Function (E4)</b></p>	<p>over the role of different forms of planning designation in managing industrial land. Despite being monitored on the protection of our industrial land supply as a whole, the protection of given sites is often undermined, even by GLA officers, due to it not being SIL and being construed as consequently enjoying lesser protection.</p> <p>The evidence base for the new Plan has made clear that this distinction is not sustainable and we strongly recommend the inclusion within the policy itself of wording like the following:</p> <p>‘While different forms of industrial space in London serve different roles they are all equally important in supporting industrial uses as a whole. No industrial space in London is less worthy of protection simply due to its designation, or its status as non-designated industrial land. All extant industrial space should be preferred for continued, enhanced and intensified industrial use managed according to the agent of change principle. Loss of any space should be managed according to the strategic supply of industrial land and a plan-led approach should always be preferred.’</p>
<p><b>Land for Industry, Logistics and Services to Support London’s Economic Function (E4)</b></p>	<p>The principle of no net loss seems ill-defined given that it is intended to underpin the whole approach to industrial supply in London. In particular, there is no suggestion as to how it will be monitored and balanced ‘across London’. It is therefore very difficult to see how boroughs will determine which losses are excessive and succeed in resisting them.</p> <p>Achieving control of this level of precision is fundamentally impractical for a regional-scale strategic plan and policy would be better focused a policy approach which is more resilient in strategic terms. The Council’s view is that the whole approach to industry needs to be revised by generating the opportunity for more flexible management through efficiencies in the dominant employment land use of logistics.</p>
<p><b>Land for Industry, Logistics and Services to Support London’s Economic Function (E4 C)</b></p>	<p>This clause is most unclear in its treatment of non-designated sites particularly given that these have no dedicated policy of their own.</p> <p>The second sentence seems to suggest that the principle of no net loss does not apply to non-designated sites. Overall the policy does little to address the difficulty of managing non-designated sites, and fails to explore their crucial role in last-mile deliveries.</p> <p>The policy should not apply a hierarchy to the principle of no net loss as it is literally impossible to manage for a net zero loss when a part of the</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	stock is excluded from this protection.
<p><b>Land for Industry, Logistics and Services to Support London’s Economic Function</b> <b>(E4 C)</b></p>	<p>This clause also conflates floorspace and capacity into the curious and essentially nonsensical concept of ‘floorspace capacity’. While the move to monitor by floorspace rather than site area is a relative improvement, the policy needs also to drive the more efficient use of space by encouraging higher rates of utilisation. This will be difficult to measure as a figure but can be addressed by encouraging particular types of space. For example, shared and managed workspace could be preferred over single occupier light industrial, and consolidation centres and last mile distribution over large, long-term storage warehousing.</p>
<p><b>Strategic Industrial Locations</b> <b>(E5)</b></p>	<p>The provisions of this policy are broadly supported as development management tools, and as principles for the management of SILs. In particular we welcome clarification of the permitted use types and the encouragement of a strategic approach to management.</p> <p>We would however question whether this approach is sufficient to drive the intensification of these sites particularly where they are in fragmented use and ownership.</p>
<p><b>Strategic Industrial Locations</b> <b>(E5 D)</b></p>	<p>The policy as a whole needs to be strengthened in relation to the management of extant non-conforming uses and some aspects of consolidation that are currently covered in Policy E7. The Council has long experience of defending appeals against SIL policy and these often hinge on the status of SIL as a ‘land-based’ policy which preserves the industrial potential of a large consolidated area of land. This risks being inadvertently undermined by the shift to a floorspace-based system of monitoring and by the lack of wording supporting increasing consolidation of these sites as a whole. It is suggested that this could be addressed in clause D by including wording such as:</p> <p>‘These industrial-type uses are always to be preferred for development within SILs and the presence of extant non-conforming uses does not reduce the need for a given site to provide industrial capacity. Development activity should always seek to reinforce the integrity of the SIL as a whole and to return sites with non-conforming uses to those uses set out in part C.’</p>
<p><b>LSIS</b> <b>(E6)</b></p>	<p>This policy is supported particularly in its encouragement for Local Plans to define specific roles for LSIS. This is essential for Ealing which has the largest projected net loss of jobs of any LPA.</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>This policy must also be reinforced by a clear statement elsewhere in the plan that LSIS is not a second class citizen. We therefore suggest that a new clause is added reflecting the comment on E5 above;</p> <p>‘Industrial-type uses are always to be preferred for development within LSIS and the presence of extant non-conforming uses does not reduce the need for a given site to provide industrial capacity. Development activity should always seek to reinforce the integrity of the LSIS as a whole and to return sites with non-conforming uses to preferred uses as defined by boroughs.’</p>
<p><b>Intensification, Co-Location and Substitution of Land for Industry, etc.</b> (E7)</p>	<p>This policy is generally supported and introduces a welcome stimulus to development within SILs. However, the Council has similar concerns about this policy as with H2; that, while the policy is on the whole a good approach to development management, it does not solve strategic issues of land supply.</p> <p>In particular, it should lead with a commitment by the Mayor to undertake long-term strategic planning for the key land use requirement of logistics which makes up 100% of London’s net industrial demand.</p> <p>In the absence of work from GLA on this issue the Council has now commissioned a fundamental review of logistics demand and supply with partners in West London.</p>
<p><b>Intensification, Co-Location and Substitution of Land for Industry, etc.</b> (E7 D)</p>	<p>This clause risks entirety undermining the plan’s approach to industrial land. A simple revision will address this through the deletion of ‘or residential development’ from the first line of this clause so that it reads;</p> <p>‘Mixed-use development proposals on Non-Designated Industrial Sites will be supported where:...’</p> <p>Complete loss of non-designated industrial sites will then need to be by exception to policy, and should be both greatly reduced and considerably more manageable in DM terms.</p>
<p><b>Intensification, Co-Location and Substitution of Land for Industry, etc.</b> (E7 F)</p>	<p>Substitution cannot practicably be left to individual boroughs particularly where it relates to strategic considerations such as logistics. This clause should reflect a commitment by the Mayor to lead strategic planning for logistics development in London. It remains an open question what the pattern of logistics development will be in London in the future, and as the dominant demand for industrial land it is</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>essential that there is a planning input into its evolution.</p> <p>At the least this should be reflected in the policy by adding to the opening sentence of this clause: ‘The Mayor will...’. This should also be backed up by a commitment to a long-term delivery programme for industrial intensification including joint working with industry and LPAs.</p>

**(b) Other Policies on the Economy**

70. Specific comments on other policies in the chapter on Economy are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<p><b>Offices</b> <b>(E1 G3)</b></p>	<p>This clause runs the risk of being read in isolation and allowing developers to argue that a given site is ‘surplus’. The supporting text should make clear reference to the fact this must be based upon strategic assessments of need.</p>
<p><b>Low Cost Business Space</b> <b>(E2)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy.</p> <p>However, greater clarity is required on the re-provision of low cost space, if this is deemed to be a different product to affordable workspace. The policy does not require re-provided employment space to be low-cost or seek to define what constitutes low-cost. This could be included in either B 2) or 3) given that the narrative indicates that some businesses can be affected by even small increases in costs. There also needs to be greater reference to evidence that the space will meet requirements of the businesses identified in the policy. In this regard there perhaps needs to be a requirement that a business or workspace provider is signed up from outset.</p> <p>There could also be greater clarity on what tests should define how premises can be identified to be unviable/there is no identified need for its retention. This for example could make reference in the policy justification to provide evidence of vacancy and marketing should be 24 months. This is the period adopted by most Boroughs to allow for robust marketing, and also to account for any changes in local market conditions.</p> <p>It would also be useful to include reference to the LPA’s economic development strategy which should seek to identify the type of space</p>



## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	and groups within the area that require low cost and affordable space.
<b>Affordable Workspace (E3)</b>	The Council supports this policy but it would benefit from measures to encourage developers to liaise with workspace providers as early as possible in the planning process, with a view to having a named provider in the S106. This would help ensure space is designed with the end users requirements in mind.
<b>Retail, Markets and Hot Food Takeaways (E9)</b>	The Council supports a common and consistent approach to the management of hot food takeaways in the areas surrounding schools. The 400 metres provision has increasingly become good practice and this policy is welcomed.
<b>Visitor Infrastructure (E10)</b>	The Council supports this policy.
<b>Skills and Opportunities for All (E11)</b>	The Council supports this policy.

## **CHAPTER 7: HERITAGE AND CULTURE**

71. Specific comments are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Heritage Conservation and Growth (HC1)</b>	<p>The Council supports a common and consistent approach to the management of heritage in London. There is no need to continually reinvent and rephrase the same basic, key development principles in borough plans when these are already covered in both the NPPF and London Plan and this policy should aim to provide all of the necessary management tools for applications that affect heritage assets.</p> <p>The policy rightly makes reference to the need for ‘regenerative change’ (HC1 B) and ‘creative re-use of heritage assets and the historic environment (7.1.6) if London is able to meet of all of its development needs in relation to housing and employment.</p> <p>Some of this has to take place within or close to historic assets (for e.g. within some of the 1000 conservation areas that exist in London). The</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>policy rightly allows Boroughs to assess and provide an understanding of their historic environment but some further policy support on achieving regenerative change in practice might be helpful.</p>
<p><b>Heritage Conservation and Growth</b> <b>(HC1 C)</b></p>	<p>This clause makes a reasonable attempt at a general development management policy for heritage but could perhaps be more focused. OPDC has been working with Historic England to produce a clear and concise heritage policy and this may prove a useful model:</p> <p>‘OPDC will give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the significance of designated heritage assets, including their settings. Proposals harming the significance of a designated heritage asset should be justified having regard to their heritage interest, reasonable alternatives to avoid or mitigate harm and delivery of public benefits’</p>
<p><b>Supporting London’s Culture and Creative Industries</b> <b>(HC5)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this new policy.</p> <p>Reference is made to Assets of Community Value (Para 7.5.5). Whilst there is no objection in principle to boroughs being ‘encouraged’ to support nominations, it should be noted that this is subject to a separate process under the Localism Act.</p>
<p><b>Supporting the Night-Time Economy</b> <b>(HC6)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy.</p> <p>But the Council objects to the downgrading of Southall from an area of ‘more than local significance’ in the current London Plan to a proposed ‘no classification’.</p> <p>This makes little sense as continuing regeneration and development efforts improve the variety of Southall’s offer and the attractiveness of its environment and immediately before the huge boost to its accessibility that Crossrail will deliver.</p>
<p><b>Protecting Public Houses</b> <b>(HC7)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and the principle of a common approach to the management of pubs in London.</p> <p>This policy provides the tools necessary to manage development proposals for pubs which have a wider public value for local communities.</p>

## **CHAPTER 8: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

72. The Council welcomes the green infrastructure approach to planning green spaces and features and supports the continued protection of a network of green and open spaces.

73. However, in the context of significant growth, we are concerned about the preservation-like nature of a number of the policies in this chapter. The lack of effective and realistic policies for securing enhancements will do little to assist in helping these spaces fulfil their potential as a resource for a growing population.

74. The Council raised similar concerns in response to the earlier consultation paper on 'A City for All Londoners' and so it is disappointing that such matters have not in our opinion being satisfactorily addressed or actioned. As many of these concerns are still pertinent, a number are revisited here.

75. Ealing as a borough is somewhat unique, in that whilst it does not sit right on the edge of London it does contain areas of Green Belt on its western edge. When combined with Metropolitan Open Land, these designations account for 22% of the land area of the borough. Given the extent of spatial coverage the Council has considerable experience of dealing with applications for development affecting such areas. Given that the extent of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land has largely remained intact then the Council's approach might be viewed as a success.

76. However, such policy designations and their associated policies have been less effective in improving the quality and or condition of such spaces or the degree to which they are functionally accessible to the general public. In certain cases the existing policies have in fact hindered our ability to secure such enhancements. Despite this, competing pressures to utilise these spaces for recreation and development continue to grow.

77. National policy principally sees Green Belt as an urban containment tool. Whilst the Council acknowledges this role too, it considers the existing aims and purposes in the NPPF to be too narrowly defined and would advocate an expansion of these purposes to also capture functions which reflect Green Belt's role as a resource (for example, in recreational and landscape terms).

78. The emerging policy G2 similarly recognises the Green Belt's role in containing further built expansion, although it is noteworthy that it only highlights this purpose after first considering many of its other beneficial functions. Whilst the Council welcomes the recognition given to these other functions, it is disappointing however that when it comes down to it in relation to the process of managing development and defining boundaries policy G2 continues to rely heavily on the NPPF.

79. Paragraph 8.2.2 of the draft London Plan says that the Mayor will work with boroughs and other strategic partners to enhance access to the Green Belt and to improve the quality of these. Whilst we support this approach it remains to be seen how such enhancements will be actually secured.

80. The Council recognises that in setting Green Belt policy the Mayor must take his lead from national policy and therefore varying or expanding on this will be challenging. Nonetheless, the

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Mayor is best placed to lead such a debate and a full London Plan review is the opportune time to do this. It was for this reason that the Outer London Commission also recommended that a strategic; London wide review is carried out. In our opinion the decision to defer so heavily to the NPPF, rather than developing a policy which properly recognises the unique role of Green Belt in London, and in a context of growing population, represents a missed opportunity.

81. To make matters worse, there are a number of clear anomalies between Clause A of Policy G2 and the NPPF which only serves to confuse matters and some clarity is essential. Despite deferring to the NPPF for advice on the management of development within Green Belt, the policy text itself would appear to adopt a stricter line to that advocated by the NPPF, through ignoring the scope to make a case for inappropriate development through demonstrating 'very special circumstances', a well-established principle outlined in the NPPF. It remains unclear whether the Mayor is seeking to take a more inflexible approach to that permitted under the NPPF, or if the approach outlined in the NPPF is still relevant, and so this confusion ought to be clarified.

82. Similarly, Clause B of the Policy G2 advises that the Mayor will not support the de-designation of Green Belt, despite also referring to the NPPF which sets out the processes and considerations for defining Green Belt boundaries, and which in certain exceptional circumstances would permit de-designation. This direction is most unwelcome and such matters should be determined locally, unless it is underpinned by a strategic review.

83. Even if current national policy objectives are to prevail and are narrowly followed by regional policy, it is crucial that the extent of Green Belt in London is correct when viewed against the existing policy provisions.

84. The current geography of Green Belt in London was largely defined many decades ago, and despite clearly having regional significance as a policy designation through shaping the pattern of London's development relative to its neighbours, the process of drawing up and reviewing boundaries has largely been left to the individual boroughs. The ad hoc and sometimes inconsistent nature by which Green Belt has been defined has given rise to many anomalies in its geography. Rather than forming a continuous band around London which separates London from neighbouring and distinct settlements, sections of it are more akin to a green wedge.

85. Whilst this arrangement clearly has merit in that it helps to bring the countryside into the urban area, it does little to contribute to its current (and perhaps primary) purpose of preventing urban sprawl. Moreover, such green wedges are sometimes fragmented or weakly linked and essentially form isolated islands surrounded by built areas.

86. Such green parcels it might be argued better reflect the characteristics of Metropolitan Open Land. Regional Planning Guidance 3 (1996), the precursor to the original London Plan, in fact acknowledged this situation and at the time advised that local planning authorities might consider reverting Green Belt land to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). This advice was never however carried

forward into the London Plan and based on the current geography it does not appear to have been heeded by the boroughs.

87. In light of the above, there clearly is a need for a pan-London review of Green Belt. Whilst the boroughs will need to implement any such changes, the GLA is best placed to oversee this, with input from the boroughs. The GLA already undertake similar exercises in the case of other strategic employment (SIL) and ecology (SMI) policy designations and so this process can and does work in practice. It is disappointing then that despite making representations on this previously, no such strategic review has been undertaken or initiated by the Mayor.

88. Whilst the Council recognises the scale of the task and understands the GLA's nervousness to take on such an exercise such a review need not be contentious. One of the weaknesses with Green Belt reviews undertaken to date, and a source of their critique, is that they frequently fail to put Green Belt first. Typically the main driver for carrying out such reviews has been to find land for housing. Whilst this cannot be ignored and may be a factor driving and underpinning a review, any pan-London review should in the first instance seek to identify opportunities to enhance this space, in the interests of making this space work more effectively to meet the needs of a growing population. The delivery of housing alongside this as an enabling tool might be an outcome of this but it would not necessarily be the central driver. Indeed, this is the approach that the Council has sought to take in undertaking its own Green Belt and MOL review, which is currently underway.

89. As noted above given the inverse relationship between Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land any pan-London review should consider both designations simultaneously.

90. As with previous iterations of MOL policy in the London Plan, the new Policy G3 also defers to national Green Belt policy, although as with policy G2 relating to Green Belt, on face value Clause A appears to adopt a more inflexible approach which disregards the scope to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. As MOL is unique to London, it does not need to rely on the NPPF in relation to Green Belt. It can and should set its own policy. Whilst MOL and Green Belt share certain common characteristics (i.e. their openness and permanence), their purposes are very distinct and the policy should be tailored to best serve MOLs function, defining its own tests for judging appropriate development and very special circumstances.

91. The risk of applying Green Belt policy to MOL is that Green Belt policy has a much narrower focus on openness and its structural function, and therefore it can be interpreted (rightfully or wrongly) as attaching less weight to any strategic functional use.

92. As an alternative to undertaking a Pan London review, or perhaps even to supplement such a review, the GLA should prepare advice for the boroughs on the methodology for undertaking local reviews. Such advice is particularly lacking at present in the case of Metropolitan Open Land, with policy G3 (D) only containing a brief description of the criteria used to define MOL, and this position would benefit from further commentary on how such criteria should be measured and interpreted.

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

93. Indeed, the absence of any advice on scale is a particular deficiency and has resulted in anomalies in the geography of Metropolitan Open Land across London. Again this was an issue highlighted by RPG 3 at the time, which called for greater consistency between Boroughs when designating such areas. Crucially such guidance should also seek to define the characteristics of Metropolitan Open Land and how it is distinct from Green Belt. This will be essential to ensure that the appropriate designation is used.

94. In defining criteria for Metropolitan Open Land it should not be constrained by the broad principles underpinning the definition of Green Belt, which at present disregards matters such as landscape quality and accessibility. It is therefore argued that these should also factor in any review of Metropolitan Open Land policy too.

95. In conclusion, a full structural and strategic review of Green Belt/MOL policy is needed to include environmental quality and recreation factors, with any boundary reviews following from this new methodology. Such a review together with the selective and perhaps partial release of some Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land could be a prime mechanism to deliver the usable green space that is demanded by the huge demographic and housing growth in London.

96. The alternative to this will see a continuation of the present unsatisfactory situation. In Development Management terms this will involve LPAs continuing to manage applications in an ad-hoc fashion through the departure route and in Plan Making terms will involve individual LPA led reviews (typically driven by housing need). Both processes will frequently be underpinned by isolated thinking and lack the input of a strategic vision for the wider network of green space. The outcome of these processes will see a constant chipping away at the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land which will only erode the usefulness of the policies and a popular willingness to accommodate new development.

97. In addition to these strategic issues, the Council wishes to raise a number of more detailed points which are summarised in the table below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Metropolitan Open Land</b>  <b>(G3 8.3.2)</b>	<p>Whilst the Council is keen to build in some flexibility into this policy, introducing the concept of land swaps represents a fundamental departure from previous MOL policies, which have previously explicitly mandated against such an approach. Whilst in very exceptional circumstances a land swap may give rise to a better configuration of open space, and therefore strengthen its MOL status, we suspect that its application to this end will likely be very limited, and instead this approach will likely be favoured to serve other (non-open space) policy objectives. We would not support its use to achieve the later.</p> <p>Introducing the concept of land swaps might therefore represent a step too far. Should reference to it remain however, we would request that</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>the text be amended to explain that any such swaps will need to be contingent on them strengthening the MOL status of the open space network, and that this goal should form the only driver for undertaking such swaps. The location of the existing space is also fundamental to consideration of such swaps, as the location itself might in fact be the critical factor determining its MOL status (for example if it forms a break in the urban form which defines the character of the area or serves an established catchment), and a land swap might therefore jeopardise this and would therefore be best avoided. Such changes must therefore also be plan led.</p>
<p><b>Local Green and Open Space</b> <b>(G4)</b></p>	<p>It is assumed that this policy would apply to green and open spaces designated through local policy and ‘Local Green Space’ as defined through the NPPF (paragraph 77), although it would be useful to clarify this.</p>
<p><b>Urban Greening</b> <b>(G5)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy, although it would benefit from additional advice (perhaps in an SPG) outlining its application in practice. Should an appropriate place be found for such advice, we would also recommend that some of the supporting text be transferred over to this, as the level of detail here would sit better in an SPG than in the policy itself.</p> <p>Further information, for example, is needed to explain how a vertical measure (e.g. green walls) should apply to a horizontal calculation (site area). In theory projects incorporating green walls could score more than 1 because the surface area of the building facades could be larger than the development footprint.</p> <p>Although the policy encourages boroughs to assess the proposal against the target levels, it may also be useful where appropriate to score the baseline position, and then consider the proposed position against the existing situation to establish if it represents an improvement.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity and Access to Nature</b> <b>(G6)</b></p>	<p>Clause B of this policy essentially comprises directive policies for LPAs when preparing their Development Plans. Whilst these are supported, where such policies are absent awaiting their preparation, a policy vacuum will exist in the interim.</p> <p>This could be addressed through rewording the policy to make it clear that certain aspects of this policy apply now when considering</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	development proposals.
<b>Geodiversity</b> <b>(G9 8.9.2)</b>	It should read 'Sites of Special Scientific Interest' not 'importance'.
<b>Geodiversity</b> <b>(G9 Figure 8.1)</b>	<p>The status of the identified sites is unclear from the naming in the key. Specifically it is unclear what the distinction is between 'Recommended RIGS', 'Proposed RIGS' and 'Potential RIGS'. One site 'Horsenden Hill' is identified within Ealing (13), as a 'Proposed RIGS'. This status appears to differ from that recorded in the London Foundations SPG where it is recorded as a 'Recommended RIGS'. Moreover it should be noted this site was identified as a RIGS as part of our adopted Core Strategy in December 2013.</p> <p>The reference numbering is curious as it does not reflect the number found in the London Foundations SPG (2012).</p>

## **CHAPTER 9: SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE**

98. The Council's comments are divided into three parts and deal with policies on energy, waste and other policies in turn.

### **(a) Policies on Energy**

99. The Council strongly supports the emerging policies on energy and our comments are primarily designed to improve clarity and understanding and improve their utility in DM. Specific comments on Policies SI2 to SI4 are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> <b>(SI2)</b>	Whilst the policy as a whole is supported, it would be useful to clarify whether in the case of mixed developments, the 35% on site target needs to be satisfied as an average for the whole development (potentially with an element of the development not meeting the target), or whether the target needs to be satisfied separately by each element. In this regard clarity is also sought in respect of the carbon offsetting requirement.
<b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b>	Based on the current wording of the policy and its current application to residential uses it is assumed that the minimum on site 35% CO2



Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>(SI2 A &amp; B)</b>	<p>emission reduction will be calculated based on the regulated energy only.</p> <p>However, the supporting text (Para 9.2.10) advises that emissions from operations should be measured and reported too. How is this expected to be demonstrated in the energy statement and what measures should be proposed in order to reduce the use of unregulated energy?</p> <p>In most major schemes, the applicants claim that identifying measures for reducing the unregulated energy is beyond their control since it falls on the occupiers and their behaviour. Further clarity should be provided.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> <b>(SI2 B, 9.2.9 &amp; 9.2.10 (L))</b></p>	<p>The policy and supporting text refer to the need to undertake monitoring to measure the operational performance of new developments. Whilst the Council supports such monitoring and recognises the value of doing this in establishing an evidence base on the actual energy performance of buildings, it perhaps is not the best measure of the effectiveness of the policy itself. Moreover, it is unclear how this data will be used and what actions should be taken by LPAs in the event that the predicted energy performance is significantly different from the actual performance. Further guidance should be provided in how the GLA envisages this policy to be enforced.</p> <p>Prior to requiring measurement and report of the operational performance, an additional measure perhaps would be to monitor the output of any renewable/low carbon energy generation secured through the development, in order to verify whether the predicted energy output estimated/modelled as part of the energy assessment are accurate or not, and therefore this will allow us to verify with certainty compliance with the energy policies. As well as providing a means by which to check if the installations are generating as much energy as expected, it might also assist in identifying any technical issues with the equipment or installation as well as it may assist with providing a better understanding of the cost to occupants as proposed under Para 9.2.10 (L).</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> <b>(SI2 A)</b></p>	<p>In respect of renewables, given the increased popularity of using heat pumps in recent years, it would be useful to define, either in this document or in the energy statement guidance, the technologies considered by the GLA to qualify as renewables. There is a debate, for</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>example, on actually how renewable Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) are, due to the electricity consumed by the pump.</p> <p>Under BREEAM for example ASHPs are considered as renewable only when they operate in heating mode. In addition based on data from the Energy Saving Trust, ASHPs do not achieve higher than 250% seasonal efficiency, whilst the majority of applicants typically assume higher efficiencies for ASHPs.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> (SI2 C)</p>	<p>The introduction of separate energy efficiency targets within the policy is noted, although these could be expressed differently. In particular, the wording could be strengthened by removing the text ‘aim’.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> (SI2 C)</p>	<p>Whilst the Council supports the use of off-site contributions (allowable solutions), it remains unclear how authorities should approach securing such contributions, including how or if these will be captured through legal agreements, how they will be monitored and how this will be enforced as necessary.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> (SI2 9.2.9)</p>	<p>It is recommended that EPCs are also referenced here, in addition to DEC, which will have limited application to public buildings only.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> (SI2 9.2.10)</p>	<p>Whilst reference to the Mayor’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPG is made, Policy 5.3 of the current London Plan has been withdrawn and is not superseded by a replacement policy.</p> <p>Clause 9.2.6 makes reference to BREEAM and in the particular the energy credits that can be achieved under the BREEAM energy category. Most LPAs have policies in their Local Plans that require non-residential developments to meet BREEAM rating of Very Good or Excellent which secure that appropriate credits will be achieved in the energy category. BREEAM also provides the certainty that all sustainable measures are incorporated since they are externally verified.</p> <p>In the past similar requirements also applied to residential schemes in through the Government’s CfSH scheme. Since its withdrawal however, LPAs have not had the power to require that specific sustainability measures are incorporated.</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>Whilst other policies in the London Plan or the Building Regulations still secure some of the measures previously required under the CfSH, the scope is now much narrower.</p> <p>For this reason, we would recommend that the policy seeks the use sustainability statements, which follow the principles in the Mayor’s SDC SPG, particularly for residential developments and mixed use schemes where one of the components does not exceed the threshold for major development or trigger a BREEAM rating.</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases (SI2 9.2.10 (b))</b></p>	<p>Definitions for ‘new-build’, ‘major refurbishment’ and ‘consequential improvement’ should be included. The term ‘refurbishment’ and its definition in building control terms is not widely understood and can be confusing and misleading when applied in a planning context.</p> <p>Our preference would be to avoid using it in a planning document. In a planning context ‘refurbishment’ is likely to be interpreted as fabric improvements only and distinct from change of use or intensification (e.g. subdivision) applications, and such refurbishment works by themselves will not require planning permission or trigger this policy.</p> <p>As it stands the use of this term causes confusion for officers and applicants. It would be better to use the terms ‘New-build’, ‘Change of use’, ‘Conversions’ (i.e. intensification/subdivision), and ‘major extensions’, as such terms are well established and understood in a planning context?</p> <p>Also there have been many cases recently in Ealing where developers propose the installation of major modular buildings for a number of years. Whilst we acknowledge the Building Regulations restrictions for this type of buildings, will policy SI2 apply?</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases (SI2 9.2.10 (i))</b></p>	<p>One of the requirements that applicants have to present in the energy statement is to demonstrate how the site will be future proofed to achieve zero carbon onsite by 2050.</p> <p>Is this requirement targeted at strategic developments only with longer build outs or is also designed to apply to schemes with shorter completion dates? Does it apply to outline applications, full planning applications or both? It should be better defined.</p> <p>In Ealing, for outline schemes, we always apply an energy condition</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>which requires reserved matters applications to meet the policies/standards current at the time of their submission. In this way, we future proof schemes to meet and be built under the updated London Plan and Local Plan energy and carbon policies. Could something similar be added in the supporting text of the London Plan?</p>
<p><b>Minimising Greenhouse Gases</b> <b>(SI2 9.2.10 (k))</b></p>	<p>With regard to the requirement for energy strategies to include proposals for minimising the embodied energy in construction, how does the GLA envisage that such proposals will be presented and quantified? Such measures fall outside of the scope of the Building Regulations and the regulated energy. In addition will this mean that the GLA will accept emission savings derived directly from fabric with low embodied energy as contributing to the main 35% CO2 emissions reduction target?</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3)</b></p>	<p>Whilst this policy is supported, in respect of its implementation, as the LPA will likely be most familiar with the latest progress on establishing networks in its area, we would welcome early dialogue with the GLA officers in advance of any comments being issued, so that the latest information can be shared with all parties and to ensure consistency in the advice issued by both the LPA and the GLA.</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 A)</b></p>	<p>How are 'large-scale development proposals' defined?</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 A)</b></p>	<p>This policy requirement may require the intervention of the GLA to drive it forward as from experience it can be very challenging for the LPAs to bring developers together to agree on large scale heat networks. Persuading developers to look beyond their own site can be difficult. Further guidance on how this can be delivered should be included.</p> <p>The establishment of a developers' forum for each Opportunity Area, Town Centres, other growth areas or clusters of significant new development should be required by the GLA. The requirement for a forum can assist with the development of large scale heat networks. It also save considerable officer in attempting to co-ordinate such dialogue and will assist us in understanding better the constraints/barriers to implementation.</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 B)</b></p>	<p>Again as above how are 'large-scale development proposals' defined?</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 B &amp; C &amp; 9.3.11)</b></p>	<p>Introducing the requirement for a developers' forum in the policy, with the involvement of the GLA and LPA, should assist in creating some common ground amongst developers.</p> <p>In addition, the responsibility for developing energy masterplans should be placed on the developers, and this should be clearly stated within the policy. The requirement for a developers' forum will also assist with the development of energy masterplans as these will be required to present compliance with the policies.</p> <p>In this way developers are encouraged/compelled to engage from an early stage whilst also potentially benefitting them through sharing costs for appointing individual energy experts and GLA and LPAs costs on officers' time, procurement etc. This will also assist with identifying potential necessary energy infrastructure requirements including upgrades to existing infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 B)</b></p>	<p>The findings from energy masterplans should be uploaded to the London Heat Map. An appropriate condition can be applied in planning applications to require developers to upload data in the London Heat Map.</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 D.1.d)</b></p>	<p>Fuel cells are not a mature technology. How will emission savings be measured and quantified in line with policy SI2?</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 D.1.f)</b></p>	<p>A definition should be provided if individual gas boilers are proposed here. In addition it might also be useful to set a threshold for what size of developments this option would be appropriate for.</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 D.2)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy. However, additional guidance on what information the applicant is expected to submit as part of the proposals should be outlined (perhaps in separate guidance document).</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 D.3)</b></p>	<p>How does the GLA plan to require developers to future proof their developments? Most developers in areas which have been identified as having potential for area wide networks typically still propose their own onsite solution even though they also future proof their</p>

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>developments.</p> <p>However, technologies proposed have a life span of 15 years or more which carries risks in terms of the actual delivery of the area wide network. It would be better if this policy was worded ‘should be designed for connection at later stage in the form of an interim solution’.</p>
<p><b>Energy Infrastructure</b> <b>(SI3 9.3.8)</b></p>	<p>This paragraph should also advise that grid electric proposals will not be supported.</p>
<p><b>Managing Heat Risk</b> <b>(SI4, 9.4.5)</b></p>	<p>The supporting text should be amended to say that the CIBSE methodology shall be employed for all major development proposals in line with proposed definitions in policy SI2, and specifically for non-residential to residential change of use proposals. The text should be expanded to explain those categories of developments which will trigger the need to assess the risk of overheating.</p>

**(b) Policies on Waste**

100. Similar to our concerns raised above in relation to the new housing supply targets, the revised waste apportionment targets are simply not deliverable for the London Borough of Ealing. The GLA’s approach to assigning the apportionment is flawed, informed by (and its delivery contingent on) opportunities which now sit beyond the LPA’s control. This follows the transfer of planning powers from Park Royal to the OPDC.

Overview

101. The Council have reviewed the new apportionment targets in Table 9.2 and notes that these represent a significant uplift on the current apportionment figures in the current Consolidated London Plan (2016). A comparison of the figures for 2021 illustrate the significance of this change, with the revised figure increasing to 543,000 tonnes from 291,000 in the current London Plan (an 86% increase). This uplift has also been evident across west London with the West London Waste Authority area experiencing a 62% increase. In the context of other significant policy changes for Ealing and the wider west London sub region, this presents a very significant challenge.

102. At present the apportioned need identified through the current London Plan is satisfied through the Joint West London Waste Plan which Ealing Council is party to. The Joint West London Waste Plan was prepared in accordance with the apportionment figures contained in the 2011 London Plan,

although at the time of examination regard was also had to the revised figures in the emerging FALP (2015). Significantly these targets were adjusted downwards.

103. Whilst some contingency therefore exists in the plan relative to the current London Plan apportionments, against the new and significantly higher targets it is probable that insufficient sites are now either allocated or safeguarded. This means that there will be a need to revisit the plan and to identify and allocate new potential sites.

104. Whilst previously the West London authorities have chosen to pool their apportionments and respond jointly, how this will be approached in relation to future plan making has yet to be discussed or determined at the sub-region level.

105. We should also point out that Ealing Council would be opposed to any revisions to Policy S18 which make it a mandatory requirement on LPAs to pool their apportionments. Whilst it is accepted that this may be an appropriate model in many circumstances, it is neither necessary nor appropriate for the Mayor to dictate such working arrangements.

106. The apportionment methodology has already sought to reassign projected need to those authorities considered to have greater capacity. To then direct how individual LPAs should meet this collectively is a step too far.

#### Application of the apportionment methodology

107. Despite raising concerns during the earlier consultation on the revised apportionment methodology in Spring 2017, the apportionments have been determined based on the administrative boundaries of the Boroughs and not the amended boundaries of the LPAs. This makes no sense at all.

108. As we understand it the apportionment methodology essentially seeks to re-assign the projected arising figures based on a Borough's suitability and capacity to accommodate waste facilities. The revised methodology scores the performance of a borough against seven criteria, with these scores representing a relative suitability index. Whilst many of the revisions to the methodology recommended by the consultants undertaking the review (LUC and SLR) represent an improvement on the 2007 methodology, some further refinement would be beneficial and commentary on these more detailed matters is covered below. Notwithstanding the overall improvement to the methodology Ealing has fundamental concerns with the geographical application of this methodology.

109. Specifically, the decision to determine the apportionments based on the administrative boundaries of the borough as opposed to the boundaries of the LPAs is fundamentally flawed. This is of particular significance to Ealing Council, as the planning powers for part of the borough (Park Royal) transferred to the OPDC in April 2015. Despite this change in planning responsibilities, the land now falling within the OPDCs jurisdiction continues to determine Ealing's suitability index.

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

110. Of particular significance is Criterion 1 which is designed to allocate a greater apportionment to those Boroughs which are considered to have greater capacity to accommodate additional waste management capacity and facilities, based on the provision of existing facilities and the extent of land in those Boroughs which are potentially suitable for accommodating waste management facilities. The latter is probably the single most significant factor, and potential future capacity is determined based on how much land in the Borough could currently be categorised as falling within a core industrial type use (with a small adjustment made to account for any planned release). These areas (defined as 'suitable industrial land') are mapped in the evidence base report, and whilst we have been unable to access the layers to quantify the extent of these areas, it is evident that a significant proportion of this land within the borough is located within Park Royal.

111. Based on designated industrial land (SIL & LSIS), Park Royal comprises the borough's largest single concentration of employment land accounting for 43% of Ealing's supply of designated land. Whilst the criteria are weighted equally, this measure also factors in a number of the other criteria too where it is combined with other data sets but forms the denominator (namely Criteria 5 and 7).

112. Moreover, Policy S18 emphasises the importance of focusing on existing industrial areas when identifying sites and suitable locations to accommodate waste facilities.

113. Although the implications of this decision disproportionately impact on the above mentioned criteria, the other criteria are also assessed having regard to the full extent of the Borough including Park Royal. These results are also flawed too. For example, Criterion 3 seeks to assign a higher apportionment value to Boroughs with the ability to transport waste via sustainable modes of transport utilising the number of railheads and wharves as a measure. Within Ealing a significant number of these railheads are located within Park Royal.

114. Assessing our capacity by factoring in land in Park Royal is clearly flawed as it puts the LPA in an impossible position. Our ability to plan for this apportionment through utilising a significant area of this land to accommodate future waste facilities now no longer exists following the transfer of plan making powers to the OPDC. The ability to utilise this capacity and to allocate new waste sites in this area now resides solely with the OPDC. To assign (through the apportionment) this responsibility to Ealing is clearly neither justifiable nor deliverable.

115. The implications of this are not unique to Ealing, potentially affecting other neighbouring boroughs too. For the apportionment model to work effectively it is key that all LPAs with potentially suitable land capacity take a share of the demand and accordingly we reiterate our position that the Mayoral Development Corporations should be given their own apportionment.

116. Whilst the earlier consultation report notes our previous representations on these crucial points, it merely advises that the GLA have confirmed that they are not currently planning to allocate an apportionment to the MDC and yet no further explanation has been given for this decision.

117. Although this justification is missing from the report we are aware that one of the reasons cited for not assigning an apportionment to the MDCs is that, unlike other established areas, it is difficult



to arrive at an arising figure for the planned area, and that it would be overly complex to disaggregate the OPDC from the rest of the Borough areas in terms of datasets. Moreover, the OPDC area covers multiple boroughs and more than one waste authority.

118. Ealing Council does not accept this reasoning and extensive evidence has been prepared to support the emerging Local Plan for the OPDC which provides a reasonable measure of future demographics for the area. With regard to the fact that the OPDC covers multiple authorities and waste authorities whilst it will be more complicated to disaggregate the data it would nonetheless still be possible.

119. Much of the apportionment exercise relies solely on existing mapped GIS data collated at a pan London level, rather than a Borough level and therefore it is no more challenging to run it for the MDCs than it is for any other LPAs. Furthermore, such concerns about the ability to disaggregate datasets have not materialised in relation to other key policy areas. The draft London Plan recognises that the OPDC is a separate entity and separate targets for MDCs have been established, for example, in relation to housing and the management of industrial land.

120. It is noted that in the absence of assigning the MDCs their own share of the apportionment, the supporting text at Paragraph 9.8.7 advises that: 'Mayoral Development Corporation should cooperate with Boroughs to ensure that the boroughs' apportionment requirements are met'. Whilst we support the spirit of this statement, in practice its effect will be limited as it compels them to do very little, and it will not secure proper accountability. By itself this text is wholly inadequate and does not represent an acceptable alternative to assigning the MDCs their own apportionment.

121. Notwithstanding our in principle objection to the lack of separate apportionments for the MDCs, the text here would benefit from some revisions. As currently framed it is not entirely clear that the reference to 'boroughs' here is to the host boroughs, nor does it adequately emphasise that the onus is placed on the MDCs to work with the boroughs as it should be. In this regard the text of the current London Plan is preferable which states: 'Where a Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) exists or is established within a Borough the MDC will co-operate with the Borough to ensure that the Borough's apportionment requirements are met.'

122. Despite the apportionments being assigned to the Boroughs, Policy S18 correctly identifies Development Plans as being the appropriate tool available to the Boroughs to meet the apportionments. To the extent that we have control over plan making in the borough, this is appropriate and the policy is deliverable and therefore effective. However, planning powers for Park Royal, including plan making, have now transferred to the OPDC. The OPDC are currently preparing a local plan for their area.

123. Whilst Ealing has sought to positively engage with the OPDC in the preparation of this plan, ultimately it is not our plan. In respect of waste specifically Ealing Council have already submitted representations on this emerging local plan, noting concerns with their proposed policy (EU6), as this only safeguards those sites already identified within the West London Waste Plan. But no additional

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

provision has been made by the OPDC to respond to a scenario where apportionments increase as is now the case.

124. Given that this OPDC's local plan is now progressing at a fairly rapid pace and will likely be adopted ahead of the new London Plan, Ealing Council are not confident that a single sentence in Paragraph 9.8.7 will sufficiently compel them to revisit their role and responsibility in meeting the raised apportionments (which is an important one given the supply of potentially suitable land in their area).

125. It should also be pointed out that the independent Inspector (Mr A Thickett) examining the Further Alterations to the London Plan in 2014, advised in his report that:

*'I have some sympathy with those Boroughs which may, because of the designation of a Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC), lose their planning functions in parts of their areas. It cannot be right, in my view, that in such cases, the responsibility for meeting the apportionment should fall wholly on the Borough.'*

126. In response the Mayor of London inserted a new sentence in the current London Plan (Paragraph 5.80), although as illustrated above this has not been effective in persuading or compelling the OPDC to do much more than just adopting the WLWA allocations. Those Boroughs hosting the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) have also raised similar concerns.

127. In summary, the effective delivery of Policy SI8B is absolutely contingent on correctly assigning the apportionment to those LPAs with the capacity and capability to identify and allocate sites and areas for waste management facilities and accordingly this matter needs to be urgently resolved if the policy is to be sound.

128. Specific comments on Policies SI8 to SI9 are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Waste Capacity and Net Waste Self-Sufficiency</b>  <b>(SI8 Table 9.2)</b>	<u>Apportionment Methodology</u>  One of the main datasets informing the apportionment calculations is the amount of industrial land in each borough deriving from the 2015 Industrial Land and Economy Study. This was considered to be the best available data to approximate potential land for waste uses. Whilst it is accepted that it should provide a good starting point, there are issues with the reliability of this data.  The authors (Aecom) of this study shared with us the baseline data, and we were asked to verify this. Unfortunately we were expected to turn this around in 2 weeks, which for a borough with a geographically large baseline (567ha), was inadequate. Given the limited time available to

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>complete this exercise, we therefore had to be selective in making updates.</p> <p>Fortunately in the case of Park Royal we were able to refer the consultants to the recently published Park Royal Atlas which contained an up to date and fine grained audit of the area. For other areas however the data and particularly the categorisation of uses in the baseline was much less fine grained and therefore less reliable.</p> <p>Where better info existed locally (as was the case with Park Royal) it was evident that the original categorisation of land against the industrial categories had been done fairly crudely. For example, uses in multiple ownership and covering multiple activities have been lumped into a single industrial use category, despite comprising a broader range of uses.</p> <p>This has presented a particular issue in this instance as only land categorised as ‘core industrial uses’ factor in the apportionment calculation, and yet it is probable that some of this land is in fact in a non-core industrial use (‘wider industrial use’).</p> <p>The implication of this is that figures (with the exception of the Park Royal areas) may have overestimated the amount of land deemed to be suitable. The relevant authorities should have the opportunity to verify this data.</p> <p>Simply determining capacity based on the amount of ‘suitable industrial land’ is also problematic, as not all industrial land is equal. This measure should have also been informed by other factors including the likely availability of this land and the probability of sites coming forward having regard to levels of vacancy, land value, demand from competing industrial uses, and competing demand from higher value non-industrial uses such as housing.</p> <p>Significant evidence of this now exists as part of the London Industrial Land Demand Report, which supplements Aecoms Supply Study. This raises a number of significant points which are highly pertinent to this matter.</p> <p>For West London and Ealing in particular relative to other outer London areas, vacancy levels are typically lower, land values higher, and demand for certain industrial sectors are increasing. With regard to the</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>later, for Ealing in particular this growing need is now reflected through its new industrial land management categorisation of ‘Provide capacity’. LUC’s consultation report also highlighted the significance of the SHLAA data in the estimation of potential industrial sites, as the SHLAA may identify industrial sites lost to housing. Whilst the SHLAA data has not informed the apportionment exercise, a worrying trend is evident when analysing the headline data for this alongside the revised apportionment figures, which is that Ealing and West London in particular are being required to absorb a significant uplift in housing, employment uses and waste.</p> <p>The notion that Ealing is awash with surplus and affordable sites for waste management relative to other boroughs uses is simply not true.</p> <p>The consultation report itself recognises that the approach to utilising this data represented a ‘blunt approach’, but importantly it recommended that once better data becomes available, the apportionment model should be updated. This update in our view should happen now.</p>
<p><b>Waste Capacity and Net Waste Self-Sufficiency</b> (S18 B 3))</p>	<p>The reference in S18B3) to identifying suitable locations for accommodating waste management facilities is welcome, and alongside site specific allocations it should provide a responsive framework for directing waste management activities to the most appropriate locations.</p>
<p><b>Waste Capacity and Net Waste Self-Sufficiency</b> (S18 D 4))</p>	<p>Whilst it might be appropriate and necessary to enclose a facility, enclosure alone may not by itself adequately address the amenity impacts.</p>
<p><b>Safeguarded Waste Sites</b> (S19)</p>	<p>The wording of this policy and supporting text is confusing. In particular it is not always clear whether the text relates to the plan making process, the development management process or both. The approach in any event should be consistent between the two processes although this perhaps needs to be clearer.</p> <p>The first sentence of S19C is potentially inconsistent with S19A, in that ‘C’ advises that waste plans should be adopted before considering the loss of a waste site, which implies that existing waste sites are not safeguarded until they are formally identified and safeguarded through</p>

## Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>an adopted plan. Surely existing waste sites should be safeguarded regardless of whether a waste plan is adopted or not, and the only exception to this should be where an adopted plan has identified them for release.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.9.2 of the supporting text advises that any waste site release should be part of a plan-led process, rather than on an ad-hoc basis, but our reading of the policy text itself and paragraph 9.9.3 is that it may be possible to consider release, subject where necessary to compensatory provision, through the development management process. This position is not entirely clear from the current wording however.</p>

### (c) Other Policies

129. Specific comments on other policies in Chapter 9 are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Improving Air Quality</b> (SI1)	The Council supports this policy and measures to improve air quality.
<b>Improving Air Quality</b> (SI1 A 5)	The need for an Air Quality Assessment should not solely be determined based on whether the proposal represents an improvement beyond the existing or previous use, as even with such improvements the development might still exceed certain standards.
<b>Digital Connectivity Infrastructure</b> (SI6)	The Council supports this new policy.
<b>Aggregates</b> (SI10 9.10.5)	The text references 'preferred industrial locations' although the associated industrial land policies no longer use such categorisation.
<b>Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)</b> (SI11)	The Council supports this new policy.

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Water Transport</b> <b>(SI15 C)</b>	The text here should promote the use of all waterways for transporting freight, and not just rivers. For example, the canal network could also support this activity.

## **CHAPTER 10: TRANSPORT**

130. Specific comments are summarised below:

Policy/Para	Comment
<b>Strategic Approach to Transport</b> <b>(T1 A)</b>	<p>The Council supports the target of 80% of all trips in London being made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041 and this is consistent with the broad aims of Ealing’s current Development Plan.</p> <p>The Council also broadly supports the proposed indicative list of transport schemes in Table 10.1.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the proposed extensions to the London Overground, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The West London Orbital Rail (as illustrated on Figure 2.1) subject to satisfactory mitigation measures being provided in Acton to maintain local connectivity across the railway, especially for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• The Brentford-Southall rail link should also be added (also illustrated on Figure 2.1).</li> </ul> <p>Devolved Suburban rail services should include the Greenford Branch Line.</p> <p>However, we consider that the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) would also need to include Outer London to improve air quality, reduce reliance on the car and to prevent displacement of vehicles subject to the charge onto the borough’s highways.</p> <p>We also strongly believe that the proposed access improvements to Heathrow Airport should not be dependent on airport expansion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council considers the London Wide Cycle Network Development will be critical in achieving the Mayor’s 80% target. However, the Council would like a commitment that we would be included and it is noted that no indicative plans for new cycle networks</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	are included within Figure 2.1.
<b>Strategic Approach to Transport (T1 B)</b>	The Council supports this policy. All development should encourage the use of sustainable modes by reducing the need to travel. High trip generating uses and high density developments should be located close to existing public transport interchanges and town centres.
<b>Healthy Streets (T2)</b>	<p>The Council support this policy and it aligns with our own Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Regards Para 10.2.3, as a minimum, we consider that by 2041, all Londoners should do at least the 30 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day, in line with the most current guidance from the Chief Medical Officer, rather than the 20 minutes stated.</p>
<b>Transport Capacity, Connectivity and Safe Guarding (T3)</b>	The Council support this policy and it aligns with our own Transport Strategy.
<b>Assessing and Mitigating Transport Impacts (T4)</b>	<p>The Council support this policy and it aligns with our own adopted Sustainable Transport for New Development SPD.</p> <p>Amend 10.4.4 to fully funded proposals by applicants to impact transport, access, capacity or connectivity should be required unless they can demonstrate extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>Adequate transport contributions/mitigations should be required irrespective of any other contributions/mitigations (e.g. social housing, open space etc.).</p> <p>Adequate transport contributions/mitigations should be required irrespective of funding sources whether private or public sector.</p>
<b>Cycling (T5)</b>	<p>The Council supports the increase in cycle provision requirements for one-bedroom units across the borough and the increases for some commercial uses within the Ealing Metropolitan Town Centre and Southall Major Town Centre so that they are aligned with current standards for Inner London.</p> <p>We believe that a case can be made for the inclusion of the entire Borough. But as a minimum we believe that all of Acton (including North Acton) should also be included in the zone where higher</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>minimum cycle parking standards apply.</p> <p>We propose that the policy should be amended to support and permit secure cycle storage facilities (subject to a given maximum size) in the front gardens of dwelling-houses in order to ensure higher take up of cycling in existing developments.</p>
<p><b>Car Parking</b> <b>(T6 G)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports the principles of a car restraint approach to development. Car parking management plans are a useful tool that has been widely used by the Council particularly for developments comprising multiple dwellings and/or uses. This ensures that limited car parking is allocated sensibly and fairly as well as ensuring that there is a mechanism to tackle informal parking in order to preserve the public realm and general amenity.</p> <p>However, it may not be practical for <u>all</u> developments with car parking to submit such a plan and clarity is sought.</p>
<p><b>Residential Parking</b> <b>(T6.1 B)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports the principles set out in the policy, although we would be wary of the legal implications of some of them (such as requiring car parking facilities to be leased rather than sold (even though this is something we have recommended to developers in the past). It is considered that a better mechanism would be that car parking spaces are not sold with a dwelling but are sold separately.</p>
<p><b>Residential Parking</b> <b>(T6.1 C)</b></p>	<p>The policy keeps the current 20% of car parking spaces to have active electric vehicle charging facilities, however, it now requires all remaining spaces to be provided with passive facilities. This is in principle welcomed but further guidance on what would count as passive provision would also be welcomed.</p>
<p><b>Residential Parking</b> <b>(T6.1 G)</b></p>	<p>We also support the provision that disabled parking now includes guidance on how enlarged spaces are to be allocated.</p>
<p><b>Residential Parking</b> <b>Table 10.3</b></p>	<p>The intention that all residential developments in areas of the borough with PTAL 5 or 6 should be car free is supported and is broadly consistent with our current approach.</p> <p>Regardless of PTAL the maximum car parking standards would need to be less than 1.5:1 for all small units in Outer London PTAL 0-1 and it is</p>



Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	not considered that the footnote is sufficiently strong enough. We would propose that this should be amended to a ratio of up to 1:1.
<b>Office Parking</b> <b>(T6.2)</b>	<p>The current London Plan parking standards are between 1 space per 100sqm and 600sqm. The draft plan proposes that in opportunity areas the standard is revised to 1 per 600sqm and for other areas to have up to a level of 1 per 100sqm. The Council is concerned that this would limit our ability to restrain parking in non-opportunity areas.</p> <p>The reference to car parking standards for use classes B2 and B8 in Clause C is welcomed but for better clarity and ease of reference it may be better to have a stand-alone policy dealing with industrial uses.</p> <p>The level of electric vehicle charge-point provision required needs to be clearly clarified for this type of development.</p>
<b>Retail Parking</b> <b>(T6.3)</b>	<p>The Council supports and welcomes the changes in Table 10.5.</p> <p>The level of electric vehicle charge-point provision required needs to be clearly clarified for this type of development.</p>
<b>Hotel and Leisure Uses Parking</b> <b>(T6.4)</b>	<p>More guidance is required for car parking standards for various uses in areas of lower PTAL, particularly for Hotels and Class D uses. Both the current and proposed standards are open to too much interpretation.</p> <p>The level of electric vehicle charge-point provision required needs to be clearly clarified for this type of development.</p>
<b>Non-Residential Disabled Persons Parking</b> <b>(T6.5)</b>	<p>The Council supports this policy.</p>
<b>Freight and Servicing</b> <b>(T7)</b>	<p>The Council supports this much revised and expanded policy. In particular, we support consolidation, modal shift, deliveries off-street and promoting deliveries at different times of the day and night in order to reduce congestion and air quality impacts.</p>
<b>Aviation</b> <b>(T8)</b>	<p>Our comments should be read in conjunction with representations made above in Paras 20-21 in this report.</p> <p>Heathrow Airport provides many Ealing residents with employment, both directly or indirectly, so we welcome the economic benefits and</p>

Representation on Behalf of Ealing Council on The London Plan, December 2017

Policy/Para	Comment
	<p>jobs that expansion could bring. However, there must be a balance between the economic benefits and the very real social and environmental impacts of expansion on people who live and work near the airport.</p> <p>The road network near Heathrow is already heavily congested and includes the busiest section of motorway in the UK on the M25. This results in extremely poor air quality and needs addressing at a cross-boundary level urgently.</p> <p>We intend to hold the government to the full compensation and environmental promises. In addition, we have asked for a £150million package of extra measures from Heathrow Airport, to help reduce the local impact of the third runway as well as a complete ban on night flights, except in emergencies. This includes walking and cycling infrastructure, bus priority measures and the Southall East-west road link.</p> <p>We also call for significant cycle infrastructure to be provided for all local areas around Heathrow particularly to provide safe cycle routes for airport workers.</p> <p>Bus priority infrastructure in the vicinity of the airport also needs to be improved to provide benefits to buses over private cars when accessing Heathrow Airport. This is on top of other strategic improvements, including a new rail link from Waterloo and the extension of HS2 to Heathrow, which we are also seeking. In particular, we agree with the assertion in Para 10.8.8 that it will not be sufficient to rely on schemes designed to cater for background growth such as the Elizabeth Line.</p> <p>In addition, the Council would like assurances that any intensification of commercial flights and associated aviation development at nearby RAF Northolt will be ruled out.</p> <p>The Council also supports Clause J which proposes that new heliports other than for emergency services should be refused and steps taken to reduce helicopters flying over London.</p>
<p><b>Funding Transport Infrastructure Through Planning (T9)</b></p>	<p>The Council supports this policy and, in particular, welcomes efforts to find new and effective ways of funding transport infrastructure.</p>

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

131. Ealing Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft London Plan and to work with the Mayor and his Team to shape its content as it moves towards adoption in 2019 or 2020. Ealing is a pro-active, pro-growth borough that is proud of its record of achievement in delivering regeneration across the borough. We have forged and enjoyed a strong working relationship with the GLA family (including Transport for London and the OPDC) that has helped accelerate opportunities for growth and development. The benefits of this collaboration can be seen in opportunity areas, estate regeneration schemes and other developments in all parts of our borough.

132. We agree with the Mayor that London needs significant new investment if his and our aspirations for growth and development are to be successfully achieved.

133. The draft London Plan seeks to break the mold and requires a step change in approach and we particularly welcome is the new emphasis on ‘good growth’ and on design.

134. We understand and, indeed share, the Mayor’s challenging commitment to deliver more housing, especially more genuinely affordable homes. But any plan-led approach needs to be based on robust evidence and housing supply targets need to be deliverable, particularly with regards the phasing of large sites and the effective delivery of small sites.

135. Ealing Council is ready to continue to play its part and would therefore welcome further opportunities to discuss how the Mayor’s aims and aspirations can be realised and, either through the auspices of West London Alliance or on our own, we would welcome opportunities for further dialogue and discussion before the draft London Plan is submitted for examination in public.

136. Finally, we would make the following additional comments regarding the structure and format of the draft plan and these are summarised in the table below:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Policy Numbering</b>	The use of letter pre-fixes instead of numbering does not assist the reader in navigating through the plan.
<b>Utility of the plan for Development Management purposes</b>	‘The removal of separate ‘plan making’ and ‘development decisions’ sections to policies is welcome as previously this could sometimes have the perverse effect of making the whole strategic purpose of policies seem irrelevant to planning decisions. There are some points where this creeps back into the new plan in policies worded ‘Boroughs should’. These should be revised to ‘Boroughs and development decisions should...’.

This submission was edited and prepared by:

Steve Barton, Strategic Planning Manager, Planning Services, Ealing Council.

Any queries or clarification please contact me at [bartons@ealing.gov.uk](mailto:bartons@ealing.gov.uk)

Contributions from the following Ealing Council officers are gratefully acknowledged:

- John Bowman, Transport
- Sam Cuthbert, Planning Policy
- Renato Messere, Planning Policy
- Russell Roberts, Transport
- Donna Skordili, Energy and Sustainability
  - Gill Tennet, Housing
  - Lisa Watson, Housing
  - Ian Weake, Planning Policy