|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Policy or paragraph  | Agreed change (insertions in bold, deletions *~~in strikethrough italic~~*) | Reason. |
| 4.11  | Amend last two sentences as follows:“Rather, it will be important that developers and others involved in the planning and development process in Central Ealing make full assessments of the impact of development on neighbouring buildings *~~nearby~~* and the local area generally, *~~potential of a particular site~~*with respect for example to the heights, bulk, scale and massing of proposals. *~~Potential~~* Planning applications*~~nts~~* must show that *~~they have taken~~* all such matters have been takeninto account in the preparation of *~~their plans~~* proposals, and detailed *~~character~~* assessments of the impact on local character will need to be submitted in support *~~of planning applications~~*.”  | To remove confusing use of words “potential” and “nearby”, and to correct grammar to clarify meaning.  |
| 4.12  | Third sentence to read: “Other than in the Office Quarter, it is noticeable that with some recent exceptions there is a consistent pattern of up to three storeys on the older and/or secondary retail frontages, and of 4/6 storeys on the more central streets of primary retail.” | Also agreed to revisit after examination, to correct any errors in Map 9 |
| E1  | Delete words *~~“will not be permitted within primary frontages, but”~~* | To remove suggestion that the policy changes existing DM DPD 4B A. |
| 5.1.7 | Amend 2nd sentence to read:“An over-concentration of a particular use occurs when the numbers and size of that type of use begin to dominate a street or area and/or the consequential effects of their operations, including the numbers of people attracted, begins to have a detrimental effect on the local environment and residential amenity.” | To define “over concentration~~”.~~ |
| E3 | Add at end of 2nd sentence:“…to meet the demonstrated need…” | To meet LBE objection.  |
| HBE1 ii) | Delete existing and re-word to read:“In Conservation Areas, be of a scale and design quality which preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Area in conformity with the relevant Conservation Area management plan.” | To clarify aim is to implement existing CA policies  |
| HBE2 i | Delete words at end:*~~“…and not dominate them”~~* | To remove objection to “dominate” |
| HBE2 iv | Amend to read:“…*~~restrict the height of frontages to be consistent with~~* be of a height and scale sympathetic to those opposite or adjacent to the site;” | To be less negative and be consistent with wording of the Arcadia Draft Supplementary Planning Document, June 2012. |
| HBE2 | Move third para from HBE3 to end, ie“Development visible from Walpole Park should observe the need to enhance or preserve the park’s character.” | To be consistent with the general intent of policy HBE2 and avoid linking to any general issue of building heights |
| 5.2.13 | Insert new sentence at end to read:“Walpole Park, which is a Grade II asset on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, requires special protection. Any development visible from the park should respect its character and avoid serious harm to it.”  | To support addition to policy HBE2, and move relevant text from 5.2.19. |
| HBE3 | Delete 2nd para (“*~~Within or adjoining….street level.”)~~* | To accept the less prescriptive wording of proposed revised HBE2(iv)  |
| 5.2.18 | Amend second sentence to read: “As noted in paragraph 5.2.11 above and illustrated in map 9, Central Ealing’s Conservation Areas are characterised by consistently low building heights *~~not exceeding~~*, generally with a maximum of six storeys on street frontages.” In 4th sentence, delete the words: *“*character*~~istics (as described in Section 2 of this Plan)”~~* | To meet LBE objection on accuracy |
| 5.2.19 | Delete 1st sentence, substitute:‘The London Borough of Ealing has identified specific locations as suitable for taller buildings but it will nevertheless seek to ensure that such development does not cause harm to existing heritage assets or their setting. Parts of the office corridor are undergoing redevelopment and the opportunity is being taken to provide larger building footprints and increased floorspace. Nevertheless.......'Move last sentence to end of para 5.2.13 (as above) | To meet LBE objection |
| CC1 | 1st sentence to read:‘As provided in Policy E3, major or strategic development will be expected to allow space for social infrastructure according to demonstrated need.’ | To meet LBE objection |
| CC2 | Last paragraph to read:“Loss of space used or allocated for community or cultural purposes *~~will only be supported~~* should be avoided except where *~~an equivalent~~* replacement or alternative provision is made.”  | To recognise that strict equivalence cannot be enforced. |
| CC3 | Last paragraph to be re-worded to read:*~~“Applications for new development or change of use will be~~ ~~carefully considered to ensure the number and nature of~~* Other uses within the Quarter including A4 & A5 *~~food and drink outlets~~, ~~licensed drinking establishments~~* and amusement arcades should enhance its cultural character and focus and avoid *~~remain subsidiary to the main cultural activities of the quarter~~ ~~and do~~ ~~not result in the~~* excessive concentrations of uses such as takeaway food restaurants which would damage amenity.  | To clarify, and meet LBE objection |
| CENP 2 | Delete 3rd sentence of 1st para, as follows:*~~Any new structures should be set back 6.6m from the Haven Green boundary and limited to no more than a single storey height.~~* | To bring into line with revised Policy HBE4 ii, and to remove potentially over-prescriptive provision. *[Note: LBE still objects to the principles of this policy.]* |