

How the revisions to the Dickens Yard planning application have or have not met the objections that SEC put forward on 26 June 2008.

1 Mix and public attractiveness. The SPG (para 5.1) calls for a "genuine mixed use development", including leisure, business and community uses. The present proposals are for an overwhelmingly residential development with ground floor retail units.

NO CHANGE

2 Density. The proposals exceed the total floor space in the original SPG (para 5.2) and in Table 3A2 of the London Plan by at least 70%.

NO CHANGE.

3 Town centre context. The plans do not adequately relate to any overall plan for an integrated town centre, despite the statement in the brief (para 3.4) that "co-ordinated development...is key to achieving the town centre vision".

NO CHANGE.

4 Design. The brief and existing policy require heights and massing that are sensitive to the scale of the surroundings, in accordance with 4B10 of the London Plan and UDP Policy 4.1 (ii) (design of appropriate height and scale), with all buildings *up to 8 storeys only* and even then "subject to siting and impact on nearby uses".

NO CHANGE. Height and density remain the same. Changes to blocks A and B are simply rearrangements of the uppermost three floors.

The design fails to respect the style of the rest of the town centre, which is characterised by traditional brick and stone low-rise buildings.

NO CHANGE.

5 Housing. The quantum of housing units exceeds the planning brief by a large and material amount. This has created significant problems in achieving acceptable standards within the space available, even though the blocks are substantially higher than specified.

NO CHANGE. The number of units remain the same at 698. However there has been a change in that there are now more two- and three-bedroom units and fewer single ones.

6 Tenure. CHANGE. Previously there was a 50:50 split between affordable units and those for private sale. In the revised plan, the split is now 70% for private sale and 30% for affordable units which no longer include Key Worker Studio Apartments.

7 Congestion. Entry and exit to all basement parking through a single portal on Longfield Avenue, accessible from both north and south, with uncontrolled right turns at entry for commercial vehicles as well as most cars, will create congestion ... especially Gordon Road and Longfield Road which are designated in the UDP as local – ie residential – roads.

NO CHANGE.

8 Public car parking. The Dickens Yard car park will be the only public car park in the centre of Ealing that is directly accessible from the north. This means that great pressure will be created on the residential road network immediately to the north, which is contrary to UDP policies.
NO CHANGE.

9 Pedestrian Traffic We are concerned that large numbers of new residents throughout the Town Centre will lead to greater pedestrian overcrowding, especially on Springbridge Road, Uxbridge Road, The Broadway and surrounding streets.
NO CHANGE.

10 Socio-economic assessment

Increase in the Residential Population The socio-economic study claims that the predicted 10% increase in the population of Ealing Broadway Ward created by the development would be a major benefit. This fails to recognise that local services are already operating at or in excess of their existing capacity, and 698 new homes with 1,536 people will create further demands on these services.
NO CHANGE

11 Open Space and Recreation facilities The proposals do not satisfy the UDP policy that outdoor recreation is essential for all age groups. There is no on-site provision for children – no on-site nursery, no play equipment or designated external play areas in the residents' terraces on the first floor. Without such facilities young people will find places to play that may be dangerous to them or cause nuisance to others.
NO CHANGE

In relation to this, here is a reminder of English heritage's view:

English Heritage Advice

The assessment of this proposed scheme upon the historic environment, and upon the conservation area, has been made in accordance with national policy guidance, and English Heritage's policies and guidance as set out in 'Conservation Principles.' The major issue is considered to be with regard to skyline, silhouette and impact upon long views. The issue of height was raised at an early stage and has been continually reinforced during discussions with the architect and applicant, however, despite minor alterations, the maximum height remains at 14 stories. The proposed skyline fails to achieve any simplicity of form, instead being jagged and complex. Because of the heights, which are significantly taller than neighbouring buildings, long views within, through, into and out of the conservation area will be impacted. The proposal cannot be considered in keeping with the character or appearance of the conservation area due to the incongruity of scale, form, material and detail.