

LBR Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Page	Para./ Policy/ Section	Summary of Representation	Change Sought	LBR Response	Modifications
R00001/01	Roman Sudak	-	-	*Soundness? Yes *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes	no change sought	Noted.	
R00002/01	Simon lang	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Any further development in South Woodford would add to the already overstretched services and the inadequate transport infrastructure, particularly traffic which is already oversaturated at peak times. *Soundness Improvements? Expand housing in areas with the infrastructure to cope e.g. Ilford. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). A far higher proportion of housing growth in the borough is projected in Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor than South Woodford.	No further change required.
R00004/01	Jennifer Gaughan	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? Don't know *Soundness Comments? South Woodford is already too crowded	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00002/01.	No further change required.
R00005/01	Bill Hobort	-	-	Schools cannot cope and the catchment areas will shrink as a result and mean residents on the outskirts of the area will need to go further out. The character of the area will change for the worse, including the skyline and faces of the roads. South Woodf	No change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00006/01	Andrew MacRae, Bealonians FC	-	-	*Soundness? Don't know *Legally Compliant? Don't know	No change sought	Noted.	No further change required
R00007/01	Meral Boztas Arpaci	-	-	*Soundness? Don't know	No comment	Noted.	No further change required
R00011/01	Susan Beard, The Prince's Trust	154	Site 114	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? You have plans to build on Eaton Court plan 114 without due consideration of the residents and impact on the local area which is already at saturation point as far as traffic and demand on the local facilities are concerned. My daughter lives in Eaton Court and I fail to see where any additional parking would be provided in the underground parking area which allocates one space per flat. The noise and intrusion of the peresent residents is totally unjustified many of whom are night workers as these flats are designated for key workers.ill concieved, thoughtless,greedy planning trying to squeeze in extra housing. These existing flats are already rabbit hutch size and to add more is immoral. *Soundness Improvements? Leave the Eaton Court plan out of your thinking. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	Comment, no change sought	Planning Consent has already been granted for six additional units at Eaton Court (application number 2487/15). This would be the case irrespective of whether the site is included within the 2015-2030 plan; but is included for the purposes of calculating the number of new housing units that will be completed from 2015-2020. The decision notice requires the developers to submit a car parking management plan; full details of this may be found via the council website.	No further change required
R00012/01	Neil Pickering	-	-	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Housing development population forecasts *Soundness Improvements? rethink policy on residential planning *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes	No change sought	The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan	No further change required

R00014/01	James Foley	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It is outrageous anyone can support building on Oakfield site Do not build on Oakfield! Use all the possible brown field sites.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Building on greenbelt land.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Do not build on Oakfield.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.	No further change required
R00016/01	Caoimhe O'Reilly	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35, Site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? New houses should not go over facilities to keep people fit and healthy. Active lifestyles are essential to good health for years to come. The planning does not consider the risks of this properly. New houses may be needed but they should not put the health and wellbeing of others at risk.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Build on land that is not essential for commun wellbeing. Local authorities also have a responsibly towards public health</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Implied comment regarding Oakfield	Policy LP35 requires the re-provision of playing pitches and facilities from Oakfield to a suitable alternative location within the borough before any redevelopment of the site	No further change required
R00017/01	Ross Anthony Theatres Trust	56	Policies LP10, LP17	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The Theatres Trust finds Policy LP17 sound in that it reflects guidance provided in para. 70 of the NPPF in refation to the safeguarding of cultural facilities. New facilities are also encouraged in both LP17 and LP 10.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	No change sought	Support noted.	No further change required.
R00018/01	AMJAD FARHAT	58	Policy LP11	<p>*Soundness? Don't know</p> <p>I am more concerned about the "(litter)" which gets disposed on sidewalks with ample amount of "(take away shops)" which have sprung in Ilford. The "(litter)" is an endemic problem with "(food stains, chewing gums)" blighting sidewalks and never gets cleaned. Proposing this new scheme/project and financial resources will only exacerbate the problem of "(cleanliness)" once this grandiose town planning implementation is completed. With town planning comes the responsibility of cleanliness which Ilford is not anymore.</p> <p>Ilford lane had new sidewalks initiated in recent years and go and have look how dirty/filthy the sidewalks are mostly due food stains and food garbage disposed on the sidewalks. This also implies to "(public beddings)" where litter never gets picked up. Further town planning's to rejuvenate is fine only if cleanliness as mentioned above is simultaneously catered for.</p> <p>Don't know</p> <p>My concerns have already been elaborated on the previous page.</p> <p>Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	Policy LP11 resists the proliferation and concentration of certain types of use, including fast food takeaways (use class A5), by restricting their overall numbers (to 5% of units along a Primary or Secondary frontage), and their proximity (no more than one A5 unit to be located within a 50m radius of an existing A5 unit) to other fast food takeaways.	No further change required.

R00019/01	juliette Williams edgeC	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No Plan is flawed because it focus on reactive instead of proactive planning. Building homes for uncontrolled immigration is at the expense of tax payers and causes unnecessary over crowding on Proposed local plan should address any existing overcrowding areas regarding schools and housing. Local Plans should not be designed to reflect future expectations of population due to overspill from other London Boroughs or what the local council do not measure regarding population flow</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Unnecessary to build on green spaces</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Residents should be consulted earlier in process of town planning to review and discuss with MP</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? Notified of local plan through online news article means taxpayers not kept in loop of changes</p>	More school places, preserve green spaces, resist expectation to accommodate overspill from other boroughs	<p>The Council has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). In particular the Council is not in a position to determine national policy.</p> <p>The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.</p>	No further change required
R00021/01	doug harrison	163	Appendix 2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I do appreciate the enormous amount of work that has gone into preparing the local plan and I have the following observations. Although there is much definition on the number of increased homes required, there is no definition on the increase in health and care infrastructure--these are defined as TBC and critical on page 163. Where are these facilities going to be and what is being done about increased hospital and doctor facilities.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructured Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00021/02	doug harrison	86	Policy LP22	<p>There is no definition on what road infrastructure requirements are required--these I believe need to be planned now to avoid traffic congestion and associated vehicle emissions. I cannot see any provision for incentives for people to use electric vehicles. I also cannot see any provision for additional police stations and additional police resources. Evaluate the issues raised in comments made and develop plans to address as part of the Local Plan. Add priorities to each of the proposed actions within the plan to effectively ensure that plans are funded on a priority basis.</p> <p>Don't know I am not a lawyer so cannot comment</p> <p>Don't know I am not a lawyer so cannot comment.</p>	need clarity on road improvements and EV infrastructure; no plans for police stations / resources	Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. The London Plan forms part of the Development Plan and includes standards for electrical vehicle charging points. The Metropolitan Police have not raised a need for new police stations in the borough.	
R00022/01	sarah marks chadwell heath academy	-	-	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00023/01	T Levine	121	Para 6.1.5, 6.1.6	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? paras 6.1.5 and 6.1.6 assert that the proposal to reduce Green Belt Land has adequately considered the intended permanence of green belt boundaries, and that the identified shortage of housing demonstrates "exceptional circumstances" to justify a review and adjustment of the borough's Green Belt boundaries. This is not exception - indeed, it is the opposite of exception, and is the very reason green belt designations were created - to prevent encroachment of urban development.</p> <p>It would certainly be easier and financially attractive for the Council to use this land for development, rather than finding alternative housing proposals, but these are not relevant factors, and as such it would not be legal to undertake such a development.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.	No further change required.
R00023/02	T Levine	32	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>*Soundness Improvements? This is not a matter of policy - the NPPF is correct as written, as are the green belt laws - the Local Plan should simply not be promoting development on Green Belt Land.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? The proposals to develop green belt land do not meet the required criteria of "exceptional circumstances" to justify a review and adjustment of the borough's Green Belt boundaries</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? The Plan should not contain proposals to develop Green Belt Land as they are justified simply on the basis of a shortage of housing</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R01085/04	No further change required
R00028/01	Cate Jolley	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It makes no sense to build housing without local infrastructure to support it, particularly school, green play spaces, doctors, parking etc. You need to ensure the amount of housing built is proportionate to the amount of supporting facilities</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Build houses in proportion to local facilities	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required

R00034/01	peter williams	61	Policy LP14	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It is not sound because it fails to adapt London's Live/work unit policy yet allows hard working residents to pay for this service and then decline planning applications frankly, the current situation is untrustworthy, deceitful and fraudulent. Is not sound because it is deceitful to resident by failing to have a clear written policy on Live/work units reflecting local government NPPC policy.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? London Borough of Redbridge is effectively in London and therefore should reflect urban policies to much degree. This modification will make the Plan sound and justified and therefore would help residents not to misunderstand planners as stifling their livelihood or home by biased, unfair, influenced or discriminative.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Policy LP14 allows for live/work units as part of mixed use schemes	No further change required.
R00034/02	peter williams	61	Policy LP14	<p>Live/work The concept of 'live/work' has now been defined in planning terms in the NPPF. It should no longer appear to mean largely different things to different planners and developers. This has been endorsed by CLG in section 21 of the NPPF, that states: "Local authorities should... facilitate flexible working practices, such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit." - "Live/work units are often mix of residential and business uses which cannot be classified under a single class within the Use Classes Order and would therefore be sui generis." Latin for of its own kind, and used to describe a form of legal protection that exists outside typical legal protections -- that is, something that is unique or different. This should be included in the content of this documents.</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00034/01	No further change required.
R00034/03	peter williams	61	Policy LP14	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? The council provides and sells a planning service where they know the policies are not actioned, followed or implemented. This doesn't complies with the legal requirements under section 20(5). Live/work unit modification will make the Plan legally compliant since it is not yet in place as per the NPPC.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? As a artist and a local resident for 20 year using the service the local authority had repeatedly demonstrated they have not got the inclination to engage with local people who are trying to develop themselves in their local community.</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00034/01	No further change required

R00035/01	ROSEMARY SMITH	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It fails to meet infrastructure requirements. It is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. The Oakfield site should not be used for development. The area is already overcrowded - there are traffic issues almost every day, it is impossible to see a doctor as the surgeries are overfull and schools are bursting at the seams. Development of this site will lead to gridlock and social issues. If the sports facilities at Oakfield are to be moved to another place, what's the point? Why not build in the area where the sports facilities are going to be relocated? This seems like a waste of public money.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? The Council should be encouraging children and local residents to use the facilities at Oakfield to get fitter and healthier to improve the wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I do not believe that the sustainability appraisal report is sufficient rigorous or accurate. Retain the sustainable facilities at Oakfield Playing Fields that lead to sustainable outcomes relating to the health and welfare of residents, both physically and mentally.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Green Belt Assessment has found that Oakfield does not meet NPPF Green Belt tests and should therefore be removed from its Green Belt designation. Sports facilities are a green belt compatible use, and can therefore be relocated to an alternative Green Belt site.	No further change required.
R00036/01	Ian Robert Gardiner	154	Sites 116, 118, 119	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? No provision has been made for: extra Hospitals, School, GP Surgeries. Furthermore the impact of traffic and parking. Type of development is not in keeping with or is sympathetic with the area.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Some of the plan features development in a pollution black spot (Charlie Browns Roundabout)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Scrap the plans for Charlie Browns Roundabout..</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Policy LP22 promotes sustainable transport, and Policy LP26 sets out criteria for achieving high quality design that responds to its surroundings. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	No further change required.

R00037/01	Peter Butt	32	Policy LP1B	<p>*Soundness? Don't know</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Goodmayes Station re Proposed Improvements in and around Seven Kings and Goodmayes Station pamphlet. How many 'drop off' and 'collect' parking spaces will there be? There used to be 5 such spaces. None are shown on the artists impression of the new layout. Whatever planners think, cars are not going to go away so the proposed improvements will not actually be an improvement.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Goodmayes Station. re Proposed improvements in and around Seven Kings and Goodmayes Stations flyer The artists impression of the new station frontage does not show any 'drop off' or 'pick up' car spaces. Will there actually be some? Whatever planners think, cars are not going to go away. There used to be 5 such places before the present temporary booking office was put in front of the station. Unless there are such places provided any improvements will not be an improvement</p>	comment, no change sought	Artist's impressions are indicative in nature to demonstrate a conceptual design for the station; any final design for a redeveloped station will require planning permission; at this point access and parking will be considered.	
R00038/01	adrian lee	125	Figure 23	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I have noticed a major error in the draft Local Plan, which I think dates at least from a consultant led listing and review of the Borough green belt which was instituted by the Council in 2009. The error has been carried forward through a Draft 2016 Green Belt Review produced for the Council by Wardell Armstrong and Co, and now appears in the Draft Local Plan. In a nutshell, the green belt parcels under the jurisdiction of Redbridge Council have been identified and given 16 numbers. These include: GB01 Wanstead Flats GB02 Wanstead Park GB03 [Snaresbrook Crown Court] and Walthamstow forest GB04 and GB04A - Woodford Green upper and lower GB05 Epping Forest Hatch and Woodford Golf Course GB06 Reeds Forest GB07 Knighton Wood. The flaw of course is that these areas are not green belt land under the control of Redbridge Council.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council sets planning policy for land within its administrative boundaries, regardless of land ownership. All land parcels referred to fall (at least in part) within Redbridge.	No further change required.
R00038/02	adrian lee	120	Policy LP34	<p>They are Epping Forest land administered by the City of London under the Epping Forest Act 1878. It follows that Redbridge Council has no jurisdiction over these parcels of land, let alone considering detailed reasons why for example Wanstead Flats, Woodford Green and Woodford Golf Course, should/should not be released by the Council from their green belt - which they are not a part of. In addition to the consultants reports, the matter is dealt with in Section 6, page 120 onwards- LP34 "Managing and Protecting the Boroughs Green Belt and Metropolitan Land: The map on page 123 clearly shows the green belt codes attached to the above locations in Wanstead and Woodford. The City of London at The Warren are aware of this entry in the plan, plus the consultants reports and no doubt will be in touch.</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00038/01	No further change required

R00038/03	adrian lee	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Remove references and suggestions that those areas listed above are part of the Borough green belt, and be aware that they are part of Epping Forest, as established by the Epping Forest Act 1878, and administered by of the City of London.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Because it seeks to appropriate City of London Epping Forest land into the London Borough of Redbridge green belt, giving it the same status as Fairop Plain and Hainault Forest, and thereby suggesting Council control. Amend the plan and other council documentation to accept and record the above parcels of land are part of Epping Forest, and and not part of the Councils green belt.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? The Council have clearly not cooperated with the City of London.</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00038/01	No further change required.
R00039/01	JOHN WALDEN	-	PPG2, PPG17	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? There are two 'sets' of issues: 1. 'political' - what is the purpose of the plan - issues for the Secretary of State and/or London Mayor? 2. 'procedural' - how is the plan developed and who is it for - issues perhaps for "Planning Inspectorate" (P.I.)? Let's deal with 2. first (using OAKFIELD as the exemplar, on the basis that issues can be applied across the LA area) i. The so-called 'independent' consultants for the "Green Belt Review - GBR" (Colin Buchanan / SKM) given brief that included expected outcome! ii. The so-called 'independent' consultants for the "GBR Mark II" (Wardell-Armstrong) referred at length to PPG2 - their criteria are NOT failure for green-belt re Oakfield (meets 3 and almost a fourth of 5) BUT more specifically, as Oakfield is a well-developed sports facility, no attention was paid to PPG17 TOGETHER with PPG2, which should always be the case - there were no approved transitional changes to the Structure Plan from 2004.</p>		PPG2 and PPG17 have been superceded by the NPPF. The Councils Green Belt Assessment assesses Green Belt parcels against its purposes as defined by the NPPF. Policy in the Local Plan recognises the value of existing sports facilities at Oakfield and as such requires their re-provision within the borough prior to any redevelopment of the site.	No further change required.

R00039/02	JOHN WALDEN	125	Figure 23	The "Green Belt Review" - Wardell-Armstrong (W-A) - was designed to reinforce the Council's view that discussions of Oakfield being 'non-green-belt' (not quite the same as "brownfield") were off the table simply because the Council had declassified Oakfield. There was never any discussion beforehand as to why Oakfield was ever included in "GB13:"Hainault Fields" in the first place. W-A acknowledges that Oakfield is "locally important open space" BUT advises that (Planning Policy Guidance) PPG2, now included in the NPPF, "proves" that Oakfield fails the "five tests" of GB - however, with regard to open land used for recreational purposes, PPG2 should only ever be considered together with PPG17 ("Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation"). This, the Council and W-A have failed to do. This was a serious omission.	Failure to consider PPG2 in combination with PPG17	See response to R00039/01	No further change required.
R00039/03	JOHN WALDEN	-	PPS	iii. PPS - (Cundall-Johnston) - not signed-off by Sport England as conforming to their guidelines - not a proper and correct PPS as Oakfield & Ford Sports 'excluded' as if already developed! The Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) - appears to have been carried out by Cundall-Johnston on the presumption that Oakfield &/or Ford Sports are to be disposed of BUT no assessment has been made of the intrinsic value of retaining the two sports grounds other than commenting on the work required (and implicit cost) of reinstating the facilities elsewhere.	PPS flawed due to exclusion of Oakfield and Ford sites	The Playing Pitch Strategy was prepared in accordance with Sport England Guidance and signed off by Sport England.	No further change required.
R00039/04	JOHN WALDEN	-	PPS	iv. "alternative" sites for sports facilities as per NPPF are themselves already sports facilities - thus immediately creating a shortfall and a sort-of concurrent mutual exclusion ("Catch 22")! v. Oakfield has been declared an Asset of Community Value (ACV) by the LA	Asset of Community Value	Existing facilities at alternative sites are currently underutilised. The Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (LBR 2.44.1) examines how replacement of existing pitches at Oakfield can be co-ordinated with levels of use of existing facilities. The community value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised, hence requirements for their re-provision.	No further change required.
R00039/05	JOHN WALDEN	124	LP35	vi. "Green Infrastructure" toolkit not used in this context by Local Authority (LA) but is standard practice for GLA - somebody, somewhere should be using this, no assumptions can be made without it.	GLA "green infrastructure" toolkit not used by LBR	The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35.	No further change required.

R00039/06	JOHN WALDEN	120	LP34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenbelt should provide further opportunities for sport, recreation, enhance visual amenity and biodiversity. • Conserve and enhance the natural local environment. • Minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains. • Protect valued landscapes. all of which Oakfield does Issues ref. 1 above - basically get your facts straight. In order to know WHERE to build (e.g. brownfield v. greenfield, that district rather than this district), it is necessary to know WHAT to build and, in order to know WHAT to build, it is necessary to know WHO to build for. <p>The 'wrong' type of development, wrong buildings in wrong place, once built cannot be unbuilt. Where is the space for Schools, Hospitals, public buildings, new roads, increased public transport infrastructure? And what are the priorities? Education & Health infrastructure cannot be built on land designated for Housing - and vice-versa. How much of each and which first?</p>		<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).</p>	No further change required.
R00039/07	JOHN WALDEN	-	PPG2, PPG17	<p>What is the impact of Brexit going to be? What if the Middle East sorts itself out and what if Africa learns how to feed itself? Are all predictions of housing "need" off the table? The "demand" for housing is infinite anyway as people living in smaller homes will always want a bigger one and those living in older homes a newer one. In this particular planning process, and one suspects in other London and South-East LAs, a huge number of assumptions seem to have been made BUT where is the SCIENCE behind the numbers. Is it REALLY possible to base plans on a 'your-guess-is-as-good-as-mine!' basis? The SMHA(s) have too many variables and are too wide-ranging. No basis of PPG ASSESSMENTS used fundamentally flawed use PPG2 TOGETHER WITH PPG17 (if you are going to use PPG2 AT ALL) as should always be the case - the crux of the LDF is the 'reuse' of land currently in use for Sport & Recreation</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? no prior consultation with 'Neighbourhoods' (as defined) re: local plans for use of land ignored responses to proposals from 'Neighbourhoods'</p>		<p>The Council has a statutory duty to plan for minimum London Plan housing targets. PPG2 and PPG17 have been superseded by the NPPF. The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (2006). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (2017) (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.</p>	No further change required.

R00041/01	Charlotte Barras	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I am deeply concerned about the lack of sufficient infrastructure for this proposal in South Woodford. The tube is already used by 5.5 million people a year. This would continue to increase the number of people using the tube. The night tube is already making the town busier at the weekend. I already struggle to get a doctors appointment within 48 hours and they are stretched with their resources as it is. Adding more people to the area needs serious consideration. There are no spaces in South Woodford for leisure.</p> <p>We have to travel to Wanstead and Woodford or Snaresbrook for green space and there is no swimming facilities within a four mile radius for public use. As a local teacher our community is extremely improvement to us residents. The lack of space around George lane would be exacerbated with developments in Marlborough road and under the viaduct. As local residents we also use travid Perkins regularly for our diy needs. This would be a shame to lose this business.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00041/02	Charlotte Barras	-	-	<p>Parking in Marlborough road is always an issue. Even though residents permits are in place, abuse of the visitors ticketing system is commonplace to use the tube. The synagogue on Marlborough road is also heavily used. As part of our diversity in this area this would be affected by residential premises built next door to them.</p>		Noted. Enforcement of parking permits falls beyond the remit of the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00041/03	Charlotte Barras	155	Site 120	<p>*Soundness Improvements? As always solutions are difficult to find. There is already a development site opposite travis Perkins that has remained untouched and boarded up for the previous 5 years. This is a prime opportunity for a development of similar flats to those close by in Marlborough road. The viaduct would nt be an appealing place for people to live and happiness is important to those in our community as well. It seems to me that squeezing in homes in small vacant areas in a Victorian town is short sighted. A new development on open space would be more desirable.</p> <p>The area down by Charlie Brown roundabout on indrustial areas could be redeveloped with the roding valley park nearby for families and residents to use he green space. Transport links would still be available for people to use, tube train road and buses.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted. The boroughs development needs are such that multiple sources of land are needed to meet housing and infrastructure needs. Raven Road industrial estate is protected as employment land on the basis of the findings of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33)	No further change required.
R00042/01	Kulwant Bains	52	LP9	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1.Plan prioritizes housing over local businesses the loss of which will be damaging to the community.</p>	South Woodford; complaint that other comparable areas excluded	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy. Several existing employment areas are protected on the basis of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33), and new fit for purpose business space will be sought as part of mixed use developments	No further change required.

R00042/02	Kulwant Bains	68	LP17	2.The housing targets do not come with any additional proposals for improvements or infrastructure		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00042/03	Kulwant Bains	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Plan refers to a 'landmark building' in the area. What does that mean exactly?	Comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14.	See response R00108/14.
R00042/04	Kulwant Bains	32	Policy LP1D	4 . The plan is unbalanced ie why is South Woodford is being targeted for excessive growth - the burden of development should be shared and proportional with surrounding areas of Wanstead,Snaresbrook,Woodford and Aldersbrook *Soundness Improvements? Remove the designation of South Woodford as an 'investment and growth area' from the plan. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	Development should be shared with neighbouring areas	The majority of growth proposed in the plan is directed to Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor.	No further change required.
R00043/01	Dhananjay Ingreji	27	Policy LP1A, LP27	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? There is undue focus on further housing, especially tall buildings, in the Ilford Metropolitan, Seven Kings, Goodmayes and Chadwell Heath District areas. These areas already suffer from very high population density, not least because of the existence of ugly tall buildings. The early years obesity reports indicate the absence of decent open spaces and facilities for sport and exercise. There is a vague promise of working with clinical commissioning groups for further medical facilities. However, if the population is projected to rise from 279,000 to 362,000 by 2030 then these infrastructure plans appear totally inadequate.		The Council consider the spatial strategy fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan. Additional detail is proposed to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, based on the latest understanding of future health requirements.	No further change required.
R00043/02	Dhananjay Ingreji	22	Policy LP1A	The impression is more of the somebody cashing in on the Crossrail Corridor rather than the welfare of Ilford South residents. There is also an impression that residents voices will be less important with the merger of the Ilford South and Barking constituencies following Boundary Commission changes. Why has there been no effort made to expand the social housing stock across Barkingside, Clayhall, and Woodford and take the pressure off the Ilford South area? Further planning does not appear for additional car parking. It is virtually impossible to drive safely in Ilford now. What will happen when thousands more homes are added. There is no report of current air quality and the projected air quality in the above said area with the increase in population and traffic.	Comment, no change sought	Boundary Commission falls beyond the remit of this Local Plan. The Council consider the spatial strategy fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan. Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of prioritising sustainable transport. Policy LP3 seeks a proportion of affordable housing in all new developments.	No further change required.

R00043/03	Dhananjay Ingreji	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Soundness Improvements? All tall building plans should be put on hold or cancelled. all efforts should be made to explore options in other parts of the borough. Proper enforcement of the rules governing people multiple-occupancy homes and illegal sheds should be a priority. Ilford South needs a clean-up and consolidation of what we already have rather than thrusting more buy to lets and pound shops on our town.</p>	Comment, no change sought	<p>The proposed Ilford Town centre redevelopments would improve the retail offer, improve the public realm, and make it competitive with other comparable metropolitan centres in Outer London. Policy LP27 on Tall Buildings is supported by the findings of the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77). The Plan seeks to distribute growth in a sustainable manner as demonstrated through the Sustainability Appraisal (LBR 1.11). Policy LP6 introduces criteria on converting larger homes to HMOs, and Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan.</p>	No further change required.
R00043/04	Dhananjay Ingreji	81	Policy LP21	<p>The flood zones in particular need to have no more concrete thrust upon them and planning permissions should be reviewed accordingly. This is a deeply flawed plan driven by politic rather than sound planning. I would certainly want a new swimming pool to replace Seven Kings pool which was so shabbily closed under the guise of health and safety.</p>	Comment, no change sought	<p>All proposals in flood risk zones subject to a sequential test, flood risk assessment and mitigation - see Policy LP21 and the Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Test (LBR 2.60). Planned infrastructure provision is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) whilst policy LP17 supports new community facilities.</p>	No further change required.
R00043/05	Dhananjay Ingreji	101	Policy LP27	<p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Legally Compliant Comments? I am not an expert and so can't comment. However, on air quality alone I suspect the plans will fail miserably but after the building work is done there will be lots of crocodile tears and soul-searching which will amount to nothing. On tall buildings the general level of light in Ilford is bound to diminish. I have seen no projections of how many homes will be blighted by the loss of light from the long shadows. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? I suspect that a lot of the plan is politically driven and residents protests will amount to nothing.</p>		<p>Policy LP24 requires the provision of air quality assessments and mitigation in appropriate cases. The Plans approach to Tall Buildings is supported by the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77)</p>	No further change required.
R00044/01	Fiona Stapleton	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? I do not find the policy justified or effective and would lead to South Woodford taking an unsustainable number of people into the area - with the current infrastructure already under pressure, and a young son already being affected by this, I find it hard to support this policy. *Soundness Improvements? Any extra homes built in the area need to have sufficient services planned with them. Neighbouring areas should help to ease the pressure. It is not clear why Wanstead and Snaresbrook have been left untouched in the plans laid out, despite the vast difference in both child poverty statistics and travel footprints. *Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	<p>New homes in South Woodford need services / infrastructure; neighbouring areas (namely Wanstead, Snaresbrook) should help to ease the pressure</p>	<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.

R00045/01	Jeanette Marsh NHS	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I feel that the plan fails to be specific enough in regard to the proposed additional healthcare provisions that the building of 650 new homes in South Woodford. This number of homes will raise the local population significantly and the existing GP practices are already dealing with significant pressures in terms of health demands. I feel that the plans need to be more concrete and detailed in terms of providing additional health centre/s and/or GP surgeries. Also, our local hospital is Whipps Cross - already unable to meet targets. Where will additional hospital beds be made available to serve an increased population? Specifically state which surgeries will be funded to increase GP numbers or where additional health centres/GP surgeries will be built or provided.</p>		Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructured Delivery Plan have been put forward	No further change required.
R00045/02	Jeanette Marsh NHS	72	Policy LP18	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Specifically state how Whipps Cross Hospital will be supported and developed to provide additional beds and A&E facilities to meet increased demand.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? I would like to see all homes, businesses, educational establishments, surgeries and leisure centres in the borough given adequate and appropriate information regarding the local plan so that everyone is as fully informed as possible. I only came across the details in my local free 'Village Gazette' or I wouldn't have known about it.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Whipps Cross Hospital falls within the London Borough of Waltham Forest. Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructured Delivery Plan have been put forward	No further change required.
R00047/01	Ludovic Ghesquiere Financial Conduct Authority	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Positively Prepared: I don't agree with the development and infrastructure assessments made in the local plan. I also do not think they were objectively determined. Rather, I believe there is an agenda to increase housing and minimise the need for infrastructure improvements. I believe the plan suffers from this bias and is not objective. Evidence: I do not agree with the evidence supporting the need for more housing without major infrastructure improvements. Just take a few anecdotes: the traffic on woodford road, the congestion at the playground in wanstead and the difficulty getting on the tube during the morning rush. All of these are evidence that there are too many people and/or insufficient infrastructure.</p>		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.

R00047/02	Ludovic Ghesquiere Financial Conduct Authority	120	Policy LP34	<p>Consistent with national planning policy: The local plan conflicts national law regarding the London greenbelt. As a final thought, even if the Council went through the right process when creating the plan, that doesn't mean the conclusions are correct. A plan that is "positively prepared", "justified", "effective" and "consistent with national planning policy" can still be a disaster. It is typical for bureaucrats to hide behind process when they should be debating substance. Please don't be like that.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? As an overarching complaint, you should not confuse whether the plan is legally compliant with whether the plan is good. Just because the council went through the correct process in making the plan does not mean they have created a good plan.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? It seems as though the plan is compliant with the Duty to Cooperate. But really, I don't care. What is important here is whether the plan is good for the local community and we should not conflate whether the Council has followed the correct procedures when making the plan with whether the recommendations in the plan are advisable.</p>		The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. The Local Plan Examination will test both if it has been prepared in a legally compliant manner, and meets tests of soundness.	No further change required.
R00048/01	Tracey Lloyd Morris	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The area is far too built up already, the traffic and local infrastructure could not support a multitude of new houses within South Woodford, as we have had many built in the last few years..</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Why not look at surrounding areas?</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor Barkingside are projected to deliver substantially more housing over the Plan period than South Woodford.	No further change required.
R00050/01	T Frederico	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The local plan is unsympathetic to the village feel and nature of South Woodford. It does not recognise that South Woodford is an area of architectural significance and is admired for its leafy suburban village feel. You only have to look at the sprawling concrete conurbation of Ilford to realise how a village can be spoiled by over development. High rise buildings in South Woodford would be wholly inappropriate for the area both aesthetically and practically. Furthermore South Woodford does not have the infrastructure to cope. Perhaps those that have proposed this plan should try driving on Woodford road at rush hour. It already takes up to 30 minutes to travel one mile. And how will local services such as doctors' surgeries cope? What further infrastructure will be implemented to mitigate these issues? South Woodford is a small village and should be left that way. Don't ruin it.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.

R00050/02	T Frederico	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? I would suggest that any development should be proportionate, sympathetic and in keeping with the aesthetics of the area. There are currently no tower blocks in South Woodford for good reason. Development that mirror the Victorian period properties in the area would be far more welcomed. It would also be fairer and more sensible to distribute the burden of development across Redbridge rather than dividing the borough by focusing development on a select few areas.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.
R00050/03	T Frederico	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? whilst I accept the council have allowed the community to complete this survey, I find it abhorrent that other developments such as the proposal to erected 150+ temporary housing units in South Woodford on the old dairy crest site seem to have been planned by stealth in an untransparent way. The council have s great opportunity in this project to prove that they actually listen to local communities rather than bulldoze their plans through without any due regard to the wishes of the community that have to live with the consequences. *Legally Compliant Improvements? Listen to the community and demonstrate how plans have been adapted, amended or suspended to ease the concerns of the community. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? I can see no evidence of healthy cooperation with local residents</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council has no plans for 150 temporary accommodation (TA) units to be located on the site at 120 Chigwell Road. The Council is developing a strategy for TA to help tackle homelessness across the borough, on more than one site These plans are yet to be confirmed by the Council, and so have not been reflected in the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00051/01	Omar Siddique	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>*Soundness? Don't know *Soundness Comments? I appreciate this is a pre-submission draft, however there is insufficient substance or information in order for people to make a judgement as to wheather the plan is sound or not. If this were a private sector submission, I would suggest the wording and lack of information is due poor preparation, attempts to hide the fact that you don't know enough or in fact an attempt to gain apporval for a plan that if the full facts and figures where laid out would cause wide spread disapproval from local residents. An example of this is section 3.6.5 The Council will seek to create a contemporary landmark within the town centre at Station Estate. This building should be sympathetically designed to respect the local character of the surrounding area. This is suitably vague that it covers a range of scenarios *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes *Duty to Cooperate Comments? However I would urge a stronger cooperation with local community groups such as South Woodford Society</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted. Contents of the plan are supported by an extensive evidence base listed within Appendix 10, the contents of which are themselves supported by further sources and evidence.	No further change required.

R00052/01	patricia castle	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35, Site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? it is an absolute disgrace to treat users of the Oakfield site and more importantly the residents who live here in this way. you could not care a less about the devaluation of our homes, the loss of pleasant surroundings , appalling noise and traffic whist doing the works, and the congestion and effects on our environment here afterwards .I will never vote for this Labour council ever again</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? it doesn't care about current residents</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council has a duty to plan for its minimum London Plan housing targets and other development needs. Policy LP35 requires the re-provision of playing pitches and facilities from Oakfield to a suitable alternative location within the borough before any redevelopment of the site. Hours of construction works can be conditioned as part of any planning application. The site is in a sustainable location close to Barkingside town centre, and easily accessible by public transport.	
R00053/01	WARREN LITKIN	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	No change sought	Noted	No further change required
R00055/01	Katherine Partridge	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I'm particularly concerned with the development plans for South Woodford. The increase in housing will stretch support services particularly schools and healthcare. GP surgeries already seem to struggle with their patients and it is hard to get appointments. The increase in the intake at Nightingale will elevate some pressure but not enough.</p> <p>Whilst high density housing may not be traditionally targeted at families the increase in housing costs forces some to consider these types of homes so please do not assume that this type of housing will be predominately young working adults who place lower demands on services.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail. Policy LP5 seeks a range of dwelling sizes in new developments.	No further change required.
R00055/02	Katherine Partridge	68	LP17	Furthermore the catchment for grammar schools is so wide that the increase in entry at Woodford County High may not increase capacity at other secondary schools around South Woodford. Finally I am also concerned at the precedent any taller buildings in the plan will create. Whilst one may not be such an issue the impact should it enable others to be built in the future will be far greater.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Policy LP27 on Tall Buildings is supported by the findings of the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77).	No further change required
R00055/03	Katherine Partridge	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Whilst I appreciate that it is hard to expand existing schools due to land constraints consideration should be given to schooling. For example, could one site be used to expand Oakdale e.g. having reception and nursery on a different site. The plans need to ensure adequate increase in health services. These plans also come at a time when other services are being cut - e.g. closure of Woodford library which coupled with increases in population via these plans will place further strain on these other services. I don't feel this has been well thought out.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	More school places, eg expansion of Oakdale onto a different site; more health services	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan(LBR 2.21).	No further change required.

R00056/01	gareth davies	43	Para 3.9.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? There is no detail whatsoever of the plans to do major building works on existing housing estates. And the location of provision for housing for homeless people. The estate where i reside has a hideous new build planned which is totally unjustified shows zero consideration of existing residents needs.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? You need to list ALL the planned builds not just new ones.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council's approach to estate regeneration is set out in paragraph 3.9.7 onwards	No further change required.
R00057/01	margaret hall	32	Para 3.6	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 3.6 South Woodford Investment @ Growth Area. Objectives of Local Plan, "to maximise opportunities to deliver a range of new housing, jobs and community infrastructure for local people." Planned areas of housing development seem to be where small businesses are based at present; the removal of which will decimate local jobs. No plans appear to be in place for extra schools or medical centres, which are already over-stretched, prior to the building of a further 650 new homes.</p> <p>3.6.8 Council is committed to preserving the character of South Woodford, whilst planning a contemporary landmark building within the Station Estate area - hardly in character with local Victorian architecture! More thought needs to be given to blending in with local housing and preservation of local businesses.</p>	Blend new development in with Victorian architecture (South Woodford)	Several existing employment areas are protected on the basis of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33), and new fit for purpose business space will be sought as part of mixed use developments. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). See response to R00108/14 regarding Station Estate	No further change required.
R00058/01	Julian Hazeldine	14	Para 1.21.4	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Having examined the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and High Level Transport Study, I believe that insufficient attention has been paid to public transport capacity in planning for housing growth Paragraph 1.21.4 of the local plan should commit Redbridge to expanding housing provision only in accordance with available public transport capacity.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	Policy LP22 directs developments that generate high transport demands to accessible locations, and sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.	No further change required.
R00059/01	parmjit rai	-	-	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? IT ENSURES THERE ARE CONCERNS AROUND THE ENVIRONMENT, GOOD DESIGN AND ENSUREING WE MEET THE HOUSING TARGET</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? LOOKING THROUGH THE DOCUMENTS IT HAS COVERED ALL THE AREAS REQUIRED.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	No change sought	Support noted.	No further change required.
R00061/01	Stuart Wright	-	-	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p>	No change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00065/01	John Tyne	40	Para 6.1.5, Policy LP3	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1) Policy LP3 Target for affordable homes should always reflect that of the Mayor, as being the highest planning authority in London 2) Para 6.1.5 It is the role of the Local Plan to define Green Belt boundaries. In determining the borough's Green Belt boundary, the NPPF makes clear in paragraph 83 that, "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, 3) Policy LP11: Managing Clustering of Town Centre Uses</p>		The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. See response to R01213/07 regarding affordable housing targets.	No further change required
R00065/02	John Tyne	40	Policy LP3	<p>*Soundness Improvements?</p> <p>1) the policy should be amended to " setting a strategic affordable housing target at least equal to that set by the planning policy of the Mayor for London" this should avoid any conflicts should the Mayor raise the London Target.</p>	change LP3 so that it always meets or exceeds strategic affordable housing target of Mayor of London (and quotes the Mayoral target)	See response to R01213/07 regarding affordable housing targets.	No further change required
R00065/03	John Tyne	120	Para 6.1.5, Policy LP34	<p>2) the large changes to the Green Belt do Not Appear to be "Exceptional Circumstances" but an simple way or meeting housing targets by releasing undeveloped land and therefore not preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should be reviewed along with areas where High density housing can be provided before changes to green belt are undertaken</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.	No further change required.
R00065/04	John Tyne	58	Policy LP11	<p>3) Although sound for A5 Takeaways there still appears to be a problem with A2 or Sui Generis uses where for example a bank closing a branch could lead to a betting shop opening without a change of use being required</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Clarity re A2 and sui generis change of use [can banks change to betting shops without Change of Use?]	Policy LP11 will be applied where planning permission is required - it cannot be applied to permitted development	No further change required.
R00070/01	ROGER LEWIS	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments apply to section 3.6: The South Woodford Investment and Growth Area (page 32 - 33). I am a landlord of several flat across London. Considering the Station Estate (site no. 117): 50 flats per floor would still require 13 floors in order to meet your target of 650 homes. The ground area is not sufficient for 50 flats, and assuming some will be houses, a high-rise seems inevitable. This would change the character of South Woodford far too much, despite the good intention: "This building should be sympathetically designed to respect the local character of the surrounding area (Policies LP26, 27 and 33)."</p>		Target of 650 homes in South Woodford relates to the entire Investment and Growth Area, not just Station Estate	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule

R00070/02	ROGER LEWIS	32	Para 3.6.3	<p>I also work in the City and commute daily. Westbound Central Line trains are almost always fully packed when they leave SW in mornings. The Plan makes no mention of working with TfL for more frequent services, therefore we must assume 650 new homes * 2 adult inhabitants on average will significantly increase traffic. This also applies to the roads. As the Plan mentions, George Lane is a pleasant area for pedestrians and cannot accommodate significantly higher volumes of cars, given its single lane design. No reference is made to other infrastructure either: schools (potentially 650 more pupils?), hospitals (Whipps Cross is excellent but, from experience, busy) etc.</p>	Comment, no change sought	<p>The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.
R00070/03	ROGER LEWIS	32	Paras 3.2, 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.7	<p>Returning to my landlord role, property investors always look at council plans for areas where re-generation or re-development is needed, in order to purchase properties beforehand and then benefit from the upside. In South Woodford, this statement "In order to deliver growth and regeneration in South Woodford..." is not correct, as regeneration is not required! For proof, pay a visit to SW at any time, then go to Ilford, Hainault, Newbury Park, Barkingside etc... Surely these areas (or other potential sites identified in Appendix 1) would not only benefit from regeneration, but also already have existing tower blocks? Therefore their character is unlikely to change too much from 650 new homes. Therefore I do not believe that your Plan is sound. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Please see my comments above. *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Please see my previous comment. *Legally Compliant Improvements? Please see my previous comment. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Please see my previous comment.</p>	Areas other than South Woodford should be development priorities as would benefit more from regeneration	<p>. The Local Plan plans for growth in different parts of the borough, not just South Woodford. Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor are projected to deliver substantially more growth over the Plan period than South Woodford. The level and type of regeneration needed differs in each part of the borough. Areas with the most appropriate conditions and capacity for higher levels of growth have been designated Investment & Growth Areas. South Woodford is an Investment & Growth Area where the Council has planned for economic rather than environmental regeneration, to protect key local industrial and business locations, boost the local economy, and develop new homes, whilst preserving local character (see Local Plan Policy LP1D).</p>	No further change required.
R00072/01	Alison Russell	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I am very concerned about the large amount of building, including high rise, in South Woodford which would fundamentally change the nature of this suburban area. More traffic on the roads & more demand on local facilities would be very detrimental.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Reduced amount of housing in South Woodford-low rise only. Plus George Lane South needs to receive council help to encourage sustainable & useful shops.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	<p>The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan. Council funding towards existing businesses falls beyond the remit of the Local Plan.</p>	No further change required.

R00073/01	Jonathan Williams	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I believe the plan is not sound due to the disproportionate adverse impact it will have on the local area, specifically existing residential properties and businesses. The massive increase in people, cars and pollution as a result of the proposed "growth" does not seem to be matched by an increase in services (especially schools, transport, and doctors). The increase in cars owned by the new residents will place an even greater stress on the roads and add to the already bad pollution caused by the proximity to the A406.</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach towards promoting sustainable transport	No further change required.
R00073/02	Jonathan Williams	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Schools cannot cope and the catchment areas will shrink as a result and mean residents on the outskirts of the area will need to go further out. The character of the area will change for the worse, including the skyline and faces of the roads. South Woodford station already has the highest footfall along this stretch of the Central Line and commuting to work during rush hour is often quite challenging due to overcrowding.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? I think it should avoid looking at South Woodford as the main centre for growth and spread the development fairly along the stations along the Central Line, from Epping to Stratford. Or it should look more north-southerly, from Chingford to Ilford, or at brown sites for development.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Distribution of growth outside of Redbridge falls beyond the scope of the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00074/01	Mitra Webster	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan includes elements that have not considered the current infrastructure and would be a detriment to the infrastructure of the area. For example: - Building so many homes so close to major junctions will create traffic gridlock in areas that are already congested - Building so many homes close to South Woodford tube station will make a busy tube station even more congested -</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted, see response to R00002/01	Noted, see response to R00002/01

R00074/02	Mitra Webster	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Local services, particularly schools, are already heavily over subscribed, with some households not in the 'catchment' for any of the local schools - and there are no plans to extend these local services under the current plans It is not justified, because - Other areas that are not currently as congested would be better suited to larger developments</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Fewer properties being built Not putting large developments so close to major roads and junctions near Charlie Browns roundabout</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate?No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? My understanding is that no consultation has taken place with local service managers, so strategic infrastructure issues have not been addressed</p>	Comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00075/01	Jack Silver	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Overall the plan is sensible, in the checks and balances, design principles, further enforcement, consideration of the housing zone and environmental consideration (although how well that will be enforced is another matter). The lack of soundness is around the little identification of infrastructure. the report should properly identify medical and GP facility gaps, to encourage new practices, and also map if there are any GPs that are not at full capacity currently and / or have the ability to increase GP numbers.</p>		Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00075/02	Jack Silver	68	LP17	<p>The local plan should also clearly identify the school places that can be provided to satisfy the new housing, right now it have very little identified and potentially new schools, or where there are spaces and do they match up with the planned development. The currently school expansion programme does not have any relation to the increase in homes, and is based on current number in the Borough.</p>		An assessment of school places is provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No further change required.
R00075/03	Jack Silver	86	LP22	<p>The plan identifies many Brownfield sites, and these are always the easy fix for housing, but in my opinion increasing density within already very densely populated areas is a tinderbox for problems. Where there are brownfields they should be considered for other uses, such as offices, work spaces, leisure and community uses. Cramming in more people into areas already 'full' (see the occupants per property numbers) will likely increase anti social behaviour risks, such as neighbours disputes, parking disputes, resource disputes etc. Let's not pretend people will not move in and have cars, they will and it will cause dispute. Some people believe the future is fewer cars, and easy car hire options, but that is not the case in Redbridge, we have many 2/3/4 household cars, especially with increasing household size.</p>	Use brownfield sites for non-residential developments	Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel. Appendix 1 sets out proposed uses for sites which includes several mixed use sites - not solely residential schemes	No further change required.

R00075/04	Jack Silver	98	Policy LP26	<p>*Soundness Improvements? See above. Reduce density of tower blocks and flats, and ensure every block built allocates a community space, space for pubs, leisure facilities, and some commercial space, reducing the need for the residents to drive.</p>	reduced density, ensure each block comes with community space and commercial space	Policy LP26 sets out the Councils approach of promoting high quality design	No further change required.
R00075/05	Jack Silver	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>The plan needs to identify more spaces such as Oakfield. The Oakfield site is perfect for building homes, and infrastructure (it could easily accommodate a medical centre and the parking for each property). It has easy access to stations, Schools, shopping centres and leisure facilities within walking distance. I would suggest the Oakfield site considers fewer properties and looks at a number in the region of 400 homes, which would provide larger family houses and therefore variety in the local plan. Again I say cramming in homes for numbers is not a good solution, the building should consider the long term consequences and impact of overdevelopment and large numbers. The fact is we will reach a point where we cannot build any more, so let's make sure the properties built are of good design, quality, variety in type and size, so we can attract and retain a wide range of resident demography, which the current plan does not consider.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? No, the duty is provided with lip service, and there should be clarity around how it will cooperate and what the checks will be to ensure it does.</p>	comment, no change sought	Support for Oakfield noted. Policy LP5 seeks a mix of dwelling sizes including family housing.	No further change required.

R00078/01	Laurence Weeks	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35, Site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I oppose the inclusion of the Oakfield Sports Ground on the Council's development plan and any possible development for housing. Oakfield is a high quality sports ground which hosts a large number of football and cricket games throughout the year. It is home to a number of long standing community sports clubs such as Oakfield Parkonians CC. It is estimated that up to 2,000 people of all ages and abilities play sport at Oakfield over a weekend. I believe it is vital that we preserve all of our high quality sports grounds. The growing population makes this even more important. We must preserve our facilities for Sports and recreation for future generations.</p> <p>Sport is essential to our wellbeing, our physical health and it is vital in tacking anti- social behaviour by giving positive activities to young people. Local authorities should do everything to preserve and expand facilities, which are only going to be more in demand with a growing population. Housing is clearly vital but the sports grounds in our borough must be preserved. Housing development must be part of developing our communities and not destroying facilities which will be lost for ever.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Comment, no change sought	See response to R00016/01	See response to R00016/01
R00080/01	Corbett Shannon	37	LP2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is not justified. I went to a meeting on Tuesday 13th and I heard that Pioneer Point in Ilford and other buildings in the borough are under occupied. Surely these issues should be addressed first before embarking on a plan of mass building across the borough. The "housing crisis" in the UK does not exist - yes, people want to live in central London, but if they wanted to people could move out of London to places in Essex such as Harlow which is not that far away but a lot cheaper and "affordable". Also, the container plan to house people at Charlie Brown's roundabout should be scrapped.</p>	housing not necessary as places away from London are cheaper; scrap temporary accomodation at Charlie Brown's	Reducing vacancy and underoccupancy of existing properties is not sufficient to address high levels of housing need in the borough; which is additional to housing demand outside of London. Temporary accommodation proposals fall outside the remit of the Local Plan	

R00080/02	Corbett Shannon	32	Policy LP1D	Residents are unhappy about this and surely the council is not a dictatorship and as tax payers are paying wages for the council they should listen to what tax payers (residents) say. There is no reason for this to happen in South Woodford. As these containers are portable they can go on any land in the borough or outside the borough as if the people are in social housing they should be grateful to be housed anywhere. Also, as it is only a 2 year solution, why not wait longer and find a long term solution, rather than having to re-visit the issue in two years time. The 30 percent affordable housing in new builds should be shared ownership only as social housing within developments does not benefit anybody and is unfair to those who are trying to buy their own homes who have worked hard to save up deposits for shared and full ownership.	Only provide shared ownership (not rented) social housing; locate temporary housing elsewhere in borough or outside; find a permanent solution to avoid re-siting temporary housing	Temporary accommodation proposals fall outside the remit of the Local Plan. High and different levels of housing need means a mix of affordable housing products are needed in addition to market housing.	No further change required.
R00080/03	Corbett Shannon	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? South Woodford as an "investment and growth" area is not viable. South Woodford should be a conservation area along with Woodford and Wanstead. The tube line - Epping branch - that runs through south woodford is a lot less frequent than the Hainault branch. The Hainault branch is always emptier than the Epping branch due to frequency and passenger numbers, this should've been looked at in your study.	South Woodford should be a conservation area	Parts of South Woodford are designated as a Conservation Area. The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line.	No further change required.
R00080/04	Corbett Shannon	155	Site 120	Also, with crossrail coming it would make more sense for Seven Kings and/or Goodmayes to be "investment and growth" areas. Site 120 in South Woodford is already a viable business, why would you want to take away a viable business. South Woodford residents are not happy about this, whilst I'm sure residents in Ilford and the surrounding areas would welcome regeneration. You should be working with residents to work together to find a solution, not going against the residents, otherwise residents will be voting in a different council come the next elections.	comment, no change sought	Seven Kings and Goodmayes are also included within an Investment and Growth area (please refer to Policy LP1B). Several existing employment areas are protected on the basis of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33), and new fit for purpose business space will be sought as part of mixed use developments	No further change required.
R00080/05	Corbett Shannon	120	Policy LP34	*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Taking away the green belt to build on is not legal or sustainable. Use brownfield sites, or again re-visit empty sites such as pioneer point. You need to look at solving the problems that you currently have in Ilford and other areas rather than just pressing ahead and causing more problems for residents. *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.	No further change required.

R00083/01	Allestree Fisher	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? South Woodford Any attempt to increase population density in the E18 area is totally unjustified unless additional infrastructural facilities are provided in the area, such as surgeries, health centres and primary schools. No provision for these has been made in the Plan. South Woodford Tube station is already the busiest in the area, used by over 1million passengers. The population has already been increased by the completion of the Queen Mary residential area. There is no call or need for any further residential development in the in the immediate area. All local medical services and schools are already creaking at the seams. The likelihood of our local parking areas being closed and replaced with residential property is fills residents with concern. Where will commuters be able to park?</p>		<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	No further change required.
R00083/02	Allestree Fisher	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Hign rise buildings in South Woodford means that the quintessential suburban nature of E18 will be destroyed. The area will be reduced to an unsightly offshoot of central London, destroying the Zone 4 character of peaceful leafiness. The only people to benefit from the proposed Plan will be builders and lawyers.</p>		<p>Policy LP26 sets out criteria for achieving high quality design that responds to its surroundings.</p>	No further change required.
R00083/03	Allestree Fisher	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Development clearly needs to be implemented to be in tune with the national plan. Houses are needed but not in the commercial centre of E18. There are brownfield sites in the Chigwell Road, adjacent to the Charlie Brown Roundabout and low-rise development would be possible in the Church End sector as has been demonstrated in Malmesbury and Buckingham Roads. Church End needs its own health centre and primary school. Another primary school is needed to serve households in the Mulberry Avenue - Chigwell Road sector.</p>	<p>Redirect development to Chigwell Road brownfield sites as well as Church End. Build a health centre and primary school in Church End, and a primary school for Mulberry Avenue / Chigwell Road.</p>	<p>All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision (based on partnership working with infrastructure providers) are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.
R00083/04	Allestree Fisher	81	LP22	<p>E18 does not need an improved mosque that will inevitably cause congestion. Cannibalising green areas is not the answer to the housing shortage. With heavy vehicle pollution from the A406 and the M11 we need all the green areas with trees that we already have. Surely the pollution-driven ill health of central Londoners is sufficient proof of this?</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	<p>Do not build a mosque in E18; don't build on green spaces</p>	<p>Local Plan does not propose a new mosque, but policies in the plan will be used to determine planning applications as they come forward. All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.</p>	No further change required.

R00084/01	Santhosh Bacchu	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It doesn't help the local area living conditions increases congestion, pollution and decreases living standard. People will lose the valuable and most used play field. This does not help to keep teens off road, rather than encouraging sport this proposal is discouraging. Living on forest road I know how long it takes as of now to get my car off the driveway, with additional homes and increased population situation will only worsen. Losing an open area is easy but to create a playfield is impossible. I strongly oppose the use of Oakfield play fields for housing.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Improve the playing field, create few tennis courts, a children's play area and open air gym encourage and help people to have healthy life style.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00016/01 and R01088/04	See responses to R00016/01 and R01088/04
R00085/01	Arvin Kane	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Very little fine detail with no pictures or alternatives to the first option</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? A comprehensive plan for each catchment</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? Very little information provided I don't want to see local plans numbers, I want to see what effects me as a resident</p>	A comprehensive plan for each catchment	<p>Unclear what policy is being referred to.</p> <p>The Local Plan is long-term and strategic in nature, and therefore more detailed visual representations will be elsewhere, such as masterplans for individual sites.</p> <p>Four options for the future development of the borough were consulted on earlier in the formation of this plan, during the 2014 Preferred Options Extension Consultation.</p>	No further change required.
R00086/01	Gagan Dulay	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness?</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? No I am based in the Barkingside area, and feel the plan to build on the oakfields site is not justified. This is because this is a vital green space for the local community. Also there are congestion concerns with the area which would turn the area into a mini city with pollution concerns</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? There are other areas such as the Ilford town centre which requires regeneration.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Don't build on Oakfield	The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Ilford is identified in the Local Plan as an investment and growth area, and a number of Development Opportunity Sites identified.	No further change required.

R00088/01	M Weinberg MBE; Chair of local PPG and former chair Redbridge CCG Forum	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? As someone who has been involved with local primary care provision for many years, I am deeply concerned at the projected increase in population and, the availability of care at GP and hospital level. Both GP's and local hospitals are already under great strain, with, I suspect many GP approaching retirement. More and more flats are being erected, with little attention being paid to the social infrastructure required.</p> <p>Local hospitals are also struggling to cope and, with plans to close part of King George then, I believe we are storing up major problems for the future, for the sake of a quick fix.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Far more attention needs to be paid, not only to government demands for more accommodation but, also to the social demands this will create. You cannot keep allowing an increase in population unless you also plan for the potential increase in demand for health and social care at a local level.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I cannot answer this question, as I am not legally trained</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? I have my doubts as to how much notice has been taken of the points raised in this response</p>	Reconsider demand for health and social care	Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00089/01	Linda Waidson	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? The council are turning this borough into a ghetto. There are far too many houses being built without any consideration for the people who have lived here for generations. The money should be spent on making the borough safer, cleaner and greener. The roads are covered in pot holes and cannot cope with the traffic as it is, parking is a nightmare and you want more road users. There are so many people living on top of each other there is now a culture of gangs and you want to encourage more people to live here.</p>		The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.

R00089/02	Linda Waidson	120	Policy LP34	<p>Your policies are driving residents out of the borough, read your own population study. Where is the provision for single people, yet again they are discriminated against. Redbridge is not being made better instead it is being ruined, turned into an inner city ghetto, it used to be a place people moved to to get away from deprivation, a safe, nice area you are destroying this. I do not think this borough can cope with the population growth, all infrastructure is already failing, hospitals , schools, social care etc . I know I am wasting my time writing this as you have proved by your actions you are not interested in what the long term residents think.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Look carefully at what you are doing to this borough. No way should you build on any green belt land, once you do this it is gone forever, there will a risk of flooding, more pollution and you will take away the place that is used by the children for exercise.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Green belt land is being used under false pretences</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. Policy LP5 seeks a mix of dwelling sizes in new developments.</p>	No further change required.
R00091/01	Catherine Ridell	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? This plan has been ill thought. There is insufficient infrastructure in South Woodford to support the plan. South Woodford is receiving a disproportionate burden. As I understand, the areas targeted as 'High growth and Investment areas' are: Gants Hill, Barkingside, Ilford and South Woodford.</p> <p>As a resident of South Woodford I have concentrated on the flaws of the plan in respect of South Woodford only. Firstly why has the housing requirement not been spread across all villages within the borough? South Woodford is already bursting at its seams. The following are examples of the infrastructure issues at South Woodford: GP surgeries close to capacity Roads are almost impassable during peak hours. Woodford Road to George lane is usually gridlocked between 8am and 9am and 4.30pm and 5pm.</p> <p>South Woodford Tube station has the highest in/out foot flow in the vicinity.I have provided numbers further on. South Woodford 5.15 million Wanstead 2.9 million Snaresbrook 2.67 million All numbers as at 2015</p>		<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.

R00091/02	Catherine Ridell	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The plan should be re-visited and Wanstead and Woodford should be placed back onto the plan in order to share the burden and because they clearly have the infrastructure to support further housing. Here are some reasons why: South Woodford Tube station has the highest in/out foot flow in the vicinity. Here are the numbers in order of highest foot flow: (all figures as at 2015) South Woodford 5.15 million Wanstead 2.9 million Snaresbrook 2.67 million Why was the Wanstead and Woodford corridor development removed from the plan?</p>	comment, no change sought	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. A lack of such sites exists in the vicinity of Wanstead and Snaresbrook.	
R00091/03	Catherine Ridell	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Wanstead has two tube stations, one at each end of the high street and both with less foot flow than South Woodford Furthermore Wanstead has excellent connections having the M11 link running through it, with easy access to the M11 and connecting highways. This needs to be re-visited as it makes no sense whatsoever Other changes to make these plans sound would be to factor into the housing number target, the proposed development of land near, to house the homeless, near Charlie Browns roundabout off the Chigwell Road. I understand circa 150 homes will be built here. Why has this development not been included within the quota of housing in South Woodford.</p>	Wanstead has superior road and tube links to South Woodford	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. A lack of such sites exists in the vicinity of Wanstead and Snaresbrook. Temporary accommodation proposals fall beyond the remit of the Local Plan, and do not propose circa 150 units	No further change required.
R00091/04	Catherine Ridell	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? The consultation period has been flawed and residents have not been provided with sufficient and transparent notice of the plan. Put simply, the lack of transparency during the consultation period is a disgrace. As a targeted 'High Growth and Investment areas' surely the residents of South Woodford should have been written to with the proposals and key dates? I have spoken to at least 50 residents who knew nothing about the plan. I myself only found out through the local village gazette. At the very least the consultation period should be extended to allow residents their democratic right to object to this grossly flawed plan.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? extend the consultation period. write to local residents that will be affected by the plan.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate Comments? I do not know what this means. This feedback form is neither user friendly nor is it in plain English. Another flaw in the plan as it provides a barrier to feedback</p>	residents in Growth and Investment areas should have been written to to notify them of the Local Plan	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.

R00092/01	Paul Harper	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It is not sound because 99% of the residents of the London Borough of Redbridge know nothing about it. My immediate neighbour was the only person in our street to receive the letter: Reference: LPReg19. WHY?</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? A letter to all residents of Redbridge must be sent with details of where they can get a copy of or view the plan. Meetings held prior to this letter must be rescheduled. Full and exhaustive consultation must be gone through before the plan is sent to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? There has been very little community involvement. I did not know of the plan until my neighbour spoke about it. He was the only person in our street who was aware of the plan.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Every resident in the London Borough of Redbridge must be told of the plan, not just a select few.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? The vast majority of residents in the London Borough of Redbridge are unaware of the plan.</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00094/01	rufus alans	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? by halfwits. South Woodford is already overcrowded, congested, polluted, lacking in infrastructure at present to the point of collapse. Central line impossible as it is. you need to check your spellings on this document! this plan NEEDS to be scrapped.Stop being so arrogant and LISTEN to the local people!</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>		. The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line.	
R00096/01	Paul Harper Jonathan Harper c/o Agent	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	no change sought	Noted	
R00097/01	Lesley Saunders	156	site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Specifically, Point 74 of the National Planning Policy states: Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields should not be built on unless: an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Remove Oakfield from the plan as facilities cannot be adequately replaced locally.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00016/01	See response to R00016/01

R00098/01	Margarita Johnson	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? South Woodford is highly populated already without adding any further large developments. Over the last few years we had had the Fenchurch office development turning into flats and also the Queen Mary's development. Both have increased the population in the area. Most of the people living in these development travel into London to work making it impossible to get on the tubes at South Woodford Station. Wanstead, which is not included in this proposal has two tube stations on different sectors of the central line.</p> <p>No extra infrastructure is being put in place and none was put in place when the above developments were constructed. We have no leisure facilities provided by the council in this area although we were promised a swimming pool. Parking is a major issue is South Woodford and you are considering development on the station carpark and other carparks in the area - why? Local residents should have been consulted in more detail and each resident should have been sent details well in advance.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable transport. All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. A lack of such sites exists in the vicinity of Wanstead and Snaresbrook. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.</p>	No further change required
R00098/02	Margarita Johnson	159	site 185	<p>*Soundness Improvements? I am not a planning expert and I pay by council tax to Redbridge and expect you to employ people who know what they are doing which is obviously not the case with this proposal. There are numerous site in the local area that have been left empty for years for example the factory at in Grove Road at the end of Canarvon Road and Stanley Road E18 has not been used for over 20 years yet you have made no attempt to develop this into houses in keeping with the local properties. This is an eyesore but you have done nothing. Instead you want to build more high level blocks in the area</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Canarvon Road / Grove Road site is identified as Opportunity Site 185 (indicative capacity 11 units).</p>	No further change required.
R00098/03	Margarita Johnson	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Parking is an issue locally and by removing the station carpark and others you are making people park in residential roads where there are no residential parking restrictions. In the Roads where I live parking has become a big issue because we have no residents scheme in place. We have all the people who work in Waitrose parking in our roads as well as people commuters using the tube. By developing the carparks this will increase parking in residential roads. This plan will affect the quality of life of the existing residents in the area</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	No further change required

R00098/04	Margarita Johnson	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I do not know how legal the plan is because I am not a lawyer or planning expert I am just a local resident who objects to the proposals for the reason given above. I would also add that as was evident at the meeting on 13/9/16 in South Woodford Library, so are all the local residents who attended. Our views were not taken into consideration and we were told that we had to complete this online document. It cannot be legal to push through plan which will not work without taking into consideration the views of the local people. As your officers were asked at the meeting why was Wanstead and Woodford taken out of the plan?</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? You have not complied because you have not consulted or taken into consideration the view of the local people expressed at meetings. You have not given local residents time to review the plans. You have not listened to the objections raised by the South Woodford Society with regards to this plan you just want to railroad it through as make the lives of all the people living in South Woodford more difficult than they already are by increasing the population without any additional infrastructure.</p>	failure to consider views expressed at public meeting	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required
R00099/01	Eleanor O'hare	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? No indication of enhancement to local infrastructure for a proposed 650 dwellings in South Woodford. There is already strain on NHS, the local hospital, insufficient parking and congested roads. School places are at a premium and the local tube station is already dangerously overcrowded in the rush hour. No indication what the landmark building is and high density high rise property that is not in keeping with the Victorian buildings</p>	objection, no specific change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required
R00099/02	Eleanor O'hare	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Try developing on the other side of the borough. There are better transport links, a choice of underground and overground. A more frequent service on the Hainault branch. There are leisure facilities in the east of the borough better suited to families and areas that need regeneration should be the centre of Ilford</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? No you are not communicating and listening to South Woodford</p>	develop on Hainault loop instead of South Woodford	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required

R00100/01	Lydia Stewart	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Infrastructure, road and rail networks are overcrowded now. The central line is overcrowded, hot and no seats available during rush hour. The north circular is regularly at a standstill during rush hour. As for the proposed plan to make people walk or cycle to work, this is impossible if you work in London where the central line takes passengers, how do you expect an elderly person to cycle or walk to work. The winter months would make this a gruelling journey.</p>		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line.	No further change required
R00100/02	Lydia Stewart	32	Policy LP1D	<p>A local doctors practice has reported in one practice in South Woodform they have over 5600 patients and they can't cope with the number of patients they have now with patients waiting over a week for an appointment to see a doctor. Also having worked for Whipps Cross Hospital for over 11 years, the hospital has been marked for closure twice in the last 11 years because it's been reported as a failing hospital being 30 million in dept with no plan to get out of the dept because it can not cope with the amount of patients going through its doors.</p> <p>Parking is very limited in South Woodford for the amount of residents already living here, if you propose to close then build on carparks you are making it impossible to park, this will mean people will not shop in South Woodford with no parking damaging local businesses. There are limited leisure facilities already in South Woodford, we were promised by the council that South Woodford would get a swimming pool when the last flats were built at Queen Mary's, we did not get this pool we were promised. The local schools will suffer, can you promise more schools so all children can get a place in a school within the catchment area where they live. South Woodford is a Victorian area, the Victorian character must be preserved, no high rise building taking away what we love about South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable transport, whilst Policy LP26 sets out criteria for achieving high quality design that responds to its surroundings.	No further change required

R00100/03	Lydia Stewart	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness Improvements? It's impossible to propose an alternative because the road and rail networks are already at its limit, the rail and road network can not cope now. This is also the case for the doctors surgery, schools and our one local failing in dept hospital. They all need investment to cope with the number of people living here already. The surrounding proposed build areas would also impact the same central line, north circular and Whipps Cross hospital.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? You have not consulted local residents, I have not received any letters, plans e.t.c from the council about this proposal. You can send us our council tax but not a letter about this proposal. Why have local residents not received a letter in the post. Most people I talk to have no idea about the build proposal. You should contact every household by letter.</p>	Investment in road and rail; doctor's surgeries, hospitals	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.13)	No further change required
R00103/01	Lee Burkwood	34	LP1E	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I consider the Local Plan is: (1) NOT legally compliant, (2) UNSOUND because it is NOT Positively Prepared, NOT Justified, will NOT be Effective and is NOT Consistent with National Policy. Furthermore, the Plan does NOT provide evidence that it complies with the Duty to Co-operate. My main concern is the plan to build on Oakfield. Here are my reasons why I feel building on Oakfield as part of the local plan is wrong. Amenity: The part of Oakfield that would be developed is 45 acres of high amenity value open space, 17 adult and youth football pitches, four cricket ovals and two large, modern pavilions. The grass roots sports ground is rated the best in LBR and probably East London. Over 1,000 people use these facilities for sport, recreation and community social activity every week of the year.</p>		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required
R00103/02	Lee Burkwood	-	NPPF para 6-10, 17, 69-70, 73-35, 70-89	<p>Protection: it has been part of the London Metropolitan Open Space since 1938 and then Green Belt, and has enjoyed a Crown Covenant since the War that restricts building development. Asset of Community Value: Oakfield is listed as such by the LBR due to its role in community wellbeing. This will not be continued if Oakfield facilities are re-located from Barkingside. The LBR Local Plan does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 6 to 10 (Sustainable Development), 17 (Principles of Planning), 69-70 (Healthy Communities), 73-75 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation), 79 – 89 (Green Belt).</p>		See responses to R01088/03, R01085/01, R01085/02, and R01088/01	See responses to R01088/03, R01085/01, R01085/02, and R01088/01

R00103/03	Lee Burkwood	-	London Plan 2.18, 3.16, 3.19, 7.1C, 7.3, 7.4A	The Plan does not comply with London Plan Policies 2.18 (Green Infrastructure), 3.16 (Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure), nor 3.19 (Sports Facilities), nor 7.1C, 7.3, 7.4A, in the Living Spaces chapter dealing with Lifetime Neighbourhoods and Designing Out Crime.		See response to R01085/02	See response to R01085/02
R00103/04	Lee Burkwood	120	Policy LP34 c)	The LBR Local Plan 2015 – 2030 contains many contradictions and inconsistencies within the Plan itself and in relation to the Council's own evidence base. These are too many to list here. The 2010 Green Belt Review by Buchanan shows that Oakfield continues to meet two of the purposes of Green Belt as laid down in NPPF paragraph 80. Oakfield prevents urban sprawl. Oakfield separates Barkingside from Hainault as per the LBR Local Plan Policy LP34(c). There are insufficient exceptional circumstances that outweigh the undoubted benefits of Oakfield such that LBR can claim that there is a necessity to develop it for housing. Housing on Oakfield would amount to less than 3% of the Borough's objectively assessed need in the Plan period.	comment, no change sought	See response to R01088/01	See response to R01088/01
R00103/05	Lee Burkwood	40	Policy LP3	The amount of social and affordable housing would be inconsequential. On the other hand, the immense amenity value for the community will be sustained if the well organised, volunteer led sports & social clubs on Oakfield are allowed to continue on site.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required
R00103/06	Lee Burkwood	-	PPS	The Draft Alternative Playing Pitch Sites Assessment by Cundall is unsafe. It contains multiple material mistakes and omissions. It is not independent. As witnessed in emails, LBR instructed Cundall to make changes and deletions to their assessments. The sections on the Forest Road site has been manipulated by BR to avoid 'showstoppers'. The report takes no adequate account of the quality of sports facilities needed in top amateur cricket and football. It takes no account whatsoever of the impact on social infrastructure issues. The recommended alternative sites for Oakfield are included in the latest LBR Mineral (extraction) Plan development – as witnessed by recent correspondence between LBR and Savills - and may be unavailable in the Plan period.	Alternative sites may be wanted for mineral extraction	See response to R01085/08	See response to R01085/08

R00103/07	Lee Burkwood	36	<p>Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35, Site 135</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate: LBR has not meaningfully cooperated with other Boroughs to identify brownfield sites elsewhere to help meet its objectively assessed housing needs. Modifications are required as follows: Remove Oakfield from the list of Opportunity Sites. Remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5 in the Local Plan. Retain LP34: (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Land) but add to Implementation, "2 The Council will seek to enhance the accessibility and opportunities on Hainault Plain, in particular at Oakfield." In LP35: (Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces) remove Oakfield from paragraph (g) which is inconsistent with and indeed reverses the policies in the previous paragraphs (a) to (f).</p> <p>*Legally Sound? No *Legally Sound Comments? The Plan does not comply with London Plan Policies 2.18 (Green Infrastructure), 3.16 (Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure), nor 3.19 (Sports Facilities), nor 7.1C, 7.3, 7.4A, in the Living Spaces chapter dealing with Lifetime Neighbourhoods and Designing Out Crime. It should comply with London plan policies.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? LBR has not meaningfully cooperated with other Boroughs to identify brownfield sites elsewhere to help meet its objectively assessed housing needs.</p>	remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5; add Oakfield to LP34; remove Oakfield from LP35 para (g)	See reponse to R01085/01	See reponse to R01085/01
R00104/01	Patricia Darvell	32	<p>Paras 3.2, 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.7,</p> <p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Improvements? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	South Woodford	See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01

R00104/02	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both also identified as investment and growth areas.</p> <p>Charlie Browns Roundabout is on the strategic road network and is therefore under the control of TfL. The Local Plan (para 3.6.7) has committed to continuing to work with TfL to seek improvements and to address some of the issues at the roundabout, particularly in relation to air quality. TfL has recently notified the Council that it is considering a scheme to signalise the roundabout and make improvements. Consultation is expected later in 2017.</p> <p>In light of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33) findings, site 118 has subsequently been proposed for protection as a Local Business Area.</p>	See Policies Map Modification Schedule.
R00104/03	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06

R00104/04	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required
R00104/05	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/11.	See response R00108/11.
R00104/06	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/12.	See response R00108/12.

R00104/07	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	See response to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00104/08	Patricia Darvell	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	See response R00108/01
R00104/09	Patricia Darvell	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	See response R00108/11	See response R00108/11
R00104/10	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14	See response R00108/14
R00104/11	Patricia Darvell	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15	See response R00108/15

R00105/01	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? In order to be found sound at examination the plan must be: i) Positively prepared – it must be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements; ii) Justified – it should be based on robust evidence and should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives; iii) Effective – it should be deliverable over the plan period and be based on effective joint working; and iv) Consistent with national planning policy – it has to have regard to, and give effect to, the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as well as extant national planning policy statements and guidance. South Woodford District Centre is identified in the Regulation 19 pre-submission draft plan in policy LP1D as an "Investment and Growth Area" with an expectation of seeking the delivery of growth and regeneration over the plan period to 2030 to provide an additional 650 new homes, 2,000 sq.m of new retail floorspace, 5,000sq.m of new employment floorspace and the generation of 100 new jobs.</p>	comment, no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00105/02	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>For the reasons set out below, I believe that the growth area proposals for South Woodford fail both the first and third NPPF soundness tests by virtue of the failure to provide a strategy for development based on delivery during the plan period of the necessary supporting infrastructure requirements. I have not seen the necessarily robust evidence upon which the strategy for South Woodford as articulated in the draft plan purportedly relies. It follows that the failure to provide sufficiently clarity and robust evidence on essential supporting infrastructure provision must mean that this section of the plan also fails the justified soundness test. In addition, it is highly questionable whether the resulting growth and development as is currently proposed in the draft plan would be truly sustainable.</p>	comment, no change sought	The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed development and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the Plan.	No further change required.

R00105/03	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Arguably therefore the fourth soundness test is failed too in that the draft plan in respect of policy LP1D cannot said to be consistent with the overarching sustainable development policy and principles articulated in the NPPF and the Government's online Planning Practice Guidance. If we are to build and create communities that will endure for our children and grandchildren's generations we need visionary Council leadership, dynamic elected representatives and imaginative planners. The Redbridge pre submission draft plan proposals fall short of enabling us to collectively meet this objective. I am aware that in addition to highlighting shortcomings in draft plans to be examined, Inspectors welcome an indication from those making representations as to what they would wish to see the plan saying instead.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>. The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough.</p>	No change required.
R00105/04	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>The remainder of my representation below seeks to do this. How the Local Plan might be revised so as to articulate the creation of a vision for a truly sustainable South Woodford In order to create a truly balanced and mixed sustainable community much more is needed than the current draft suggests; failure to do so represents a missed opportunity for the Local Plan to be far more visionary. As currently drafted, the plan in respect of this part of the Borough at least, appears to be reactive to development pressures rather than taking the opportunity to be positively and proactively place shaping in its intent. I understand that the South Woodford Society intend shortly to establish a Neighbourhood Forum with the intention of then creating a Neighbourhood Plan. That being the case, it is to be hoped that this plan, which once made will of course form part of the local development plan for the Borough, will provide this missing positive vision for South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>. The Council believes that Policy LP1D sets out a sound, positive and sustainable vision for South Woodford. Response R00108/01 proposes to modify the Local Plan by adding to the supporting text for Policy LP1D, expressing why the strategy for the South Woodford Investment and Growth Area is a proactive and sound vision.</p>	No change required.
R00105/05	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>The only key infrastructure/projects identified to meet the developments as listed in policy LP1D are relatively small scale (but nevertheless still important) high street and public realm improvements and improved cycling infrastructure – for education and health infrastructure the reader is directed to Appendix 2 which contains no site specific proposals for provision within the South Woodford / Woodford area. Also listed in policy LP1D is preserving and enhancing the George Lane and South Woodford Conservation Areas. Whilst I totally agree that this is very important in order to preserve the intrinsic quality, attraction and feel of the area, it seems odd to include this reference here with the inference of being an infrastructure project.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>. The list of key infrastructure/projects in Policy LP1D is not an exhaustive list. Preserving and enhancing conservation areas ARE projects, which may well involve improvements to infrastructure.</p>	No change required.

R00105/06	Ken Bean	32	para 3.6.5	<p>On this matter I find it difficult to see how, as the draft plan advocates, constructing a “contemporary landmark” (euphemism for very tall building) in this location where the prevailing building height is 2-3 stories would achieve the preserving and enhancing of the Conservation Areas. I note that a recent opinion poll conducted by Ipsos MORI found that a majority of Londoners would support a limit on both the height and number of tall buildings granted planning permission in the capital. Whilst a collective of tall buildings together in the appropriate location (City of London and Docklands) can provide interest and even be inspirational on the skyline, random solitary tall buildings in the suburbs or set apart from other (like Ilford’s Pioneer Point or even the ‘Walkie Talkie’) have the opposite effect.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>. Landmark buildings are not necessarily tall, Barkingside Library for instance is a local landmark but only a single storey in height. As part of the modifications in response to comments submitted during the pre-submission consultation for the Local Plan, the text at paragraph 3.6.5 has been amended to make clear the Council’s aspirations for high quality developments in South Woodford. See response R00108/14.</p>	See response R00108/01.
R00105/07	Ken Bean	101	Policy LP27	<p>High quality design means the right building in the right location and I think it clear that the majority view of South Woodford residents is that South Woodford is not an appropriate location for a building that is significantly taller than its surroundings. If higher density development is to be built in this location (Station Estate) in close proximity to South Woodford tube station then why not build well planned up to 4 or 5 storey blocks? In doing so inspiration might be taken from and perhaps seeking to emulate the design principles of the 18th Century London squares – as the Georgians proved to us, it is a misnomer to believe that to achieve high density building tall is a prerequisite! London squares were built for people to live in.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	No change required.
R00105/08	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>The layout of Georgian and Victorian squares created an ordered, spacious arrangement of streets and leafy open spaces which has made an enduring contribution to the quality of life in London. Most were garden squares, originally built as private communal gardens for use by the inhabitants of the surrounding houses. Today, London’s squares are a vital part of the city’s fabric: a focus for local communities and pleasant places for Londoners in which to live, work and relax. They can also be a haven for wildlife, important links in the green chain between the city’s parks and back gardens, and occasional oases in built-up areas. Today, private squares co-exist with those run by councils, more open in their layouts and often with playgrounds and sports facilities. Public ownership has allowed more people to enjoy the delights of squares, which provide vital access to recreation and green surroundings in poorer urban areas. This type of space is most prevalent in central London, but squares are also found in the suburbs – so why not be ambitious and plan a contemporary London Square through the Local plan (and then detailed masterplan SPD / design code) for the Station Estate in South Woodford?</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>. The planning brief for the Station Estate that was drafted and adopted by the Council in April 2015 offered two urban design options, both contained a public open space or square at the heart of the proposed development options, with a larger space in the second option. Both spaces contained green areas and tree planting. However a petition was lodged against the brief which is now in abeyance and awaiting alteration/further work.</p>	See response R00108/14.

R00105/09	Ken Bean	32	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.4	<p>Transportation Paragraph 3.6.4 of the draft plan notes that the District centre of South Woodford is well served by public transport such as South Woodford Underground Station on the Central Line and rightly requires any growth to be contingent on improved capacity on Central Line – not only at peak hours. Transport into and out of the area is heavily reliant on the Central Line, with a very large percentage of the area’s resident working population using the tube on a daily basis to commute to their jobs in London. The Central Line is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how its potential could be improved.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Local Plan Policy LP22 also states that the Council will resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on capacity on local and strategic road networks and public transport. As a statutory consultee Transport for London (TfL) is notified on all planning applications for new development, and will inform the Council where serious capacity issues are implied by development affecting roads or near train stations. Transport for London (TfL) have also identified ways in which capacity on public transport can be increased such as through improved signalling on the Central Line and walk through trains.</p>	See response to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00105/10	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Indeed, anticipated levels of growth for Districts further out – principally Epping Forest District Council - is only going to add to current overcrowding levels on the Central Line by virtue of even more commuters boarding and alighting from stations from Buckhurst Hill through to Epping. I remain to be convinced that the construction of Crossrail will significantly impact on the Central Line and there appears to be no indication in either the draft Plan or supporting evidence of improved capacity; nor am I aware that TfL has indicated either through the Mayor’s London Plan or on its website any intention, let alone committed funds, for planned investment in increased capacity.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>As stated above at response R00105/09 the Council is working in partnership with strategic transport authorities such as TfL to identify ways in which capacity on public transport can be increased.</p>	No change required.
R00105/11	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>The planned additional population in South Woodford will also inevitably generate additional car use and therefore add to the existing congestion and on street parking capacity issues, regardless of the level of parking is provided on new developments. Traffic is already at breaking point in the area, particularly during peak hours, and there is no indication given in the draft plan that the housing or “growth” targets will be accompanied with commensurate improvements to the existing road infrastructure designed to improve existing capacity and traffic flows through the area.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. The aim of the Policy is to encourage a modal shift away from the use of the private car. Another objective is to implement the Mayor’s Transport Strategy locally and deliver the Local Implementation Plan. The Council also intend to maintain and improve transport infrastructure. The Local Plan also directs development to areas well supported by good public transport infrastructure to help reduce car journeys; supports transport projects that promote and increase the use of public transport; supports improvements to Central Line stations; encourages walking and cycling; will work with TfL and London Buses to improve the frequency of bus services; require major development to submit transport assessments and green travel plans; resist development that might result in unacceptable impacts on the transport network, as well as other measures. These are all the things a responsible Local Planning Authority can and should do to promote sustainable transport, and clearly the Council is doing all it can as outlined in Local Plan policy.</p>	No change required.

R00105/12	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>School Places In addition to transportation, there is no indication given of where the additional state sector school spaces will be provided to educate the additional pupils generated by the 650 additional new homes together with the additional “temporary” 150 units proposed on the site adjacent to Charlie Brown’s roundabout. The plan will therefore seemingly have to rely on a wing and a prayer that promoters of free schools come forward and are able to find suitable sites (not an easy task given the already very built up nature of the area) to address additional provision. All the current primary schools in South Woodford / Woodford are full with very limited – if any - additional capacity to expand. Certainly at the school where I currently serve as Chair of the Governing Body, the four form entry Churchfields Infants’ Nursery and Language Facility School, we have now exhausted all possible opportunities utilising to maximum effect every square meter to enhance educational provision on our site for the existing number of pupils and certainly on our very constrained site cannot absorb increased pupil numbers.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>See response R00108/01. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 does plan for schools at current provision, and identifies future requirements between 2015 and 2022. It includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough. The Council recognises that There is a need for school places in the borough, specifically secondary school places. The IDP is a ‘live’ document that is continually updated with thinternal and external partners.</p>	No change required.
R00105/13	Ken Bean	161	Site 217	<p>The local state secondary school – Woodbridge – also operating on a very constrained site with no playing fields has recently expanded to a 10 form entry school and surely cannot accommodate even more pupils without very significant detriment to the quality of education provided. I have repeatedly suggested over the last 15 years that the former Woodford Football Ground be used as this site is I understand owned by the Council and the land identified in the extant local plan for education use. I therefore fail to understand the continued reluctance of Woodbridge High School and the Council to grasp this opportunity to operate from this second site – less than a mile from the current school. The site lends itself to perhaps dual use, certainly to provide the school with its own much needed sports field and also perhaps constructing a 6th form centre, thereby creating greater capacity on the very overcrowded main school site.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Site identified as an opportunity site in Appendix 1 (site 217)</p>	No change required.

R00105/14	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Health and other Social and Community Infrastructure Given the increased population proposed, the draft plan is silent on and therefore fails to explain how South Woodford will cope with no increased provision in terms of GP surgeries, community and leisure services – lacking either an indoor publicly run sports centre or swimming pool, this side of the Borough has historically been very poorly served in this respect and residents tend to look towards neighbouring Waltham Forest for these facilities.</p> <p>Again this Local Plan provides an opportunity to address to imbalance by planning for some provision to be made in the Woodford / South Woodford area. Were the Council to take up my suggestion above for use of the former Woodford Football Ground then dual could be made by Woodbridge School and the community through the provision of sports facilities on this site.</p>	Provide healthcare, community, leisure facilities in South Woodford	<p>See response R00108/01</p> <p>The former Woodford Football Club ground (Development Opportunity Site 217) is indicated for leisure / community / healthcare use within Phase 3 of the plan (ie 2026 to 2030). The Wanstead and Woodford area of the borough has two major sports and leisure facilities, Wanstead Leisure Centre and Ashton Playing Fields, and a large number of sports pitches and playing fields, including Wanstead Flats, with affiliated clubs that play football, cricket and rugby. The provision of leisure facilities is part of the Council's strategy to deliver adequate levels of community facilities and is considered in the supporting text of Policy LP17 Delivering Community Infrastructure. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) also considers the current and future provision of leisure facilities, and is informed by the Redbridge Cultural and Leisure Strategy 2015-19. Investment for future provision will focus on intensification of existing use/facilities and increasing access to this provision. This will involve developing new facilities; making existing facilities open for use to the community; improving existing facilities; and bringing unused facilities back into use to meet future demand.</p>	See response R00108/01.
R00105/15	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Local Employment Opportunities I am aware of, and indeed largely share, the South Woodford Society's representations and concerns about the potential impact that the draft Plan's proposals are likely to have on jobs. I accept that to a large extent Central Government's continued relaxation of permitted development rights limits the Council's ability to control the continued loss of employment opportunities including offices to residential use. Constant changes to the planning system since 2004 have and are continuing to hinder our ability to deliver quality places. This is of course detrimental to the creation of sustainable and balanced communities in terms of restricting the opportunities for local residents to work locally and harmful to other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Local people will have to travel further to get to work thereby exacerbating further existing public transportation overcrowding and traffic congestion. Also, whilst not having the evidence to prove it, anecdotally I understand that profitable businesses are being forced out of the area to relocate in order to facilitate the building of new homes.</p>	Ensure local employment / business sites remain	<p>Several existing employment areas are protected on the basis of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33), and new fit for purpose business space will be sought as part of mixed use developments</p>	No change required.
R00105/16	Ken Bean	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Please see my detailed comments above. In short, at the examination stage I invite the Inspector to recommend that the following modifications be made in respect of South Woodford in order that the Redbridge Local Plan be found sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone • Remove reference to landmark buildings in South Woodford 	Modify the Plan by removing South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone, and reference to landmark buildings in South Woodford	See response R00108/01 and R00108/14.	No change required.

R00105/17	Ken Bean	32	Para 3.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend consequential changes be made so as to ensure that South Woodford remains open for business, keeping a viable economy in the High Street with a mix of footfall throughout the day, night and weekends. 	comment, no change sought	Noted	See response R00108/11.
R00105/18	Ken Bean	161	Site 217	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure adequate specific infrastructure proposals are identified for the area in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in order to accommodate any commensurate growth levels that the Inspector may approve. Consideration be given to use of the former Woodford Football ground as dual community leisure and education use. 	comment, no change sought	The former Woodford Football Club ground (Development Opportunity Site 217) is indicated for leisure / community / healthcare use within Phase 3 of the plan (ie 2026 to 2030). As stated at response R00105/14.	See response R00108/01 and R00108/14.
R00105/19	Ken Bean	32	Para 3.6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Station Estate be considered for a contemporary London squares residential led mixed use type development that incorporates care and extra care provision for the elderly, community uses including a community care, pocket park / open space / playground provision as part of the design. 	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15. Responses R00105/11; R00105/12 and R00105/14 discuss infrastructure delivery.	No change required.
R00105/20	Ken Bean	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes 	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00107/01	Jonathan Williams	21	Para 3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Soundness? No *Soundness Improvements? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan. 	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	No change required.
R00107/02	Jonathan Williams	33	Paras 1.21.4	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	No further change required.

R00107/03	Jonathan Williams	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06
R00107/04	Jonathan Williams	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/09	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/09

R00107/05	Jonathan Williams	33	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12
R00107/06	Jonathan Williams	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses R00108/14 and R00108/17	See responses R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00107/07	Jonathan Williams	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	See response R00108/01
R00107/08	Jonathan Williams	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	See response R00108/11	See response R00108/11
R00107/09	Jonathan Williams	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14	See response R00108/14

R00107/10	Jonathan Williams	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15	See response R00108/15
R00108/01	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Local Plan is unsound because it is not positively prepared or effective Para 3.2. Investment & Growth Area designation - South Woodford designated for more than 650 homes with no infrastructure improvements, will not cope with increased population</p>	Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment & Growth Area	<p>South Woodford has been identified as an Investment & Growth Area because it has an active, thriving district centre located around good levels of local public transport including South Woodford Underground Station, and has capacity for further development. The area also includes a key Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) at Southend Road that the Council wants to protect and direct industrial activity towards.</p> <p>The Local Plan approach of directing growth towards Investment & Growth Areas and town centres is a positive strategy to enable the delivery of successful places and a thriving economy, and provide a robust planning framework against which the aspirations of the Council can be successfully delivered. It is considered that the preferred approach in the Local Plan is on balance the most sustainable. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan, which has informed the Plan and supports the preferred strategy within it. Paragraph 3.2.1 explicitly states that each of the Plan's Investment and Growth Areas are distinctive in their own way with their own individual context and character and proposed level of growth.</p> <p>The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan, as well as the policy position. The IDP plans for the expansion of schools in the borough by looking at current provision and identifying future requirements between 2015 and 2022, and includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough, The IDP also discusses provision of infrastructure for open space, leisure, community and health facilities to support growth in the borough. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.</p>	No further change required.

R00108/02	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<u>Para. 1.21.4.</u> South Woodford station unable to cope with current footfall (1.21.4), how can its capacity be improved? Growth should be focused at stations with less footfall, such as Hainault station	No change sought	<p>Policy LP22 within the Local Plan states that the Council will resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on capacity on local and strategic road networks and public transport. As a statutory consultee Transport for London (TfL) is notified on all planning applications for new development, and will inform the Council where serious capacity issues are implied by development affecting roads or near train stations. Transport for London (TfL) have also identified ways in which capacity on public transport can be increased such as through improved signalling on the Central Line and walk through trains.</p> <p>The Council is working in partnership with strategic transport authorities such as TfL and Network Rail to deliver Crossrail and invest in renewing transport infrastructure and public realm, and improved infrastructure to support growth. Infrastructure improvements in South Woodford will include improved cycle infrastructure and improvements to the junction at Charlie Brown's roundabout, to reduce the level of traffic congestion and improve the pedestrian and cycle network.</p> <p>The Local Plan concentrates growth at other stations within the borough, at Fairlop, Barkingside, and Gants Hill Underground Stations, and in particular at Ilford Station and three Overground Stations within the Crossrail Corridor (see Policy LP1 Spatial Development Strategy i).</p>	No further change required.
R00108/03	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	Site 116	<u>Para. 3.6.7.</u> - How can the Council make improvements to the junction at Charlie Brown's roundabout where much of the development is proposed? (sites 116, 118 & 119). Lack of consideration for road infrastructure	No change sought	<p>Charlie Browns Roundabout is on the strategic road network and is therefore under the control of TfL. The Local Plan (para 3.6.7) has committed to continuing to work with TfL to seek improvements and to address some of the issues at the roundabout, particularly in relation to air quality.</p> <p>TfL has recently notified the Council that it is considering a scheme to signalise the roundabout and make improvements. Consultation is expected later in 2017.</p>	<p>Add the following text to the end of para. 3.6.4 as follows.</p> <p><u>The designation of South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Area will ensure a strategy for growth that boosts local business and commercial activity through new mixed use development, as well delivering additional homes. The objective is to increase footfall in South Woodford District Centre and create jobs, strengthening it economically. Opportunities have been identified where improvements can take place, but the Council also recognises the special character of South Woodford, which underpins its designation as an Investment and Growth Area. A balanced approach to development and the preservation of local heritage assets and their settings will be required, and new development must respect local character and make a positive contribution to the area.</u></p> <p><u>Update Appendix 2 to show proposed education provision in the west of the borough.</u></p>
R00108/04	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	155	Site 122	Schools - No plans for schools with the planned new homes	No change sought	See response to R00108/01	No further change required
R00108/05	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	Current school expansion not planned to cope with future demand resulting from planned growth	No change sought	See response to R00108/01.	No further change required
R00108/06	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Woodbridge school will struggle to cope with plans for expansion. Sports facilities will be sacrificed to accommodate excessive pupil numbers. The Council is taking risks with children's education and safety.	No change sought	There is a need for school places in the borough, specifically secondary school places, The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (July 2016) identifies the infrastructure needed to deliver planned growth set out in the Local Plan sustainably. The expansion of Woodbridge School is one such improvement necessary to absorb some of this demand. This expansion has taken into account existing playing fields and it is considered by the Council that this will not compromise children's safety.	No further change required
R00108/07	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Policy LP1D	<u>Other Infrastructure</u> - Local Plan does not plan for doctor's surgeries, community/leisure services, childcare and hospitals	No change sought	See response to R00108/01 above	No further change required
R00108/08	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	How will South Woodford cope with increased population and no plans for infrastructure?	Make reference in the Local Plan to community infrastructure supporting growth.	See response to R00108/01 above	No further change required.

R00108/09	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Para 3.6.5	Infrastructure plans in the Local Plan are unsustainable and will create increased travel patterns for South Woodford residents in order to use schools and sports/leisure facilities	No change sought	<p>See response to R00108/01</p> <p>Local Plan Policy LP35 states that the Council will support new high quality outdoor sports facilities and promote sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports.</p> <p>The Council is currently undertaking a feasibility study associated with the delivery of a new swimming pool in the Wanstead area. Once finalised, the IDP will be updated to reflect this. Details of the location will be confirmed. The proposal of a new pool in Wanstead is considered to meet the demand in the west of the borough.</p>	No further change required.
R00108/10	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Para 3.6.5	No adequate plans for leisure provision in South Woodford (site 122 is inadequate)	No change sought	<p>The Wanstead and Woodford area of the borough has two major sports and leisure facilities, Wanstead Leisure Centre and Ashton Playing Fields, and a large number of sports pitches and playing fields, including Wanstead Flats, with affiliated clubs that play football, cricket and rugby. The provision of leisure facilities is part of the Council's strategy to deliver adequate levels of community facilities and is considered in the supporting text of Policy LP17 Delivering Community Infrastructure. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) also considers the current and future provision of leisure facilities, and is informed by the Redbridge Cultural and Leisure Strategy 2015-19. Investment for future provision will focus on intensification of existing use/facilities and increasing access to this provision.</p> <p>LP35 also states that the Council will protect and enhance the quality of open space and will improve access to existing green space. The policy commits the Council to support for new high quality outdoor sports facilities and the promotion of sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports.</p> <p>See response R00108/09 above in relation to a proposed new swimming pool in the Wanstead area.</p>	No further change required.
R00108/11	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	61	Policy LP14	See above.	See above.	See above.	No further change required
R00108/12	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	12		Para. 1.17.8 references poor office space; there has been no new office space in South Woodford for many years.	No change sought	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 discusses some of the economic issues and challenges facing the borough. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deal with these issues, which includes identifying Investment and Growth Areas, and improving existing employment areas to attract investment in order to maximise employment opportunities across the borough.</p>	No further change required

R00108/13	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	61	LP14	Business are displaced by homes and must relocate; local people travel further to work placing burdens on transport, traffic and childcare	No change sought	See response to R00108/11	<p>Amend paragraph 3.21.3 to read:</p> <p>Industrial land uses continue to make a valuable contribution to local employment and provide important local services. The Council recognises the role these play in providing a suitable range of jobs and acting as locations in the borough for jobs, and therefore seeks to protect its best quality industrial land alongside planned growth of new business space. A number of leading UK-companies have made Redbridge their head office location in recent years.</p> <p>Amend LP14(c) to read:</p> <p>(c) Intensifying and managing Local Business Areas of Newton Industrial Estate, Forest Road, Hainault Works, and Ravens Road, and Connaught Road West. In these areas the Council will support:</p> <p>Amend LP14(c)(ii) to read:</p> <p>Mixed use employment led schemes which include housing and live/work units as long as it does not prejudice the ongoing use of the area for business purposes, there is no net loss of employment space, and where residential use is compatible with existing employment uses.</p> <p>Insert new point (d) to read as follows (and renumber subsequent policy points accordingly):</p> <p><u>d) Seeking to protect Local Business Areas at The Shrubberies, Barnado's, Coventry Road and Cranbrook Road, Beal Road, Wellesley Road, and Roden Street North for continued office use.</u></p> <p>Amend existing LP14 point (d) (iii) to read:</p> <p>iii) Include compatible modern fit for purpose employment uses as part of any new or replacement mixed use schemes.</p>
R00108/13a	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	61	LP14	As above	As above	As above	<p>Amend existing LP14 point (e) to read:</p> <p>Supporting a minimum 21,206 sq.m of new purpose built modern flexible office and business accommodation in Investment and Growth Areas, and town centres, and other land previously used for employment purposes, to accommodate small and medium enterprises (SME) falling in Class B1; and</p> <p>Add to end of 3.21.4:</p> <p><u>In doing so, poorer quality space can be released to more productive use such as housing, whilst in appropriate locations also offering the opportunity to secure compatible business space for modern business needs as part of mixed use developments.</u></p> <p>Rephrase last sentence of 3.21.9 to read:</p> <p>Such diversification could include housing as part of a mix of employment and commercial uses, provided this does not undermine the overall business function of the area.</p>
R00108/13b	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	61	LP14	As above	As above	As above	<p>Amend paragraph 3.21.10 to read:</p> <p>Offices provide an important component of local employment. However, as the ELR (2016) identifies, the borough hosts a considerable supply of outdated and underutilised office accommodation which no longer meets market demand and is failing to contribute to local employment. The majority of such sites are referred to as non-designated employment land and their redevelopment or conversion to more productive uses is broadly supported. The ELR does however also identify some town centre office stock with use and characteristics that merit protection, and such sites have subsequently been designated as Local Business Areas. the future use of such sites is being further undermined by changes to permitted development rights meaning the Council has little control over changes of use conversions from offices to residential.</p> <p>Update Policies Map to reflect the above employment designations.</p>

R00108/14	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Para 3.6.5	<u>Para. 3.6.5 Landmark building on Station Estate</u> – Residents petition with 2,000 signatures rejected tall buildings	Amend text at para. 3.6.5 by removing reference to a landmark building.	While higher density development is generally considered more acceptable closer to highly accessible location such as stations, the term 'landmark building' does not necessarily mean 'tall building', rather it relates to the Council's aspiration of bringing forward a development of high quality design that respects and contributes to the character of the existing area. Any future development of Station Estate will be subject to a planning application and consultation with the local community. Agree to amend paragraph 3.6.5 to make it clear the Council's aspiration for high quality developments in South Woodford.	Re-word para. 3.6.5. line 9 to read as follows: 'The Council will seek to create a contemporary landmark within the town-centre at Station Estate. This building should be sympathetically designed to deliver high quality developments on these Opportunity Sites that respect the local character of the surrounding area (Policies LP26, 27 and 33).
R00108/15	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	Para 3.6.5	Para. 3.6.5 proposes a landmark building on Station Estate conflicting with para 3.6.8 regarding local character. Station Estate would be better used for specialist accommodation for the elderly. The plan cites a lack of such facilities at 3.10.	Amend text at para. 3.6.5 by removing reference to a landmark building. Change Local Plan to reflect potential community uses on site 117	The term 'landmark building' does not necessarily mean 'tall building', rather it relates to the Council's aspiration of bringing forward a development of high quality design that respects and contributes to the character of the existing area. With regard to the suggestion that Station Estate could be partly used for specialist accommodation, the Local Plan does not preclude that possibility.. However any proposals for specialist accommodatuion on the site would need to meet the tests within Policy LP4: Specialist Accommodation	No further change required
R00108/16	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	32	LP1D	Why is the strategic Local Plan specifically identifying a landmark building in South Woodford?	Remove reference to landmark buildings on Station Estate	See response R00108/14.	See response R00108/14.
R00108/17	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	101	Policy LP27	How do proposals for tall buildings in the South Woodford Investment and Growth Area fit in with protecting local character and heritage?	No change sought	See response to R00108/14 above. The emerging Local Plan does not make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford. Paragraph 5.2.12 explicitly states that opportunities for tall buildings are fewer in areas like South Woodford and Barkingside because of existing character and overall scale and mass of buildings being at lower heights of 2-3 or 4 storeys. These areas are generally more sensitive to buildings of substantial height and bulk. The Tall Building designation for Station Estate, as set out in the Core Strategy (2008), has been removed from the draft Local Plan. The Station Estate site is retained as a development opportunity site for mixed use, including housing and commercial. The Council has also undertaken a Tall Buildings study of the borough, to support the policy position of the Local Plan and to ascertain areas in the borough that can accommodate this type of development. Initial findings indicate that due to a general lack of tall buildings in the area, and the local character development opportunities are limited. Following adoption of the Local Plan, the Planning Brief for the Station Estate at Eastwood Close will be updated to reflect the most up-to-date position in relation to development proposals for Station Estate.	To reflect the adopted Planning Brief for Station Estate, update the preferred uses column for site 117 of Appendix 1 to include community uses as a preferred use.
R00108/18	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	Site 116	<u>Site 116, 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park</u> – the map for the development opportunity site includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed	Remove Rose Avenue Park from site map 116	Agree to proposed modification.	See above modification at response R00108/14

R00108/19	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	Site 116	Opportunity Site 116, 120 Chigwell Road, South Woodford is marked as Flood Zone 3b and should not be developed for housing	The findings of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA April 2016) for Redbridge, which has been approved by the Environment Agency (EA), states that site 116 is covered by Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3a, none of which are functional floodplains. The site is not entirely suitable for residential use, and on those parts of the site that are unsuitable, development proposals should be directed towards less vulnerable uses.	The findings of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA April 2016) for Redbridge, which has been approved by the Environment Agency (EA), states that site 116 is covered by Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3a, none of which are functional floodplains. The site is not entirely suitable for residential use, and on those parts of the site that are unsuitable, development proposals should be directed towards less vulnerable uses.	Amend bullet point 2 in the Implementation section of Policy LP1 as follows: 2 The Council will prepare and facilitate the production and updating of planning briefs and/or Masterplans for the key Opportunity Sites as required. In particular, master-planning frameworks will be prepared to guide the future development at Oakfield, Goodmayes and King George Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, land at Billet Road, Station Estate and Gants Hill Opportunity Sites;
R00108/20	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	Site 116	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Opportunity Site 116, 120 Chigwell Road, South Woodford This site, which is marked as Flood Zone 3b, has been identified in the Local plan as a development opportunity site earmarked for housing. This area is located within the London Borough of Redbridge functional floodplain and therefore residential development is not considered appropriate. The Environmental Agency (EA) wrote to the council on 11th January 2012 and 2nd February 2012 in response to planning application ref 2207/11.</p> <p>Both letters make clear reference to Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) that residential should not be permitted and the area should only be used for water-compatible uses in the functional floodplain. There is no ambiguity in the EA's assessment of residential development proposals in this area as any housing would be at a high risk of flooding. The council make use of the "Exception testing" where development will provide "sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and that it will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall"</p>		The plan is supported by a Flood Risk sequential test that is supported by the Environment Agency. Any proposals in flood zones will require a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment as set out in policy LP21	Amend site boundary on site ref 116 to remove Rose Avenue Park from the opportunity site boundary.

R00108/21	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	154	Site 116	<p>There are no mitigating circumstances that can justify residential development on this functional floodplain. Residential development is inappropriate and the council is merely looking to MAXIMISE housing development in South Woodford. Whether they propose to build "temporary housing" or permanent housing the result is the same. Any residential development is not sustainable. The site should be left clear for water use.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Remove proposed use of "Residential" for site 116; 120 Chigwell Road South Woodford Proposed use should be "Industrial/Commercial/Open space"</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Proposal to build temporary or permanent housing on a the functional floodplain does not agree with Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) which states that only water-compatible uses and the essential infrastructure listed in Table D.2 should be permitted in the functional floodplain. Remove proposed use of "Residential" from Site 116, 120 Chigwell Road, South Woodford</p>		See response to R00108/20	Change preferred uses and indicative numbers of homes in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan for site116, to reflect feasible land uses based on the different levels of flood risk across the site. See separate schedule of proposed modifications to Appendix 1.
R00110/01	Kerry Knowles	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Approximately 50% of the site at 120 Chigwell Road is in fact flood zones 1 and 2 and those parts of the site could be suitable for more vulnerable uses such as housing. Where proposals are made for the development of the site a detailed flood risk assessments (FRA) will be required for the whole site in order to demonstrate compliance with the Exception Test.</p>		. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Ilford, the Crossrail Corridor Barkingside and Aldborough are each projected to deliver substantially more housing over the Plan period than South Woodford. For issues relating to the status of South Woodford as an Investment & Growth Area, and tall buildings in South Woodford see responses R00108/01 and R00108/14 respectively.	
R00111/01	Maggy Farrow SWS	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons:- Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 home, however there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INTRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01

R00111/02	Maggy Farrow SWS	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4. and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention to further growth should focus.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences 'high levels of traffic at peak times'. How can the Council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116, 118, & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00104/02	See responses to R00104/02
R00111/03	Maggy Farrow SWS	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 650 new homes PLUS the 150 temporary units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale primary Schools are in place to cop with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to uild new school blocks and they have had to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds of students. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/06 and R00108/09	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/06 and R00108/09

R00111/04	Maggy Farrow SWS	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodfords cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years?</p> <p>The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with a better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities at Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is nor sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	
R00111/05	Maggy Farrow SWS	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford. Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for businesses to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damage other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12

R00111/06	Maggy Farrow SWS	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the Council will 'seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character' How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing; homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14 and R00108/17	See response R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00111/07	Maggy Farrow SWS	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	See response R00108/01
R00111/08	Maggy Farrow SWS	154	Sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/11	See response R00108/11
R00111/09	Maggy Farrow SWS	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14	See response R00108/14
R00111/10	Maggy Farrow SWS	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15	See response R00108/15

R00112/01	Saqib Malik	156	site 135	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I don't see why more green recreational space is being used for housing. Oakfield is widely used by young people and the local residents as a place for fun, games, exercise and fresh air. And now there will be a whole new development which will impact on surrounding areas and create a huge traffic problem in the area.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? See above. Do not use Oakfield for residential development.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00016/01 and R01088/04	See responses to R00016/01 and R01088/04
R00114/01	Lisa Baker	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? It is all focused on South Woodford Area. It is ludicrous that SW has been designated for excess of 6501 homes, to an area that is already at full capacity. With no mention of improvement to infrastructure. SW will and can not possibly cope with the proposed increase to population With regards to traffic and congestion - Charlie Browns is already heavily congested, being a major junction. Chigwell Road is already struggling to cope. South Woodford always being a small Central Line station is already heavily relied upon compared to some time ago. I have two children in local schools that I know are feeling the strain of over populated areas. Are our children to suffer even more so? Sports and recreational grounds are being used to build on for more school buildings? This is not correct or helpful to children of any age.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 - R00108/03 and R00108/09	See responses to R00108/01 - R00108/03 and R00108/09
R00114/02	Lisa Baker	68	LP17	<p>I know of people being asked to locate to other doctors as SW doctors are over crowded, some of these people have been with their doctors for many years this is totally unfair and unreasonable. SW has many businesses that will be disposed of and built for residential at a time when the economy is already strained we can not believe they are being totally overlooked and not considered? SW has always been an area of period style homes and now the plans are to create tower blocks and buildings of this type, this will totally spoil the look of a wonderful area - a sought after area. We have lived here for more than 26 years and just can not fathom the plans for SW.. We are certain crime would increase. Our elderly and young will become more vulnerable. Small parks where parents take their small children must not be disregarded as if not important.</p>	comment	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/11, and R00108/17	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/11, and R00108/17

R00114/03	Lisa Baker	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? South Woodford needs to be completely removed as an investment and growth zone. Why just South Woodford? Remove business sites that are earmarked for 'development'. Listen to local business owners and most importantly residents who care and look after this area and have done for a number of years.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	Remove Policy LP1D and all references to South Woodford as a Growth and Investment Area	See responses R00108/01, and R00108/11	See responses R00108/01, and R00108/11
R00115/01	Margaret McCann	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area for the following reasons: NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed to cope in the plan.</p>		See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01
R00115/02	Margaret McCann	33	Para 3.6.7	<p>TRANSPORT South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line which is currently not even coping with the current footfall, as acknowledged in para 1.21.4 and it is very difficult to see how it's potential can be improved. The footfall at South Woodford Station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault Branch where attention for further housing should be focused. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116, 118 and 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope as are several of the immediate side streets which are grid locked at peak times with public trying to short cut Charlie Brown's roundabout e.g. Pulteney Road, Alexander and surrounding roads.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	See response to R00104/02

R00115/03	Margaret McCann	154	site 116	<p>SCHOOLS There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion scheme already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. A large proportion of places currently held at private schools in the area are because of the lack of current local school places. No consideration has been given to that fact either. The expansion at Woodbridge School is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has had to sacrifice sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. New schools have already been built in the Ilford area to accommodate the immediate increase in population. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary, careless and in fact reckless risks regarding the education of the children currently living in the area let alone protecting their right to have a local school to attend in a safe, nurturing and decent environment with access to outdoor space and sports facilities.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/06 and R00108/09	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/06 and R00108/09
R00115/04	Margaret McCann	155	site 122	<p>OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as Doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a Borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/09	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/09

R00115/05	Margaret McCann	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>PARAGRAPH 3.6.5 - Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this Plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential (as occurred at South Woodford station recently). This has done untold damage to local residents' ability to work locally and damaged other local business who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well as increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12	See responses to R00108/11 and R00108/12
R00115/06	Margaret McCann	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>PARAGRAPH 3.6.5 LANDMARK BUILDING ON THE STATION ESTATE Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2,000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford. As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these buildings will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion, the maxim of the plan is 'growth in a sustainable manner (Para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job and infrastructure' (para 3.22) does not deliver this in its current format. In fact, the proposals appear to be more in line with causing a 'blight' on the area as it apparently intends to degenerate the entire landscape of South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00115/07	Margaret McCann	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses R00108/01.	See responses R00108/01.
R00115/08	Margaret McCann	154	Sites 116, 117, 118, 120	<p>2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120</p>	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	See response R00108/11.	See response R00108/11.
R00115/09	Margaret McCann	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14.	See response R00108/14.

R00115/10	Margaret McCann	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15.	See response R00108/15.
R00117/01	Peter Wright	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No The long-suffering residents of South Woodford currently face, on a daily basis, overcrowding, acute pollution, congestion, lack of adequate infrastructure, facilities and civilized transport (a journey on the Central line passing through South Woodford at busy times is stressful, unhealthy and dangerous. A simple outpatient blood test at Whipps Cross can take anything up to 2 hours!). The steady increase in crime is particularly disturbing although local police do their best with diminishing resources.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/02. Whipps Cross falls within London Borough of Waltham Forest	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/02.
R00117/02	Peter Wright	-	-	<p>The Redbridge Local Plan is ill thought out, inappropriate, dangerous and totally lacking in empathy for local residents. The crowded 'Drop In' Session that I attended recently at South Woodford Library was nothing short of a farce - NO Councillors were present and the Planning Officers really couldn't cope at any level. This could have been a useful exchange between Council and residents to allow residents' views and concerns to be appreciated, allowing Council members to fully carry out their function of implementing local wishes.</p> <p>To sum up, the Local Plan does not meet the National Planning Policy Framework's criteria for soundness in that it is NOT POSITIVELY PREPARED, certainly is NOT JUSTIFIED when considering the current plight of long-suffering, struggling residents and would in NO WAY BE EFFECTIVE in promoting a caring, useful and flourishing community in our local area.</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations	No further change required.
R00117/03	Peter Wright	-	-	<p>*Soundness Improvements? In order to be sound, the Plan needs drastic reformulation. This can only be effectively achieved as a PARTNERSHIP between Local Council and local residents. Dictated terms and conditions from afar, via the local Council, are ultimately bound to fail. Perhaps if we all remind ourselves of the meaning of Democracy it may help!</p>		The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations.	No further change required.

R00117/04	Peter Wright	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? The objective of local involvement has been made, intentionally or otherwise, virtually impossible for the 'average' resident (and I mean to imply no disrespect)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? The process of consultation needs to be straightforward and simple to enable ALL to become involved. It can not be assumed that we are all literate, articulate and have access to the internet! As broad a range of communication possible should be employed in order to allow all those wishing to contribute to do so.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No The plan is lop-sided and the focus should not be on South Woodford, which is already overcrowded and lacking in resources.</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00118/01	Neill Vanlint	33	para 3.6.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Para 3.2 Designates South Woodford as a Investment and Growth Zone and has 650+ new homes designated however there are no improvements to the infrastructure. As in Para 1.21.4 the Central line can barely cope now with a significantly higher footfall than the Hainault Loop. Surely these areas should be a higher priority with more capacity to manage the extra population. Turning to road travel, as Para 3.6.7 notes Charlie Brown's roundabout experiences high peak time traffic congestion and yet still sites number 116, 118, 119 contemplate large scale development. That means a Tube system and a road system that will be unable to cope what the plan is certain to do is create an unsustainable transportation situation around South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	See response to R00104/02
R00118/02	Neill Vanlint	154	sites 116, 120	Despite the planned additional 650+ homes there are no considerations for additional schools. Woodbridge has only just been expanded to its current size to cope with current demand so an additional 150 home at sites 116 and 120 in Chigwell Road will put serious strain on a Woodbridge, a school that already has one of the largest form entry sizes in London. Sacrificing sports facilities and implementing staggered breaks all represent a worsening quality of school environment.		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06

R00118/03	Neill Vanlint	32	Para 3.6.5	I do not see plans for additional hospitals or Doctors surgeries and my personal experience of the increase in demand and lack of GP availability at the Elmhurst practise since the St Mary's development was completed is an illustration of a strained healthcare system already at breaking point. Illustrations of capability across the borough are not helpful. We live in communities and we need community amenities it is not reasonable to be asked to travel across 5 or 6 miles across the borough to gain access to amenities in other communities. in Para 3.6.5 earmarks business sites in Soutgh WOODFORD for residential development. This reduces the opportunities for local work and forces yet more people to commute by overused road or Tube to find work. Where is the investment in more, better equipped office space in the area on sites already used for business purposes ?	comment, no change sought	Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/11	See response to R00108/11
R00118/04	Neill Vanlint	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Look at other sites in the borough with more Tube capacity and less dependence on traffic bottlenecks e.g. Hainault for residential growth.	Consider Hainault for residential growth	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.
R00118/05	Neill Vanlint	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Invest in business sites 116, 117, 118 and 120 as business centres rather than earmark them for residential development.	Invest in sites 116, 117, 118 and 120 as business centres rather than residential development	See response R00108/11.	See response R00108/11.
R00118/06	Neill Vanlint	68	LP17	3. include investments in schools and healthcare top accompany the increase in residences in whichever area such residential capacity is included.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00118/07	Neill Vanlint	-	-	*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00120/01	Lorraine McBride	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01

R00120/02	Lorraine McBride	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	See response to R00104/02	See response to R00104/02
R00120/03	Lorraine McBride	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See response to R00104/02

R00120/04	Lorraine McBride	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/09	See response to R00108/01 and R00108/09
R00120/05	Lorraine McBride	33	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		See response to R00108/11 and R00108/12	See response to R00108/11 and R00108/12

R00120/06	Lorraine McBride	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage?</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00120/07	Lorraine McBride	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	See responses R00108/01.	See responses R00108/01.
R00120/08	Lorraine McBride	114	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/11.	See response R00108/11.
R00120/09	Lorraine McBride	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14.	See response R00108/14.
R00120/10	Lorraine McBride	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/15.	See response R00108/15.

R00122/01	Margaret Bye	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01
R00122/02	Margaret Bye	33	Para 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00104/02	See responses to R00104/02
R00122/03	Margaret Bye	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06

R00122/04	Margaret Bye	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01 and R00108/09	See response R00108/01 and R00108/09
R00122/05	Margaret Bye	33	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/11 and R00108/12	See response to R00108/11 and R00108/12

R00122/06	Margaret Bye	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage?</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14 R00108/17	See response R00108/14 R00108/17
R00123/01	Brian Schofield	154	Site 116	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? No improvements or consultation regarding the infrastructure - transport, school, doctors etc. Pollution - this is not mentioned for Charlie Brown's roundabout - we want improvements to pollution as this is very damaging to our health and other as well. Parking is already in-manageable and over capacity for current residents. Include pollution improvements immediately in the plan. You cannot have more people living near the motorway due to health reasons.</p>		Appendix 2 provides a summary of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. Also see response to R00104/02	See response to R00104/02
R00123/02	Brian Schofield	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Please justify whether what solutions are there for the already overcrowded tube line at South Woodford - it could well become dangerous at times. What increased infrastructure would there be to cope with the increase residents ? More doctors, more schools, more dentists ? More parking ?</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/02	
R00123/03	Brian Schofield	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Lack of consultation of this plan with all local residents - feel every household should have had prior opportunity to express their opinions and were not notified. It has only been in the last couple of weeks that we have received one page leaflet from a political party. Restart the consultation period to involve everyone and allow sufficient time to respond. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? The planning authority have never notified households with relevant paperwork.</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	

R00124/01	Amanda Tipper	32	Paras 1.21.4, 3.2, 3.6.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Paragraph 3.2 has been designated for in excess of 650 homes. The area has no ability to cope with a higher population. The infrastructure shows improvements to the area.</p> <p>Transport South Woodford is not coping with the current footfall as knowledges by paragraph 1.21.4, how can this be improved? How is this going to cope with the growth. Paragraph 3.6.7 quotes that Charlie Browns roundabout is a major junction and has high levels of traffic at peak times. How on earth is the council going to make improvements to this junction, when they want to develop in this area. The roundabout is so dangerous as it is, and it struggles with all the traffic. The plan does not provide any improvement for doctors surgery S, or community or leisure services and hospitals. Its disgusting that we have to book 2 weeks in advance to get a doctors appointment. It does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years.</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/02	
R00124/02	Amanda Tipper	68	LP17	Schools The schools expansion is for the current population, you do not proposal to build any new schools. All the playgrounds are disappearing in the schools. The schools will loose all their outdoor space, and they should have that for sports and break times.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	
R00124/03	Amanda Tipper	32	Para 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 LAndmark building on station estate. Residents signed a petition with around 2,000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This will not reflect the Victorian and Edwardian houses in the area.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00124/03	Amanda Tipper	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Area. Keep South Woodford businesses and preserve the community. Stop encouraging residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for developing. Such as numbers 116,117,118,120. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate. South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/01, and R00108/11, and R00108/14.	

R00125/01	Elaine Schofield	154	Site 116	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Infrastructure is not mentioned and thought of in the plan. Also, pollution around Charlie Browns roundabout has been left off. Building houses nearby without addressing the pollution issue would be irresponsible and dangerous to children.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? More detailed explanation regarding infrastructure and how to tackle the pollution around Charlie Browns roundabout.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? As previously mentioned, not all aspect have been detailed. Address the issues mentioned previously.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? Feel this has been rushed through and due consideration has not been given to all households.</p>	Provide more detail regarding infrastructure, and dealing with pollution around Charlie Brown's Roundabout	Appendix 2 provides a summary of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. Also see response to R00104/02	
R00126/01	Amanda Kellegher	33	Paras 3.2, 3.6.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Totally ineffective for the South Woodford area: Transport: paragraph 3:2 designates South Woodford as an investment and growth zone and South Woodford has been designated for 650 plus homes, but there are no improvements to infrastructure. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed increase in population. The central line is not coping with current numbers of passengers, South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central line. Footfall in South Woodford Station is significantly higher than that of the stations along the Hainault Branch. It is therefore better to focus housing growth around the stations with lower footfall, i.e along the Hainault Branch. Charlie Browns roundabout has extremely high levels of traffic at peak times, as noted in paragraph 3.6.7. The plan fails to consider the fact that the road infrastructure is struggling to cope with current levels of traffic.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00126/02	Amanda Kellegher	68	LP17	<p>Schools: The expansion of Woodbridge High and Nightingale Primary are in place to try and cope with current demands, there is no plan in place to cope with a further increase in population. My daughter attends Woodbridge High, it is already crowded and the outdoor space has decreased due to new buildings. It is ridiculous to consider any increase in school population, the impact on young people and their education must be seriously considered.</p>		see responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00126/03	Amanda Kellegher	155	site 122	<p>Infrastructure of South Woodford South Woodford does not have the capacity in terms of doctors surgeries, childcare or community and leisure services to cope with any increase in population. Borough level improvements are not local to South Woodford and any suggestion that it is reasonable to expect residents to travel is ridiculous considering the concerns around transport (noted above), and of course the increased pollution caused by expecting residents to travel in order to have access to basic services. The proposal that site 122 could provide some leisure facilities is hardly adequate for the proposed population growth</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00126/04	Amanda Kellegher	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Business Sites Paragraph 3.6.5 The plan has earmarked all business sites in South Woodford for residential redevelopment. This plan is attacking economically viable business space. The area has already lost too much business space as freeholders convert to residential. This is damaging as it stops residents from working locally and puts further burdens on transport, traffic and childcare. A petition of almost 2000 residents clearly demonstrated that residents do not want tall buildings, as they are not in keeping with the characters of the area. The proposal for a landmark building is in direct conflict with paragraph 3.6.8 which states that new developments must respect the established residential characteristics. Also paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will seek to enhance local heritage, recognising South Woodfords Victorian and Edwardian character- tower blocks do not fit with this heritage.</p> <p>The plan for South Woodford does not balance infrastructure, homes and jobs in a sustainable manner butts completely I'll considered and damaging for the South Woodford and its residents</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14	
R00126/05	Amanda Kellegher	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an investment and growth zone.</p>	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/01.	
R00126/06	Amanda Kellegher	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	<p>Preserve South Woodfords business community. Stop the land grab e.g. Sites 116, 117, 118 and 120.</p>	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00126/07	Amanda Kellegher	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Remove reference to landmark building in Station Estate, South Woodford</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00126/08	Amanda Kellegher	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Consider using earmarked development sites like Station Estate for a community solution focussed development e.g. Home for elderly, community facility. Something that would not increase the strain on transport at peak time</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00128/01	John Regan	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The local plan proposes an increase in housing in the South Woodford area. It frames the main transport link to and from the city (the Epping branch of the central line) as a good reason for this plan. The plan fails to discuss the capacity issues of this branch at present and its ability to accommodate the increase in population of workers using the link during rush hours if these plans go ahead.</p>		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line.	
R00128/02	John Regan	32	Para 3.6	<p>Anyone who uses this branch can tell you that it is very overcrowded during rush hour as things stand now. Observing the trains during rush hour one can easily notice the Hainault branch trains are considerably less packed than the Epping branch trains; also most passengers using this branch alight at South Woodford. In my view South Woodford is already at capacity. The plan also states in point 9.6 below the issues of acute congestion around on the A406 - South Woodford being nearby and that the effect of population growth will make this problem worse. It appears to put forward a very generalistic idea that that, Crossrail or bus services for instance, will alleviate the issue.</p>		see response to R00108/02	
R00128/03	John Regan	32	Policy LP1D	<p>However Crossrail and the ELT will not be coming anywhere near South Woodford and to be effective. From the Infrastructure Delivery Plan: 'Road congestion is a general issue for the Borough's road network. This is experienced particularly acutely on the M11, A406 and A12. It is believed that the provision of Crossrail and high quality bus services such as East London Transit will help to alleviate congestion, although the issue is likely to persist, as the population continues to grow'</p>		See responses to R00108/01=03	
R00128/04	John Regan	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The Local Plans need to change to remove South Woodford from its core strategy as unworkable due to the transport issues I have highlighted. It should not blight an already overstretched area just to meet some house building quota.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Seriously!? *Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/01.	
R00131/01	Lynda Knight	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is ineffective regarding the South Woodford area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 designates South Woodford as an investment and growth zone. South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are no improvements planned for our infrastructure. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demand that comes with a higher population and no improvements to infrastructure has been proposed in the plan. This includes:</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	

R00131/02	Lynda Knight	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport: South Woodford is heavily reliant on the central line, which I use everyday. It is pretty awful and is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged in paragraph 1.21.4 and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at the station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further house growth should focus. There is also a higher amount of trains that go to that side of the central line branch - rather than the Epping branch, which impacts South Woodford. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences 'high levels of traffic at peak times'.</p> <p>How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development is in this area (site number 116, 118, 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now. I live on Pulteney Road and the congestion from Chigwell Road at peak times impacts my ability to get in and out of my road by car as they use my road as a shortcut. It's dangerous and more than often leads to people getting out of their cars shouting at each other. It's awful!!</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00131/03	Lynda Knight	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes plus the temporary 150 units at sit number 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for schools places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary school are in place to cope with current demand and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposals. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage huge crowds. This plan makes it look like Redbridge Council does not regard the education of local people a priority and is taking unnecessary risks in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are safe, nurturing and in a decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See response R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00131/04	Lynda Knight	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any other improvements to local infrastructure including doctor surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare, hospitals and a police presence. how will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years. The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford, this is not sustainable growth. At the moment it takes me a minimum of two weeks to be able to book a doctors appointment. If it is an emergency, I have to beg and explain to the receptionist why I should see the doctor sooner - are you suggesting that this experience gets worse for the residents of South Woodford... The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car par (site 122) which would be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	
R00131/05	Lynda Knight	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business pace which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local residents ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>	comment, no change sought	- see response to R00108/11	
R00131/06	Lynda Knight	12	Para 1.17.8	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable business are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see responses to R00108/11-12	

R00131/07	Lynda Knight	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 landmark building on station estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on station estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking up on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these buildings will be address by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will 'seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character'. How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the plan is growth in a sustainable manner (Para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, jobs and infrastructure (Para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00131/08	Lynda Knight	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/01.	
R00131/09	Lynda Knight	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	<p>2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120</p>	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00131/10	Lynda Knight	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00131/11	Lynda Knight	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00132/01	Keith Gardner City Gates School Trust	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? City Gates School Trust is proposing a Free School with a Christian ethos in Redbridge and was approved by the Department for Education (DfE) for pre-opening in March 2015. The School will be an all-through school for children aged 4 to 16 years old with three forms in the Primary Phase and four forms in the Secondary Phase. The School will be non-denominational, however the Trust have entered into an affiliation relationship with the Board of Education of the Diocese of Chelmsford of the Church of England to link with their expertise in running schools with a Christian ethos. Whilst demand for the School is from across the Borough, the main focus has been in the Goodmayes area. The demand for the School is both from Christian families (roughly two-thirds), and from families of other and no faith (roughly one-third). A key issue for the Trust, together with the DfE, has been finding a suitable site for the School.</p>	comment, no change sought	Noted.
R00132/02	Keith Gardner City Gates School Trust	68	LP17	<p>The DfE have been unable to secure a site so far, mainly due to the lack of available land in the Borough, and as a result the School is on 'pause' until the DfE are able to acquire a suitable site. This is most likely to occur as land is released as part of the Redbridge Local Plan process. City Gates School Trust fully supports the Local Plans identification of the need for additional primary and secondary school places in the Borough, and of the need to release land, including where appropriate Green Belt land, to accommodate new schools to meet this demand.</p>	comment, no change sought	Support noted.
R00132/03	Keith Gardner City Gates School Trust	68	LP17	<p>In particular, City Gates School Trust supports the release of Green Belt land in the Goodmayes Hospital area for education as well as housing and other uses as this is the Trust's preferred location, given the demand for the School. The Trust, with support from the DfE, is keen to partner with the Borough to see the School opened as soon as possible to help provide additional school places to meet the growing demand in the Borough. Subject to the Local Plan process, it could be ready to open as soon as Autumn 2018 if land can be released before the end of 2017 for the DfE to acquire for the School. This submission has been co-ordinated with the DfE who are also making a submission to the Local Plan Consultation.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? See previous comment</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? See previous comment</p>	no change sought	Support noted.

R00133/01	Yevgen Dyryavyv	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00133/02	Yevgen Dyryavyv	33	para 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00133/03	Yevgen Dyryavyv	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00133/04	Yevgen Dyravyv	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see responses to R00108/11-12	
R00133/04	Yevgen Dyravyv	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	

R00133/05	Yevgen Dyravyv	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00133/06	Yevgen Dyravyv	33	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00133/07	Yevgen Dyravyv	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00133/08	Yevgen Dyravyv	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00133/09	Yevgen Dyravyv	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00134/01	Susan Read	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? While I agree the Plan is basically sound, an increase of proposed housing stock to accommodate the projected population growth means that the needs of school places for growing families across the spectrum should be prioritised. To that end I would like to draw the Planners' attention to the following: City Gates School Trust is proposing a Free School with a Christian ethos in Redbridge and was approved by the Department for Education (DfE) for pre-opening in March 2015. The School will be an all-through school for children aged 4 to 16 years old with three forms in the Primary Phase and four forms in the Secondary Phase. The School will be non-denominational, however the Trust have entered into an affiliation relationship with the Board of Education of the Diocese of Chelmsford of the Church of England so as to access their expertise in running schools with a Christian ethos. Whilst demand for the School is from across the Borough, the main focus has been in the Goodmayes area.</p>		Noted	
R00134/02	Susan Read	68	LP17	<p>The demand for the School is both from Christian families (roughly two-thirds), and from families of other and no faith (roughly one-third). A key issue for the Trust, together with the DfE, has been finding a suitable site for the School. The DfE have been unable to secure a site so far, mainly due to the lack of available land in the Borough, and as a result the School is on 'pause' until the DfE are able to acquire a suitable site. This is most likely to occur as land is released as part of the Redbridge Local Plan process.</p>		Noted	

R00134/03	Susan Read	68	LP17	<p>City Gates School Trust fully supports the Local Plans identification of the need for additional primary and secondary school places in the Borough, and of the need to release land, including where appropriate Green Belt land, to accommodate new schools to meet this demand. In particular, City Gates School Trust supports the release of Green Belt land in the Goodmayes Hospital area for education as well as housing and other uses as this is the Trust's preferred location, given the demand for the School. The Trust, with support from the DfE, is keen to partner with the Borough to see the School opened as soon as possible to help provide additional school places to meet the growing demand in the Borough. Subject to the Local Plan process, it could be ready to open as soon as Autumn 2018 if land can be released before the end of 2017 for the DfE to acquire for the School. This submission has been co-ordinated with the DfE who are also making a submission to the Local Plan Consultation.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Legally Compliant Comments? Please refer to previous comment. *Duty to Cooperate? Yes * Duty to Cooperate Comments? Please also see comment to Q1</p>	no change sought	Support noted.	
R00136/01	Antony Sims	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00136/02	Antony Sims	33	para 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00136/03	Antony Sims	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00136/04	Antony Sims	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	

R00136/05	Antony Sims	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see responses to R00108/11-12	
R00136/06	Antony Sims	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00136/07	Antony Sims	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00136/08	Antony Sims	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00136/09	Antony Sims	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	

R00136/10	Antony Sims	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00138/01	Nathan Leaman-Hill	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00138/02	Nathan Leaman-Hill	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00138/03	Nathan Leaman-Hill	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00138/04	Nathan Leaman-Hill	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00138/05	Nathan Leaman-Hill	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00138/06	Nathan Leaman-Hill	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00138/07	Nathan Leaman-Hill	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00138/08	Nathan Leaman-Hill	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00138/09	Nathan Leaman-Hill	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00138/10	Nathan Leaman-Hill	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00138/11	Nathan Leaman-Hill	154	site 116	Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00139/01	Leaman-Hill Danae	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00139/02	Leaman-Hill Danae	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00139/03	Leaman-Hill Danae	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00139/04	Leaman-Hill Danae	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00139/05	Leaman-Hill Danae	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see responses to R00108/11-12	
R00139/06	Leaman-Hill Danae	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00139/07	Leaman-Hill Danae	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00139/08	Leaman-Hill Danae	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00139/09	Leaman-Hill Danae	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00139/10	Leaman-Hill Danae	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00139/11	Leaman-Hill Danae	-	-	*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	no change sought	Noted.	
R00140/01	David Reekie	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The area of South Woodford is already stretched to breaking point regarding schools, doctors' surgeries, accident and emergency, policing, parking, traffic and Central Line. There has already been a massive incursion of residents following the development of the Queen Mary College and Fenchurch Insurance sites. My Doctor's surgery patient numbers have increased from 3,500 to 7,000 over 18months and waiting times have increased from 1 to 2 days to 10 to 14 as an example of the area's over-crowding.	objection, no specific change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00140/02	David Reekie	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? The Hainault Branch of the Central Line is far more able to accept increased numbers of commuters than the Epping line. Consequently any further development should be centred along this corridor. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? I have seen no evidence of any serious consultation with other agencies i.e. Police, Schools, Hospitals, Doctors, London Underground. Nor has there been any consideration given to the increase in pollution along the A406 corridor which is considered one of the worst in the country.	Development should be focussed along Hainault Branch	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.

R00142/01	Lewis Marshall	154	Site 117	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Plans for Development Site 117 (Station Estate off George Lane, South Woodford.) do not meet the above for the reasons stated here: The Development Plan: Reference : Site Number 117: Station Estate off George Lane, South Woodford. The site is designated as a “landmark building” and 120 homes are to be built on an area of 0.76 hectares. This means that this will require a structure of a tower block, completely contrary to the Characterisation Study outlined below. It is likely that the structure will require a height in terms of storeys amounting to double figures, (e.g. 12 storeys, assuming 10 dwellings per floor, 15 storeys at 8 dwellings per floor, 20 storeys at 6 dwellings per floor, etc.)</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00142/02	Lewis Marshall	-	-	<p>It is possible that it could be higher. Therefore it is inconsistent with the stated aims of the South Woodford section of the Characterisation Study published by the Redbridge Local Authority (extracts shown below) This is a section from SECTION 5: Character Areas (from Redbridge Characterisation Study June 2014 Pt 3) South Woodford “Elsewhere on George Lane some attractive upper floor features have been retained amid more varied ground floors. There are still many original dormers, barge-boards, ridge cresting on roof tops, chimney stacks and original stonework, although few windows are now original. In contrast there are also much newer structures built specifically as shopping space that are both out of scale and character. Overall however the core retains its charm as an attractive, older London suburb and shopping centre.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00142/03	Lewis Marshall	-	-	<p>This charm becomes more evident further down George Lane, from the former Woolworths store and beyond Glebelands Avenue, and towards the Central Line railway. The views become more interesting and the roof-scape of the buildings begin to become more coherent and consistent in design and scale. The Natwest bank at the corner of Marlborough Road is of note, this is an ornate three storey listed building in the Edwardian neo-Georgian style. Between numbers 98 to 137 on the southern part of George Lane, closer to South Woodford Station, there are some very good examples of Edwardian architecture that exhibits classic and varied motifs and themes of the architectural style of that period. Among these buildings there is an architectural pattern that is repeated but which varies in an appealing manner. On this section of George Lane the Victorian and Edwardian architectural imprint is stronger than further up George Lane closer to The Shrubberies.</p>	no change sought	Noted	

R00142/04	Lewis Marshall	-	-	<p>The buildings here illustrate elaborate detailing that helps to make this section of the street distinctive and characterful despite the lack of heritage designation. George Lane slopes noticeably downwards towards the south east as building heights generally increase. This produces a consistency in relation to the evenness of the overall roof scape. At the north west of George Lane heights tend to be no more than two to three storeys, but towards the south eastern end of George Lane heights increase by around a storey and a half, although the finer Edwardian grain is maintained. The street widths at George Lane vary dramatically, with the much wider widths at the north-west around The Shrubberies and Electric Parade, and far narrower widths closer to South Woodford station. As might be expected as the street widths narrow, building frontages and pavement widths tend to shrink. Narrower street widths and taller buildings create much greater levels of enclosure in the south-east of the core. The building grain in the core tends to be finer in the older parts of the centre, especially the south eastern section of George Lane where historic development is better preserved.</p>	no change sought	Noted	
R00142/05	Lewis Marshall	-	-	<p>There are a number of Big Box developments within the centre in the form of Sainsbury's and Waitrose supermarkets, and the Odeon Cinema, but these are situated behind the existing form of the street enclosure represented by the older buildings overlooking the street, and are therefore not a major intrusion on the character of the core. Public realm enhancements at South Woodford Centre were undertaken between 2009 and 2011 and there is now consistency in the street palette: surfacing materials are not of the highest quality but at least have a uniformity. "</p>	no change sought	Noted	
R00142/06	Lewis Marshall	-	-	<p>"The most important views within the core are those views directly onto The Shrubberies and vistas along George Lane north to south and south to north. It is important that direct views onto the Conservation Area are not obscured, and there is no intrusion on the current panoramic view of the buildings. The important vistas on George Lane consist of attractive views of the roof-scape, and a variety of interesting short views and glimpses experienced by pedestrians as they walk further down George Lane towards South Woodford Station. "</p>	no change sought	Noted	

R00142/07	Lewis Marshall	154	Site 117	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The number of dwellings is excessive for a site of 0.76 hectares. In order to comply with the Characterisation of South Woodford as described above, the structure should not exceed the height of the roof line. Therefore it should be no greater than 4 - 5 storeys high.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? The wording in the Barking and Dagenham, and in the Havering ONA states that Redbridge is "not unable to" which means it "is able to" meet their ONA within their boundary. This is misleading, as it is untrue.</p>	"Landmark Building" in section 3.6.5 should be no more than 4/5 stories	. See response R00108/14. The Local Plan does not propose tall buildings for South Woodford.	
R00143/01	sue brown	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Many dwellings are planned for this area with absolutely no improvement to infrastructure. E18 is becoming intolerable to live in due to the drastic increase in the population already. another 650 dwellings could easily bring another 2000 people to the area which as it is cannot cope with the current population. There are not enough school places and it can take up to 3 weeks to see a doctor at some of the practices. At 7am in the morning it is impossible to get a seat on the tube into London and any later it is difficult to even get a standing place. Animals are treated better than humans when in transit.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/02	
R00143/02	sue brown	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Wanstead has 2 station to serve it with much less footfall at those stations so why is some of the planned housing not being built there where they can cope better with transport There are not wide enough roads to take the cars as a lot of them were built in Victorian times with no plans to increase road widths. 650 new homes could bring a further 1300 cars. The roads are already at a standstill during rush hour and there is no point in even attempting to take a car out on a Saturday day time. There is already hardly any open space for recreation and with any increase in population there would be no amenity for families to get outside and exercise.</p>	comment, no change sought	Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP35 seeks open space enhancements	
R00143/03	sue brown	32	Policy LP1D	<p>It is suggested businesses could relocate elsewhere to make space for housing, businesses are need to keep south woodford thriving and offer jobs as well as services otherwise cars will be used even more. The pollution levels are already high and some of the planned dwellings as so near busy roads that it will be dangerous to residents health causing them to possibly need doctors appointments in the already creaking surgeries.</p> <p>I appreciate there is the basic situation of too many people and not enough housing in Redbridge but South woodford can not sustain any further building.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11 regarding business space. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	

R00143/04	sue brown	101	Policy LP27	*Soundness Improvements? Make sure any housing that is built does not detract from the current low level housing stock by limiting it to 3 stories high.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14 and R00108/17.	
R00143/05	sue brown	32	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Do not build on business sites	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/11	
R00143/06	sue brown	32	Policy LP1D	Build in Wanstead on the green field site and areas near a12 towards Redbridge roundabout	Redirect development to Wanstead and Redbridge Roundabout	The boroughs housing and development needs are such that a variety of sites are needed, as set out in the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00143/07	sue brown	40	Policy LP3	Build only rental accommodation or affordable housing	Build only rental sector / affordable housing	A mix of housing products and sizes will be sought through policies LP3 and LP5	No further change required.
R00143/08	sue brown	68	LP17	Invest in doctors surgeries, longer trains, school places, wider roads, leisure facilities and park lands before increasing the population	Invest in local infrastructure before increasing the area's population	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R00143/09	sue brown	32	Polict LP1D	Make SW town centre a pedestrian/bus area only *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No	Make South Woodford Town centre bus / pedestrian only	Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.	No further change required.
R00147/01	Nicky Tranmer South Woodford Society	-	-	Entry merged with R00108		See response to R00108	
R00149/01	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	see response to R00108/01
R00149/02	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See responses to R00104/02	See response to R00108

R00149/03	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06
R00149/04	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	

R00149/05	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		See responses to R00108/11-12	See responses to R00108/11-12
R00149/06	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00149/07	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00149/08	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00149/09	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00149/10	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00149/11	Gary Linard WASTECARE LTD	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00150/01	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00150/02	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See responses to R00104/02	

R00150/03	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00150/04	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	

R00150/05	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see responses to R00108/11-12	
R00150/06	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00150/07	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00150/08	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00150/09	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00150/10	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00150/11	Alan Patient (FCA) Alan Patient & Co Limited	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	: See response R00108/18.	
R00153/01	John Singleton, LifeLine Church	68	LP17	*Soundness? Yes *Soundness Improvements? While I agree the Plan is basically sound, an increase of proposed housing stock to accommodate the projected population growth means that the need of school places for growing families across the spectrum should be prioritised. To that end I would like to draw the Planners' attention to the following. City Gates School Trust is proposing a Free School with a Christian ethos in Redbridge and was approved by the Department for Education (DfE) for pre-opening in March 2015. The School will be an all-through school for children aged 4 to 16 years old with three forms in the Primary Phase and four forms in the Secondary Phase. The School will be non-denominational, however the Trust have entered into an affiliation relationship with the Board of Education of the Diocese of Chelmsford of the Church of England so as to access their expertise in running schools with a Christian ethos. Whilst demand for the School is from across the Borough, the main focus has been in the Goodmayes area.		Support noted.	
R00153/02	John Singleton, LifeLine Church	68	LP17	The demand for the School is both from Christian families (roughly two-thirds), and from families of other and no faith (roughly one-third). A key issue for the Trust, together with the DfE, has been finding a suitable site for the School. The DfE have been unable to secure a site so far, mainly due to the lack of available land in the Borough, and as a result the School is on 'pause' until the DfE are able to acquire a suitable site. This is most likely to occur as land is released as part of the Redbridge Local Plan process.		Support noted.	

R00153/03	John Singleton, LifeLine Church	68	LP17	<p>City Gates School Trust fully supports the Local Plans identification of the need for additional primary and secondary school places in the Borough, and of the need to release land, including where appropriate Green Belt land, to accommodate new schools to meet this demand. In particular, City Gates School Trust supports the release of Green Belt land in the Goodmayes Hospital area for education as well as housing and other uses as this is the Trust's preferred location, given the demand for the School. The Trust, with support from the DfE, is keen to partner with the Borough to see the School opened as soon as possible to help provide additional school places to meet the growing demand in the Borough.</p> <p>Subject to the Local Plan process, it could be ready to open as soon as Autumn 2018 if land can be released before the end of 2017 for the DfE to acquire for the School. This submission has been co-ordinated with the DfE who are also making a submission to the Local Plan Consultation.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	no change sought	Support noted.	
R00154/01	Ian Tarrant	-	-	<p>*Soundness? Yes *Soundness Comments? It is clear that a great deal of information has been taken into account. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	no change sought	Support noted.	
R00155/01	Andrew Cook	86	Policy LP22	<p>*Soundness Comments? I have the following comments concerning Redbridge Local Plan:-</p> <p>1) Regarding the playing fields north of Forest Road (close to Fairlop Water open space) - I would very much like to see a traffic free cycle route created within these playing fields. This cycle route would link Fairlop Water with Inverness Road and also with Huntsman Road. The link with Inverness Road would create a link from Fairlop Water to Hainault Station on the Central Line. The link with Huntsman Road would be part of a cycle route from Fairlop Water on to Hainault Forest Country Park, and would save having to cycle along the busy Forest Road.</p> <p>2) From the grounds of Goodmayes Hospital there is a view going across to the water tower at the top of Shooters Hill in SE London. I would like this strategic view to be safeguarded. This view is from a footpath north of a playing field. This playing field, and the land to the south of it, should be kept free of any buildings that would obstruct this view across to Shooters Hill. Andrew Cook</p>	Create cycle track in playing fields north of Forest Road, preserve view of Shooters Hill water tower	Policy LP22 supports sustainable transport measures. Specific interventions will be promoted through the Local Implementation Plan. Development of King George/ Goodmayes will be subject to masterplanning as set out in Policy LP1B. Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77) assesses key views in the borough to inform strategy of where tall buildings are deemed acceptable in principle. Views across multiple London boroughs fall into the remit of the London Plan, and the London View Management Framework	

R00156/01	ROY ENGLISH	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? SOUTH WOODFORD The most important question is what basis is the 65000 increase in population based on?.If it is say on the last 10 years trend then I suspect no account has been taken on the result of the referendum.The next two years could see a reduction in past trends.This needs to be challenged before plans are made that become set in stone. In peak times South Woodford roads are grid locked and,the central line is packed.Past governments and councils have been naive about the use of cars-the M25 was suppose to relieve traffic off the north circular!!</p>		There is no clear evidence to suggest that EU referendum results will substantially reduce levels of housing need in the borough.	
R00156/02	ROY ENGLISH	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Cross rail will not relieve commuting in South Woodford. Where are the sites for the new schools ,health centres and hospitals that families in 18000 new homes will need? if the predictions on increased population are right[which I have reservation about] then a more radical approach must be taken by governments/councils to support the building of new towns where proper planning can go into housing,schooling,health care and most importantly transport. We cannot keep trying to put a quart in a pint pot in London South Woodford cannot cope with another 18000 homes</p> <p>Legally Compliant? Don't know Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>		Noted. Please refer to the response to R00100/3, also note that 18000 is approximately the borough wide figure for new housing during a 15 year period; and a significant proportion of housing growth is proposed for Ilford and the Crossrail corridor, whereas only 650 homes are proposed for South Woodford.	
R00159/01	Sarupe Singh	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00159/02	Sarupe Singh	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00159/03	Sarupe Singh	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00159/04	Sarupe Singh	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>	

R00159/05	Sarupe Singh	32	paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00159/06	Sarupe Singh	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00159/07	Sarupe Singh	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00159/08	Sarupe Singh	32	Sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00159/09	Sarupe Singh	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00159/10	Sarupe Singh	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00159/11	Sarupe Singh	32	Site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00160/01	Bhagwant Singh	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00160/02	Bhagwant Singh	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00160/03	Bhagwant Singh	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00160/04	Bhagwant Singh	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00160/05	Bhagwant Singh	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00160/06	Bhagwant Singh	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00160/07	Bhagwant Singh	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00160/08	Bhagwant Singh	32	Sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11	
R00160/09	Bhagwant Singh	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00160/10	Bhagwant Singh	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00160/11	Bhagwant Singh	154	Site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00162/01	david ross	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? There is no explanation of how the infrastructure (transport, schools, doctors, public amenities) in South Woodford can be increased to match the proposed increase in residents. There is already a shortfall in necessary infrastructure - it is clear that LBR have no "story" (let alone plan) as to how this will be addressed. Remove the designation of South Woodford as a an Investment and Growth Zone. Allow residential investment only when supported by adequate infrastructure. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	South Woodford	. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Regarding the designation of South Wodford as an Investment and Growth Area see response R00108/01.	

R00163/01	NICHOLAS HAYES	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No APPENDIX 1, SOUTH WOODFORD INVESTMENT AND GROWTH AREA There is no doubt that London is facing intense pressure on housing because: the economy is relatively healthy migration from other EU countries, and to an extent internal migration within the UK the strength of financial services within London and especially Canary Wharf and the City.</p> <p>Much of London's economic health depends on trade with the EU - this is unlikely to continue in the same way as before the referendum result, and it is highly likely that over the timescale of this plan the demand for housing in the London area will reduce significantly because of reduced financial services activity and reduced migration from EU countries. Indeed, London may face a net reduction in population over the period 2015-30. It will therefore be unnecessary to develop every last plot of land for housing, and become more important to preserve all employment opportunities by preserving commercial and industrial sites in their present use, such as Raven Road Industrial Estate and others. As financial services jobs decline because of Brexit, it will be necessary to preserve and create jobs in other sectors.</p> <p>*Soundness? Sites 116-120 should retain their current land use designation, and residential development should not be allowed.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Sites 116-120 should retain their present land use; and not be used for residential development	. See response R00108/11.	
R00164/01	Lewis Marshall	155	sites 120, 196	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? This representation claims that the plan contravenes the criteria, values and principles of the council's publication "Parking strategy - five year objectives" and that therefore that the Local Plan is not sound, measured against the following: This representation shows that the plans for Site 120, to build dwellings on a very busy station car park used by commuters at South Woodford Station is incompatible with the Council's own Parking Strategy, and Consultation feedback from residents. This representation also shows that the same circumstances apply to plans for Site 196, Woodford Station Car Park. But also, importantly, in addition, the replacement by home building of the adjacent large Charteris Road Car Park which is extensively used by shoppers accessing retail outlets in The Broadway and Snakes Lane.</p>		Policy LP22 promotes sustainable transport, consistent with the contents of the parking strategy, which identified a clear need to move towards more sustainable modes of transport.	

R00164/02	Lewis Marshall	32	Policy LP1D	<p>In both cases, there will be no recognised car parking facility for the hundreds of commuters who currently use all three car parks. They will have to avoid South Woodford and Woodford local centres, reducing the footfall in retail outlets and influencing economic wellbeing for businesses in both neighbourhoods. Shoppers, likewise, will lose their "ease of finding a space without driving around too much" (a key feedback from residents, recognised in the borough Parking Plan – see below) when the number of places available is outnumbered by the number of shoppers' vehicles. Charteris Road Car Park provides this adequately at present.</p>		See response to R00164/02	
R00164/03	Lewis Marshall	86	LP22	<p>References from: Parking strategy - five year objectives Parking Strategy - Values and aims Values: 5. Efficiency and effectiveness WE WILL MAKE OPTIMUM USE OF PARKING SPACES AND PROVIDE SERVICES THAT ARE RESPONSIVE TO NEED AND ADAPTABLE. 6. Supporting business ALL NEW PARKING SCHEMES WILL AIM TO PROTECT EXISTING BUSINESSES AND ATTRACT NEW BUSINESSES Aims: • Improve road safety and accessibility • Promote sustainable modes of transport and improve air quality • ACTIVELY SUPPORT BUSINESS • PROVIDE GOOD QUALITY PUBLIC CAR PARKING FACILITIES • LISTEN TO THE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES AND VISITORS AND HELP TO CHANGE PERCEPTIONS • Provide for those with accessibility issues~ • Consider wider Council strategic objectives in the design and management of parking • RECOGNISE DIFFERENT CHARACTERISTICS OF AREAS WITHIN THE BOROUGH WHILE BEING FAIR AND CONSISTENT • Keep traffic moving to reduce congestion and assist the reliable and effective operation of public transport Be responsive to changing parking circumstances Developing the strategy - your views The three most important priorities around traffic and parking were: • PARKING POLICY THAT SUPPORTS LOCAL BUSINESSES • Fair and consistent parking charges across the Borough; and • Maintaining road safety 81% OF RESPONDENTS AGREED THAT SHORT TERM PARKING SHOULD BE OFFERED IN SHOPPING AREAS SO THAT EVERYONE GETS A FAIR CHANCE TO PARK AND VISIT SHOPS The following are quotes from the Appendix 1 of Parking strategy - five year objectives :</p>		Noted	

R00164/04	Lewis Marshall	86	LP22	<p>Section - COUNCIL CAR PARKS: "Our aim is to provide suitable parking for local shoppers and/or commuters where we can." Sub-section: KEY CHALLENGES: "maximising car park use." Sub-section: WHAT'S IMPORTANT TO YOU? "ease of finding a space without driving around too much." Sub-section:WHAT WE INTEND TO DO OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS "maximise car park use " SECTION: PARKING FOR SHOPPERS AND VISITORS Sub-section: KEY CHALLENGES "...to assist local business viability" " Promoting where applicable the use of our off-street car parks. " "Providing for parking spaces at all times to ease congestion on our roads." Sub-section: WHAT'S IMPORTANT TO YOU? "Parking policy that supports local businesses." "Ease of finding a parking space without driving around too much." "Parking near to your destination."</p> <p>Sub-section:WHAT WE INTEND TO DO OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS "Minimise traffic and congestion caused by drivers looking for car parking spaces and promote off-street parking where feasible." SECTION: INITIATIVE AND SUMMARY - COUNCIL CAR PARKS Intention to "promote usage" SECTION: INITIATIVE AND SUMMARY - PARKING FOR SHOPPERS AND VISITORS "Fair and consistent approach....in all of the Borough's shopping areas" "To support local business and to promote the use of Council Car parks" SECTION: INITIATIVE AND SUMMARY - PERMIT PARKING "That directly or indirectly support local residents and economic activity in local town centres"</p>		Noted	
R00164/05	Lewis Marshall	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The car parks serve the local communities of Woodford and South Woodford by supporting the local retail town centres. The borough has a high proportion of commuters travelling into London via the Central Line. With commuters having nowhere to park, the retail centres will see a decline in footfall, especially in the morning and evening rush hour.</p> <p>A possible solution is to focus several new "commuter" bus routes through more of the suburban areas within a 2 - 4 mile radius of the Underground stations and INCORPORATE THE BUS FARE INTO THE PRICE OF THE COMMUTER TICKET to encourage use and commitment. The additional cost has to be much lower than the cost of parking to encourage use.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No Not accurately stated: The Barking & Dagenham and the Havering OAN sections state that Redbridge is "not unable to" instead of "unable to", which is the complete opposite of the meaning intended.</p>	provide feeder bus routes to South Woodford tube station	Bus and Tube fares are within the remit of TfL rather than the borough; however the £1.50 bus fare is competitive with the cost of station parking.	

R00165/01	Asif Mohammed Natha Computacenter	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? They are too reliant on cross rail without understanding its benefits</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Council need to investigate the impact of cross rail it's benefits and the impact of other councils whose areas utilise the trains to understand if ilford will actually benefit from it</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? They have made it difficult for the local constituent to know what they are planning</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Make it more easily available</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Investigate the impact of Crossrail and consider plans of other councils on Crossrail route	Crossrail will reduce journey times to central and west London, increase capacity on existing trains, and also add capacity to the Central Line	
R00166/01	Ruth Musgrave	22	LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? THE PLAN DOES NOT FULFILL ITS OBJECTIVES OF INCREASING FAIRNESS AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL RESIDENTS PARAGRAPHS 1.13, 1.20; LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3 There will be a huge increase in population in Ilford South, which is already the most densely populated and deprived part of the borough. There are already problems with the traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. The schools are also overcrowded and are being expanded, with loss of open space. This is making them too large and impersonal, detrimentally affecting children's well being. There are huge catchments for doctors and there is already a deficiency of open space in the area. THE EVIDENCE BASE IS POOR PARAGRAPH 1.8; LP24 Population projections and housing data have poor analyses and use insufficient and erroneous data.</p>		<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy. Ilford is the most accessible part of the borough and policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21 . Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Policy LP35 seeks the provision of new open space as part of new developments; either on-site or through financial contributions. The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements.</p>	
R00166/02	Ruth Musgrave	46	LP5	<p>No population density, parking stress or pollution level surveys have been carried out in areas of high proposed development. The benefits of Crossrail to enhance train capacity are not scrutinized or quantified. THE DWELLING MIX WILL NOT ADDRESS LOCAL NEEDS PARAGRAPHS 3.11, 3.12, 7.7; LP5; The preponderance of 1 and 2 bedroom flats will not provide the dwelling mix required for the local area, where there is a major shortage of family housing. The council is, therefore, not addressing the specific housing needs in the borough, particularly for families, but is simply trying to meet housing unit numbers. Using council land predominantly for private, market rate housing is a strategy to generate income for the council and will not address the housing issues of the borough.</p>		<p>The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements. Crossrail will reduce journey times to central and west London, increase capacity on existing trains, and also add capacity to the Central Line. Policy LP5 sets out the Councils preferred dwelling mix which includes a range of household sizes including family housing. Affordable housing will be sought on Council owned land in accordance with Policy LP3.</p>	

R00166/03	Ruth Musgrave	40	Policies LP3, LP10, LP11	<p>THE POLICY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL NOT ADDRESS THE HUGE CRISIS OF AFFORDABILITY IN THE AREA PARAGRAPH 3.9.4; LP3 For affordable to be defined as 80% of market rate in Redbridge, which has some of the highest house prices in outer London, is simply unrealistic. A 30% affordable target is very low when there is such a need. The council is, therefore, not addressing the housing crisis in the borough but simply trying to meet housing targets and to generate income for the council. THE TALL BUILDINGS STRATEGY IS POORLY THOUGHT THROUGH PARAGRAPHS 5.4; LP26,LP27, LP29 The encouragement of high density tall buildings, primarily residential, predominantly in Ilford South, is a dangerous gamble on the part of Redbridge Council. These developments will be overbearing and out of character with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing and height. This strategy is likely to cause the quality of life of the residents to degenerate.</p> <p>The town centres need a focus on employment rather than housing. It will exacerbate the many existing problems of an already crowded environment, along with the associated problems relating to the amenities of local residents, in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, and wind tunnelling. The policy standards of LP26 have been and, we fear, will continue to be constantly flouted with no regard to the amenity of existing residents. THE TIMESCALES ARE NOT DELIVERABLE LP9, LP10, LP11 The timescales advocated within the Plan are not practicable. The plan proposes a high concentration of building sites in a number of limited areas, coming on stream at the same time. It will turn certain areas into permanent building sites for years.</p>		<p>Affordable housing definition is consistent with the NPPF. See response to R01213/07 regarding affordable housing. Policy LP27 on Tall Buildings is supported by the findings of the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77). The Plan supports a mix of uses in Ilford town centre reflecting its status as a Metropolitan Centre. Policy LP26 sets out the Councils approach to promoting high quality design. Historic implementation of policies falls beyond the remit of consultation on the Local Plan. Phasing set out in the plan reflects site constraints and their impact on when sites are likely to come forward for development.</p>	
R00166/04	Ruth Musgrave	67	Para 3.24	<p>The phases are ill-thought, giving so much development to Ilford South in phases 1 and 2 and reserving development in other parts of the borough until phase 3. IT DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE SOUND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLANNING. PARAGRAPHS 3.24; APPENDIX 2 There are no visual plans of the infrastructure. To have such a detailed plan for housing sites in Ilford South for all phases before having an equally detailed and robust plan for infrastructure for the same time scale is highly irresponsible. Funding is still being secured for much of the infrastructure. Many things have yet to be confirmed and are listed as borough wide rather than area specific. There are too many get out clauses which, we fear, will lead to infrastructure not being put in place at all, as has happened in the past.</p> <p>ALLOWING HMOs (HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION) AND CONVERSION OF HOMES TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH WILL LEAD TO FURTHER DECREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL NEEDS LP6, LP7, LP13 Allowing the further conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing, will continue to lead to the degradation of the Ilford South area.</p>		<p>Phasing set out in the plan reflects site constraints and their impact on when sites are likely to come forward for development. It also accounts for Ilford's status as a Housing Zone. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required. Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan. Policy LP13 sets criteria for new hotels in the borough.</p>	

R00166/05	Ruth Musgrave	22	LP1A	*Soundness Improvements? THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH		The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The Local Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy.	No further change required.
R00166/06	Ruth Musgrave	22	LP1A	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: DOING DETAILED, ROBUST ANALYSES OF POPULATION, HOUSING, PARKING AND POLLUTION LEVELS IN ILFORD SOUTH AND BY SCRUTINIZING THE TRUE IMPACT OF CROSSRAIL		The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements.	No further change required.
R00166/07	Ruth Musgrave	40	LP3	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: A HIGHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET LINKED TO AVERAGE INCOMES – WITH NO GET OUT CLAUSES		The affordable housing definition in the plan is consistent with the NPPF. See response to R01213/07 regarding affordable housing target.	No further change required.
R00166/08	Ruth Musgrave	46	LP5	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: MORE UNITS NEED TO BE FAMILY AND ELDERLY FRIENDLY. COUNCIL LAND SHOULD BE USED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE		See response to R00166/02. In addition LP4 sets out the Council's approach to specialist accommodation.	No further change required.
R00166/09	Ruth Musgrave	101	Policy LP27	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: JUSTIFYING THE REASON FOR A TALL BUILDING ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS – NOT SPECIFYING A PARTICULAR AREA FOR THEIR LOCATION. HAVING ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE QUALITY DESIGN IS ADHERED TO.	comment, no change sought	. Policy LP27 sets out the strategic approach to tall buildings in the borough and sets out criteria for determining individual proposals. It is supported by the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77)	
R00166/10	Ruth Musgrave	38		THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: CHANGING THE PHASING ALLOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS	comment, no change sought	See response to R00166/04	
R00166/11	Ruth Musgrave	138	LP41	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: GIVING MUCH GREATER DETAIL WITH INFRASTRUCTURE TIMESCALES LINKED CLOSER TO HOUSING TRAJECTORIES. DETAILED VISUAL PLANS REQUIRED.		See response to R00166/04	No further change required.
R00166/12	Ruth Musgrave	47	Policies LP6, LP7	THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: NOT ALLOWING ANY FURTHER HMOS, BEDS IN SHEDS AND CONVERSIONS TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH		See response to R00166/02	

R00166/13	Ruth Musgrave	4	Para 1.7	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? CONSULTATION ON THE PLAN AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES HAS BEEN INADEQUATE PARAGRAPHS 1.7 In Ilford South, residents have only become aware of the draft Redbridge Local Plan in the last few months. This has meant considering a Plan in the last stage of its completion with virtually no room for change. Awareness raising was through the work of a resident's group and not the council. None of the preceding consultations were known about by the vast majority of people in Ilford South. It has been assumed that Ilford South will take most of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives to this strategy have been marked by their absence. Any debate in the last few years has been about a very small percentage of development that might be in other areas</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING MOST OF THE NEW HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (2006). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (2017) (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00166/14	Ruth Musgrave	-	-	<p>Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? I opened the document but it is too complicated for me, and most residents, to understand</p>		Noted	
R00167/01	Chris Williams	13	Para 1.19.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1. Section 1.19.2 referring to emissions and climate change "The growth the borough is experiencing could make meeting climate change objectives more difficult, as a result of the additional greenhouse emissions that will arise from greater energy consumption generated by additional homes, new employment and transport emissions. However, growth is also a major opportunity to address climate change by ensuring that new buildings are constructed in a sustainable way, and increased use of sustainable public transport rather than reliance on the car." This representation is to advise that "new buildings are constructed in a sustainable way" is not sufficient to address the problems you are creating from increased emissions. The representation suggests the plan is not positively prepared or effective in this respect</p>	comment, no change sought	Policy LP22 promotes sustainable transport, whilst Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	

R00167/02	Chris Williams	155	sites 120, 196	<p>2a. Appendix 1, site number 120 & 196 (Building on station and shoppers car parks!!!) This representation shows that the plans for Site 120, to build dwellings on a very busy station car park used by commuters at South Woodford Station is incompatible with the Council's Parking Strategy, and Consultation feedback from residents. This representation also shows that the same circumstances apply to plans for Site 196, Woodford Station Car Park. But also, importantly, in addition, the replacement by home building of the adjacent large Charteris Road Car Park which is extensively used by shoppers accessing retail outlets in The Broadway and Snakes Lane. In both cases, there will be no recognised car parking facility for the hundreds of commuters who currently use all three car parks. They will have to avoid South Woodford and Woodford local centres, reducing the footfall in retail outlets and influencing economic wellbeing for businesses in both neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Shoppers, likewise, will lose their "ease of finding a space without driving around too much" (a key feedback from residents, recognised in the borough Parking Plan – see below) when the number of places available is outnumbered by the number of shoppers' vehicles. Charteris Road Car Park provides this adequately at present. This representation claims that the plan contravenes the criteria, values and principles of the council's publication "Parking strategy - five year objectives" and that therefore that the Local Plan is not sound, measured against the following: Positively prepared - based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.</p>		See response to R00164/02	
R00167/03	Chris Williams	154	sites 117, 120	<p>2b. Appendix 1, site number 117 (and associated 120) This representation puts forward the case that the Plan is not sound in relation to being: Positively prepared - based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. Plans for Development Site 117 do not meet the above for the reasons stated in the following pages. The site is designated as a "landmark building" and 120 homes are to be built on an area of 0.76 hectares. This means that this will require a structure of a tower block, completely contrary to the Characterisation Study outlined below. It is likely that the structure will require a height in terms of storeys amounting to double figures, (e.g. 12 storeys, assuming 10 dwellings per floor, 15 storeys at 8 dwellings per floor, 20 storeys at 6 dwellings per floor, etc.). It is possible that it could be higher. Therefore it is inconsistent with the stated aims of the South Woodford section of the Characterisation Study published by the Redbridge Local Authority (extracts shown below)</p>		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	

R00167/04	Chris Williams	-	-	<p>This is a section from SECTION 5: Character Areas (from Redbridge Characterisation Study June 2014 Pt 3) South Woodford "Elsewhere on George Lane some attractive upper floor features have been retained amid more varied ground floors. There are still many original dormers, barge-boards, ridge cresting on roof tops, chimney stacks and original stonework, although few windows are now original. In contrast there are also much newer structures built specifically as shopping space that are both out of scale and character. Overall however the core retains its charm as an attractive, older London suburb and shopping centre. This charm becomes more evident further down George Lane, from the former Woolworths store and beyond Glebelands Avenue, and towards the Central Line railway. The views become more interesting and the roof-scape of the buildings begin to become more coherent and consistent in design and scale.</p> <p>The Natwest bank at the corner of Marlborough Road is of note, this is an ornate three storey listed building in the Edwardian neo-Georgian style. Between numbers 98 to 137 on the southern part of George Lane, closer to South Woodford Station, there are some very good examples of Edwardian architecture that exhibits classic and varied motifs and themes of the architectural style of that period. Among these buildings there is an architectural pattern that is repeated but which varies in an appealing manner. On this section of George Lane the Victorian and Edwardian architectural imprint is stronger than further up George Lane closer to The Shrubberies. The buildings here illustrate elaborate detailing that helps to make this section of the street distinctive and characterful despite the lack of heritage designation.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00167/05	Chris Williams	-	-	<p>George Lane slopes noticeably downwards towards the south east as building heights generally increase. This produces a consistency in relation to the evenness of the overall roof scape. At the north west of George Lane heights tend to be no more than two to three storeys, but towards the south eastern end of George Lane heights increase by around a storey and a half, although the finer Edwardian grain is maintained. The street widths at George Lane vary dramatically, with the much wider widths at the north-west around The Shrubberies and Electric Parade, and far narrower widths closer to South Woodford station. As might be expected as the street widths narrow, building frontages and pavement widths tend to shrink.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted	No further change required.

R00167/06	Chris Williams	-	-	<p>Narrower street widths and taller buildings create much greater levels of enclosure in the south-east of the core. The building grain in the core tends to be finer in the older parts of the centre, especially the south eastern section of George Lane where historic development is better preserved. There are a number of Big Box developments within the centre in the form of Sainsbury's and Waitrose supermarkets, and the Odeon Cinema, but these are situated behind the existing form of the street enclosure represented by the older buildings overlooking the street, and are therefore not a major intrusion on the character of the core. Public realm enhancements at South Woodford Centre were undertaken between 2009 and 2011 and there is now consistency in the street palette: surfacing materials are not of the highest quality but at least have a uniformity. "</p> <p>"The most important views within the core are those views directly onto The Shrubberies and vistas along George Lane north to south and south to north. It is important that direct views onto the Conservation Area are not obscured, and there is no intrusion on the current panoramic view of the buildings. The important vistas on George Lane consist of attractive views of the roof-scape, and a variety of interesting short views and glimpses experienced by pedestrians as they walk further down George Lane towards South Woodford Station.</p>	Comment, no change sought	Noted	No further change required.
R00167/07	Chris Williams	80	LP20	*Soundness Improvements? 1. To resolve representation 1 above it is recommended that the plan should clearly state that "It shall be the responsibility of construction companies to ensure that all new dwelling built in the period of the plan should be, as a minimum, 'energy neutral' and preferably contribute to energy injected into the national grid'	All houses should be energy neutral, and preferably be net contributors to National Grid	Policies LP19-20 sets out the Councils approach to addressing climate change in conformity with the London Plan	
R00167/08	Chris Williams	155	Sites 120, 196	2a. To resolve representation 2a above it is recommended that appendix 1, site number 120 and 196 are removed from the plan	Remove sites 120 and 196 (South Woodford station Car Park and Chantris Road Car Park) from Appendix 1 "to build dwellings on a very busy station car park used by commuters at South Woodford Station is incompatible with the Council's Parking Strategy"	. The Council's parking strategy consists of a number of approaches that include disposing of Council assets that are surplus to requirements.	
R00167/09	Chris Williams	154	Site 117	2b. To resolve representation 2b above it is recommended that appendix 1, site number 117 is removed from the plan	comment, no change sought	. See response to R00108/14.	

R00167/10	Chris Williams	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Statement of community involvement Consultations should be planned so that every member of the community is advised in writing of consultation opportunities so that they can make their representations Redbridge have failed to advise their residents of the existence of the plan, the consultation opportunities and reasonable consultation facilities. The release/acceptance of the plan should be delayed so that every resident is advised in writing of the proposed introduction of the plan and given at least one opportunity for consultation at a venue capable of supporting the number of people who wish to participate. In addition, Redbridge should ensure that there are sufficient representatives of the local authority available at the consultations to ensure a fair representation from the community is both received and considered by the council</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Failure to advise residents re existence of plan	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	
R00168/01	andy walker	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Redbridge will be even more over crowded than it is now once these developments happen. Previous practice of building new towns was far better. No further development in Redbridge. We have done our bit already. New towns or expanding new towns would be better.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>		New towns outside Redbridge are beyond the scope of the Local Plan; however the Government has announced new Garden Villages and Garden Towns. No further Change Required.	

R00170/01	Alison Goodliffe	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I recognise that there is a need for more housing within the borough. However I feel that as well as housing extra infrastructure needs to be included as part of the plan. In the area where I live, South Woodford, there are plans for a large number of extra homes but only plans to expand one form of entry at primary schools (and that not in the schools closest to main development areas) or to increase the capacity of the central line (our main public transport route). We already failed to gain a space at our closest primary school for our daughter 4 years ago and the schools are already full.</p> <p>I commute to my teaching job in Bethnal Green every morning and even at 7am the central line is frequently packed. When there are delays on the central line trying to get on the train at South Woodford in the mornings or to get home in the evening is nearly impossible. The plans only talk about improving accessibility of stations through lifts, rather than actually increasing the ability of remains to cope with the increase in passenger numbers. While I have no objections to the building of new homes I think that doing so without adequately planning for the knock on implications on the quality of life for all in the area is wrong.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Plans for new schools/ school places in the areas where new houses are being planned. Work to increase the capacity of the central line.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).
R00173/01	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01

R00173/02	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00173/03	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00173/04	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00173/05	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11</p>
R00173/06	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>
R00173/07	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p>		<p>See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>

R00173/08	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will “seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford’s) rich Victorian and Edwardian character”. How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford		see response to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00173/09	Margarita Johnson	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford’s designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00173/10	Margarita Johnson	155	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a ‘land grab’ for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no’s 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00173/11	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00173/12	Margarita Johnson	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge’s part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00173/13	Margarita Johnson	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00174/01	Atanas Dimov	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective for the South Woodford are due to the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone envisaging growth in the number of house. However, the existing infrastructure has no capacity to cope with such a population increase and no infrastructure improvements are included in the plan.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	

R00174/02	Atanas Dimov	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport Paragraph 1.21.4 acknowledges that the Central Line which is the major means of transport cannot cope with the current footfall. There is no evident way to improve this; therefore areas along the Hainault branch of the Central line would be better positioned for growth from this perspective.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 states that Charlie Brown Roundabout is a major junction and experiences high traffic levels at peak times. How can improvements be made to the junction when some of the adjacent sites are proposed for development (site no 116, 118, and 119). This shows a lack of consideration in relation to road infrastructure.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00174/03	Atanas Dimov	32	LP1D	<p>Schools The plan proposes 651 new homes and 150 "temporary" units in South Woodford. Current school expansion schemes (Nightingale and Woodbridge) are undertaken to cope with existing demand and had to sacrifice sports playgrounds in order to accommodate current number of students. Therefore, the proposed plan creates grounds for educational crisis which will risk the education quality and the well-being of the increased number of schoolchildren.</p>		See response to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00174/04	Atanas Dimov	155	Site 122	<p>Other Infrastructure Despite proposals that will foster population increase in South Woodford, the plan does not put forward other infrastructure improvements such as doctor surgeries, sport and leisure centres, hospitals, etc., apart from a tiny site (site 122). Travelling to such facilities in neighbouring areas will have environmental impacts (pollution, etc.) and will further impact the already burdened public transportation.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00174/05	Atanas Dimov	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 would require the conversion of most of the South Woodford business units into residential facilities. This will take jobs away from South Woodford and will hamper the ability of the population to find local jobs. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office space but there has been no new office space development in the recent years. Paragraph 3.6.5 suggest a landmark building at the Station Estate. This contradicts paragraph 3.6.8 which states that developments must respect the established residential characteristics. How does a tall landmark building fit within the current characteristics of the area?</p>		see response to R00108/11-12 and R00108/14	
R00174/06	Atanas Dimov	32	Site 3.6.1	<p>Furthermore, paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character. Therefore, it is difficult to see how the proposed plan can achieve a maximum growth in a sustainable manner (paragraph 1.4.2) balancing homes, jobs and infrastructure (paragraph 3.22).</p>		The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	
R00174/07	Atanas Dimov	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response 108/01.	

R00174/08	Atanas Dimov	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford's business community rather than encouraging residential development. Remove a number of business sites earmarked for residential development (sites 116, 117, 118, 120).	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00174/09	Atanas Dimov	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove plans for landmark buildings at Station Estate or anywhere else in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00174/10	Atanas Dimov	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Replace Station Estate landmark building option with special accommodation for elderly people (paragraph 3.10.1 specifically outlines such a need). This will also provide easy access to the tube station for these people who are less mobile. Part of the estate can also be accommodated for a community centre or a sports facility.	comment, no change sought	. See respnses R00108/14 and R00108/15.	
R00174/11	Atanas Dimov	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Legally Compliant Comments? Even if legally compliant, the plan does not take into consideration the existing population and how the proposed developments would impact the life of the people. *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate Comments? I would expect that the duty to cooperate also expands to communication and discussions with local societies and businesses. Has this been done?	South Woodford	. Comment noted. The Council considers that it has met the duty to cooperate. Detailed information regarding how the Council has met its duty to cooperate is included in the separate Duty to Cooperate statement for submission (LBR 1.14).	
R00175/01	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Improvements? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00175/02	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00175/03	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00175/04	Michael Speyer	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00175/05	Michael Speyer	32	para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident’s ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11	

R00175/06	Michael Speyer	12	Para 1.17.8	Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00175/07	Michael Speyer	32	para 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford?	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00175/08	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.6.1	As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	. The Local Plan does not propose tall buildings for South Wodford. The Plan proposes to withdraw the tall buildings designation within the current Local Development Framework (LDF 2008); ee response R00108/14. With regard to issues on Rose Avenue Park, see response See response R00108/18.	
R00175/09	Michael Speyer	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00175/10	Michael Speyer	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00175/11	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00175/12	Michael Speyer	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00175/13	Michael Speyer	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response See response R00108/18.	
R00177/01	Imtiaz Umer	22	LP1A	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Considering the density of Ilford south, this plan will result in increased density in an already highly populated area resulting in repercussions for the current population and services. *Soundness Improvements? Redirecting the objectives to other parts of the borough would help make the plan sound. *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? The consultation period is not allowing sufficient time for the local population to consider it. *Legally Compliant Improvements? Much more longer consultation period rather than rushing it through under the noses of the local people. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? The strategy seems ill-thought and not having any consideration for the local area who will be affected the most.	Ilford South	The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough.	No further change required.
R00178/01	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Improvements? Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan. Moreover, with the question of infrastructure in mind, there is no evidence of joint working with London Transport, other transport agencies, the NHS, General Practitioners (not part of NHS, but independent contractors), Schools (all sectors), the Local Education Authority etc.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	

R00178/02	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Turning to the Epping branch, the footfall at Snaresbrook remains much lower than at South Woodford. The high level of footfall at South Woodford reflects the fact that it is a residential area which is already densely populated.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). Whilst there is a reference to improving Charlie Brown's there is no substance to this intention which lacks all credibility: the Plan will, in fact, just add to the pressures there. The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure more broadly with Chigwell Road and the High Road already struggling to cope.</p>		<p>The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both also identified as investment and growth areas. In light of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33) findings, site 118 has subsequently been proposed for protection as a Local Business Area.</p>	
R00178/03	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford, despite the fact that the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a significant extra demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children.</p> <p>The Plan will jeopardise the safety of our children by risking the school's capacity to be a nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports. I also fear that there will be more accidents and deaths on the roads through the increased traffic congestion around all South Woodford schools at 'dropping off' and 'picking up' times. I live next to Oakdale Infants School and think the traffic at those times is already an accident waiting to happen - an increase in pupils.... a risk!</p>		<p>See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06</p>	

R00178/04	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? What is the future of Whipps Cross? Will it be able to cope with increased demand? Anecdotal though it is, my last visit to the Walk In Centre at Whipps Cross kept me there from 10.00pm to 4.00am! The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth.</p> <p>The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00178/05	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00178/06	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	

R00178/07	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? It is vital to the character of South Woodford that developments, improvements and maintenance in the area respects and reflects that character. It is vital to the well-being of the residents and to the long-term success of the area - and, at present, it is a successful and thriving area as noted in the Plan. It is also vital to local democracy and to residents' confidence in the political systems that our earlier petition as well as our response to your Plan is noted. As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00178/08	Tim Drew	154	site 116	<p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". High rise or tower blocks do not fit in with this wonderful heritage.</p> <p>Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). The current plan does not deliver this for South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	see responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00178/09	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>To the contrary, if taken forward the Plan would jeopardise the quality of life in South Woodford by over-stretching the local infrastructure, and by harming the local character of an attractive part of the Borough. Taking forward the Plan would also harm local confidence in the political process - on which point, I find it disgraceful that I have been advised that comments on the Plan will only be taken by the borough if this internet based format is used - this excludes many older people from commenting: this, I believe to be a deliberate attempt to reduce the amount of comment. The format itself is not easy boxing responses into a framework that lies outside the way most of us think about these issues - is that another way of reducing the number comments or just bureaucratic insensitivity?</p>		see response to R00108/01. The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (LBR 1.15). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	

R00178/10	Tim Drew	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The local Plan needs to very substantially reduce the number of new residences to be introduced into this already crowded residential area. It is recommended that the Plan does not look beyond bringing back into use currently unused/empty prior residential accommodation. The Local Plan should look to increasing residential development at sites that might make use of the the Snaresbrook and Wanstead underground stations, and at further sites along the Hainault line.</p>	Development should be focussed at Snaresbrook, Wanstead, and the Hainault Loop	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.
R00178/11	Tim Drew	32	para 3.6.5	The Local Plan should respect the character of South Woodford and refrain from introducing any high rise of 'statement' buildings.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00178/12	Tim Drew	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Legally Compliant Comments? This question sits outside my knowledge base!!</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Holding in mind the lack of local infrastructure to support this plan, I see no evidence of joint working with London Transport, other transport agencies, the NHS, General Practitioners (not part of NHS, but independent contractors), Schools (all sectors), the Local Education Authority etc..</p>	Oakdale Infants School, traffic safety around schools	The Council considers that it has met the duty to cooperate. Detailed information regarding how the Council has met its duty to cooperate is included in the separate Duty to Cooperate statement for submission (LBR 1.14)	
R00179/01	Julie Spraggon	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? South Woodford has been targeted for a massive increase in housing - 650 new homes - without any improvements to infrastructure to copy with this increase in residents. S. Woodford station is already overcrowded and not coping with the traffic (as acknowledged in para 1.21.4. It is much busier than stations on the Hainault branch and so it would be much more logical to site further housing there. Roads are also failing to cope especially around Charlie Browns' and there is no indication of any proposals to improve this. A lot of the new development is focused on this area. Pollution in the area has just been reported to be 4x higher than EU regulations so more housing without tackling this issue does not seem like a good idea.</p>		see responses to R00108/01-03. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	
R00179/02	Julie Spraggon	32	Policy LP1D	There are no new schools proposed for South Woodford to copy with the large increase in population. Those we have are already oversubscribed and current expansion plans target the current oversubscription and will soon be absorbed by increased demand. Schools are in danger of becoming oversized - eg new expansion at Woodbridge - with the consequential loss of quality and standards. Schools green areas and playing fields are being targeted as a solution to this (eg Woodbridge) which is a very poorly thought through idea given the pollution in the area (which green spaces at least help with) and the continuing obesity crisis. This is really short-term, not joined-up thinking.		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00179/03	Julie Spraggon	32	Policy LP1D	I am very disappointed that our council doesn't have the vision to come up with long-term, big-picture strategies with regards to the local area and the quality of life there. South Woodford (despite always being targeted for housing) never gets a share of sports and leisure facilities. We have lost the best part of our library to a pay-for gym; have never had a pool, have no sports grounds or leisure centres (Wanstead is the nearest). There is nothing for kids to do. The parks at Churchfields and Onslow gardens (particularly the latter) are neglected, particularly in comparison to Wanstead park and others on the other side of the borough. Businesses are also under attack with all business sites in South Woodford being earmarked for residential development. Local businesses are essential to the life and economy of an area. Landmark building on the Station Estate is proposed again despite the objections of nearly 2000 residents.		see responses to R00108/01, R00108/10, R00108/11 and R00108/14	
R00179/04	Julie Spraggon	32	Policy LP1D	This is totally out of place in this part of the borough. In sum, the current plan burdens South Woodford with huge increased in housing and population, attacks businesses, with no plans for infrastructure development or any protection given to the character of the area.		The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of the full range of policies contained within the plan.	
R00179/05	Julie Spraggon	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone Preserve the economic vitality of the business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab'.		See response R00108/01 and R00108/11.	
R00179/06	Julie Spraggon	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Remove a number of business sites earmarked for development - 116, 117, 118, 120		Site 118 has been removed as a Development Opportunity Site on account of the findings of the Employment Land Study. See also response to R00108/11	
R00179/07	Julie Spraggon	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate South Woodford		see response to R00108/14	
R00179/08	Julie Spraggon	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked developments areas like Station Estate could be used for social or leisure purposes to improve facility and quality of life in the area. Specialist accommodation for the elderly could be sited here (deemed lacking in para 3.10.1) as this would have less of an impact on tube usage . *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	South Woodford	See response R00108/15	

R00180/01	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	4	Para 1.7	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1) We believe the Plan is not legally compliant because: CONSULTATION ON THE PLAN AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES HAS BEEN EXTREMELY POOR PARAGRAPHS 1.7 In Ilford South, residents have only become aware of the draft Redbridge Local Plan in the last few months. This has meant considering a Plan in the last stage of its completion with virtually no room for change. Awareness raising was through the work of a resident's group and not the council. None of the preceding consultations were known about by the vast majority of people in Ilford South. It has simply been assumed that Ilford South will take 75% of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives to this strategy have been marked by their absence. Any debate in the last few years has been about a very small percentage of development that might be in other areas.</p>	Ilford South	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	
R00180/02	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	56	Paras 3.11, 3.12; Policy LP5	<p>2) We believe the Plan is not sound. It is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy because: THE DWELLING MIX WILL NOT ADDRESS LOCAL NEEDS PARAGRAPHS 3.11, 3.12, 7.7; LP5; The preponderance of 1 and 2 bedroom flats will not provide the dwelling mix required for the local area, where there is a major shortage of family housing. The council is, therefore, not addressing the specific housing needs in the borough, particularly for families, but is simply trying to meet housing unit numbers. Using council land predominantly for private, market rate housing is a strategy to generate income for the council and will not address the housing issues of the borough.</p>		Policy LP5 sets out the Council's preferred dwelling mix which includes a range of household sizes including family housing	
R00180/03	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	8	Paras 1.13, 1.20, Policies LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3	<p>3) We believe the Plan is not sound. It is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy because: THE PLAN DOES NOT FULFILL ITS OBJECTIVES OF INCREASING FAIRNESS AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL RESIDENTS PARAGRAPHS 1.13, 1.20; LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3 There will be a huge increase in population in Ilford South, which is already the most densely populated and deprived part of the borough. There are already problems with the traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. The schools are also overcrowded and are being expanded, with loss of open space. This is making them too large and impersonal, detrimentally affecting children's wellbeing. There are huge catchments for doctors and there is already a deficiency of open space in the area.</p>		The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.
R00180/04	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	93	Para 1.8, Policy LP24	<p>4) THE EVIDENCE BASE IS POOR PARAGRAPH 1.8; LP24 Population projections and housing data have poor analyses and use insufficient and erroneous data. No population density, parking stress or pollution level surveys have been carried out in areas of high proposed development. The benefits of Crossrail to enhance train capacity are not scrutinized or quantified.</p>		The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements.	

R00180/05	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	42	Para 3.9.4, Policy LP3	5) THE POLICY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL NOT ADDRESS THE HUGE CRISIS OF AFFORDABILITY IN THE AREA PARAGRAPH 3.9.4; LP3 For affordable to be defined as 80% of market rate in Redbridge, which has some of the highest house prices in outer London, is simply unrealistic. A 30% affordable target is very low when there is such a need. The council is, therefore, not addressing the housing crisis in the borough but simply trying to meet housing targets and to generate income for the council.	comment, no change sought	Definitions of affordable housing are in conformity with the London Plan and NPPF	
R00180/06	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	98	Para 5.4, Policy LP26, LP27, LP29	6) THE TALL BUILDINGS STRATEGY IS POORLY THOUGHT THROUGH PARAGRAPHS 5.4; LP26,LP27, LP29 The encouragement of high density tall buildings, primarily residential, predominantly in Ilford South, is a very dangerous gamble on the part of Redbridge Council. These developments will be overbearing and out of character with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing and height. This strategy is likely to cause the quality of life of the residents to degenerate. The town centres need a focus on employment rather than housing. It will exacerbate the many existing problems of an already crowded environment, along with the associated problems relating to the amenities of local residents, in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, and wind tunnelling. The policy standards of LP26 have been and, we fear, will continue to be constantly flouted with no regard to the amenity of existing residents.		See response to R00166/03	
R00180/07	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	52	LP9	7) THE TIMESCALES ARE NOT DELIVERABLE LP9, LP10, LP11 The timescales advocated within the Plan are not practicable. The plan proposes a high concentration of building sites in a number of limited areas, coming on stream at the same time. It will turn certain areas into permanent building sites for years. The phases are ill-thought, giving so much development to Ilford South in phases 1 and 2 and reserving development in other parts of the borough until phase 3.		Phasing set out in the plan reflects site constraints and their impact on when sites are likely to come forward for development.	No further change required.
R00180/08	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	67	Para 3.24	8) IT DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE SOUND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLANNING. PARAGRAPHS 3.24; APPENDIX 2 There are no visual plans of the infrastructure. To have such a detailed plan for housing sites in Ilford South for all phases before having an equally detailed and robust plan for infrastructure for the same time scale is highly irresponsible. Funding is still being secured for much of the infrastructure. Many things have yet to be confirmed and are listed as borough wide rather than area specific. There are too many get out clauses which, we fear, will lead to infrastructure not being put in place at all, as has happened in the past.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017) (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.

R00180/09	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	47	LP6	9) ALLOWING HMOs (HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION) AND CONVERSION OF HOMES TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH WILL LEAD TO FURTHER DECREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL NEEDS LP6, LP7, LP13 Allowing the further conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing, will continue to lead to the degradation of the Ilford South area.		Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required.	No further change required.
R00180/10	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	22	LP1A	*Soundness Improvements? 1) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (LBR 1.15). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00180/11	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	46	LP5	2) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: MORE UNITS NEED TO BE FAMILY AND ELDERLY FRIENDLY. COUNCIL LAND SHOULD BE USED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE		Policy LP4 supports specialist accommodation, whilst Policy LP5 seeks a dwelling mix in new developments that includes family housing.	No further change required.
R00180/12	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	22	LP1A	3) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH		The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan	No further change required.
R00180/13	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	20	LP1	4) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: DOING DETAILED, ROBUST ANALYSES OF POPULATION, HOUSING, PARKING AND POLLUTION LEVELS IN ILFORD SOUTH AND BY SCRUTINIZING THE TRUE IMPACT OF CROSSRAIL		The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements.	No further change required.
R00180/14	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	40	LP3	5) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: A HIGHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET LINKED TO AVERAGE INCOMES – WITH NO GET OUT CLAUSES		The definition of affordable housing is in conformity with definitions used in the London Plan and NPPF.	No further change required.
R00180/15	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	101	LP27	6) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: JUSTIFYING THE REASON FOR A TALL BUILDING ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS – NOT SPECIFYING A PARTICULAR AREA FOR THEIR LOCATION. HAVING ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE QUALITY DESIGN IS ADHERED TO.		Policy LP27 on Tall Buildings is supported by the findings of the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77).	No further change required.
R00180/16	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	138	LP41	7)THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: CHANGE THE PHASING ALLOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS		Phasing set out in the plan reflects site constraints and their impact on when sites are likely to come forward for development.	No further change required.
R00180/17	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	138	LP41	8) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: GIVING MUCH GREATER DETAIL WITH INFRASTRUCTURE TIMESCALES LINKED CLOSER TO HOUSING TRAJECTORIES. DETAILED VISUAL PLANS REQUIRED.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00180/18	Fahad Sheikh, Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	47	LP6	9) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: NOT ALLOWING ANY FURTHER HMOS, BEDS IN SHEDS AND CONVERSIONS TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH *Legally Compliant? No	Do not allow any further HMOs or Beds in Sheds.	Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required. Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan.	No further change required.

R00181/01	Shilpa Patel	22	LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The effect of so many people living in the centre with put a strain on health and social services on only in the town centre but neighboring wards.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? The plan has to show were more health and social services will be created or increased to meet the increase number of people. Not all will be young health working people between the ages of 21 to 40 years.</p>		Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00182/01	Tahera Patel	22	LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Hardly any consultation, will ruin the old town, high rises lead to all sorts of problems, light, noise, nuisance etc.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Do not build any new flats. You are ruining the look of Ilford. Hmos should not be allowed. Nor should further bed sit style hotels be allowed.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? No one is made aware.</p>	No new flats, no HMOs, no long stay hotels	The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMOs where planning permission is required. Policy LP26 promotes high quality design. The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00184/01	Christina Woodward	158	Site 166	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Map 5 site 166 The destruction of The Horse and Well This is a rare 17th century building</p> <p>Para. 1.1.5 "The Local Plan will also safeguard and enhance what is good and special about Redbridgeheritage, distinctive buildings"</p> <p>Para.2.2 "To preserve and enhance ... the borough's conservation areas and other historic and valued buildings"</p> <p>Para.1.23.1 "to ensure that new development is respecting local character and heritage" You have blatantly gone against your own policy</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	Planning Consent has already been granted for a total of 8 housing units at The Horse and Well; this would still be valid irrespective of the policies of this new Local Plan. The site has been included within the list of Opportunity sites so that it is included within our projections of housing capacity, as it is expected to be completed within Phase 1 of the Plan. Full details of the application, including the Decision Notice, [ref 2476/11] are available on the Council website.	No further change required.
R00185/01	Barbara Franklin	-	-	*Soundness? No	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00186/01	Christina Woodward	168	Para 2.2, Appendix 3	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I refer to Paragraph 2.2 Strategic Objectives "to preserve and enhance the unique character of Redbridge" And Appendix 3 Target - Reduce dependence on the private car, minimising greenhouse gases</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? I suggest you stay with your above mentioned plan, rather than blatantly ignoring it. I refer now to Site 196 - To build flats over Charteris Road and Woodford Station Car Parks 1. This will destroy the quiet charm of walking home from Woodford Station 2. Blocks of flats, running on electricity and gas, using vast amounts of household appliances DO NOT emit less greenhouse gases than parked cars in a park lined with trees. 3. These car parks are filled mainly by people travelling to work. If they lived within 3/4 mile of the station, then they would probably walk there rather than pay to park. If the car parks weren't there, they would be forced to drive even further to find a station with a car park. Extending their working day and emitting even more greenhouse gases.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Do not build on site 196, as it would conflict with para 2.2 strategic objectives	The Local Plan aims to deliver sustainable growth. Policies, such as LP1, LP1A-E have been included in the Local Plan to ensure that in the context of growth we continue to protect our environment and secure opportunities for improvement and investment.	No further change required.
R00188/02	Christina Woodward	157	Para 2.1.1, Site 154	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 2.1.1. "...high quality developments that enrich the borough's heritage and character." 2.2 "To preserve and enhance the unique character of Redbridge" Site 154 Post Office, Johnston Road This Post Office building is situated in the original Woodford Green village, where small houses and shops sit around a duck pond. To stay true to the wording of your own policy, any replacement building would need to be no more than 2 stories high.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? As the Government can change the laws to fit the Plan, the question is irrelevant. Legal or not, the Local Plan has much in it that is morally wrong. This is of such little concern to you, that there is no proper space on this form for the subject to be raised.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? As the Duty to Cooperate was compiled by councils, for councils, then it probably does comply. It means nothing to anyone outside the council.</p>	objection, no specific change sought	Noted. The site allocation at Woodford Green Post Office relates to a planning application that has already been granted (irrespective of the new Local Plan) and is included within Appendix 1 to allow for housing numbers and land supply to be accurately calculated. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.

R00189/01	Imran Ayubson	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? There will be a huge increase in population in Ilford South, which is already the most densely populated and deprived part of the borough. There are already problems with the traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. The schools are also overcrowded and are being expanded, with loss of open space. This is making them too large and impersonal, detrimentally affecting children's wellbeing. There are huge catchments for doctors and there is already a deficiency of open space in the area. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH</p>	Reduce housing numbers for Ilford South	<p>The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.
R00189/02	Imran Ayubson	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? In Ilford South, residents have only become aware of the draft Redbridge Local Plan in the last few months. This has meant considering a Plan in the last stage of its completion with virtually no room for change. Awareness raising was through the work of a resident's group and not the council. None of the preceding consultations were known about by the vast majority of people in Ilford South. It has simply been assumed that Ilford South will take 75% of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives to this strategy have been marked by their absence. Any debate in the last few years has been about a very small percentage of development that might be in other areas.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>		<p>The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.</p>	
R00191/01	Angelika Barclay	-	-	*Soundness? No	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00192/01	Lida King	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00192/02	Lida King	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00192/03	Lida King	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00192/04	Lida King	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00192/05	Lida King	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	
R00192/06	Lida King	12	Para 1.17.8	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	
R00192/07	Lida King	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'.</p>		<p>See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>	

R00192/08	Lida King	32	Para 3.6.1	<p>Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will “seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford’s) rich Victorian and Edwardian character”.</p> <p>How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00192/09	Lida King	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford’s designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00192/10	Lida King	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a ‘land grab’ for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no’s 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00192/11	Lida King	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00192/12	Lida King	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge’s part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00192/13	Lida King	154	site 116	<p>5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00193/01	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00193/02	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00193/03	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00193/04	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00193/05	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	
R00193/06	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	
R00193/07	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p>		<p>See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>	

R00193/08	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will “seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford’s) rich Victorian and Edwardian character”. How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00193/09	Manjit Bhatia	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford’s designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00193/10	Manjit Bhatia	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a ‘land grab’ for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no’s 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00193/11	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00193/12	Manjit Bhatia	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge’s part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00193/13	Manjit Bhatia	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00194/01	Alan Johnson	-	-	*Soundness? Don't know	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00196/01	David Lawson	-	-	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? the proposals will place an unbalanced pressure on the services in onew part of the borough *Soundness Improvements? the proposed increases in housing availability should be spread over the borough *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know		Other areas of the borough such as Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor are identified for a significantly largger amount of development than South Woodford	No further change required.

R00197/01	George Jillian	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The area is already overdeveloped, plus Oakfield is greenbelt and very well used by the existing population.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Insufficient account taken regarding the growth of the youth population and the fact that it is against the government sports policy</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? its not consistent with the national policy and not positively prepared</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00016/01 and R01088/01	
R00198/01	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is not sound regarding the South Woodford Area. For example Paragraph 3.2 designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone with plans for in excess of 650 homes. but no plans for infrastructure improvements to cope with the already stretched services such as transport (the Central Line in particular) Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". That is inconsistent with the proposed large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119) is. The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. In light of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33) findings, site 118 has subsequently been proposed for protection as a Local Business Area.	No further change required.
R00198/02	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 650 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, would make a high demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are intended to cope with current demands and will struggle to do so, losing sports grounds in the process. This Plan has not considered future demands with the growth proposal.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00198/03	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to other infrastructure areas in South Woodford such as health (GP surgeries and hospitals) leisure services and childcare. There is no recognition of the needs of such a dramatic rise in the population, and the consequent risks to all. in the locality. The only site which will potentially provide some facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal - this would not be sufficient.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00198/04	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford The new plan seems to have earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. The business case for this is not made out. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential - impacting adversely on local residents who have to travel further to work, causing pollution and adding other costs Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. . Finally, the Plan talks about growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). As presently drafted the Plan does not achieve this		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00198/05	Nicola Hayes	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? - remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone -	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00198/06	Nicola Hayes	54	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	preserve the economic life of South Woodford business community - remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00198/07	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.6.5	- remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00198/08	Nicola Hayes	32	Para 3.6.5	and instead identify it as specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, (reference para 3.10.1 that such accommodation is lacking -	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00198/09	Nicola Hayes	-	-	attention for further housing growth should focus along the Hainault branch of the Central Line where attention for further housing growth should focus (and scope for transport links could be improved) *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	Focus housing growth along Hainault branch of Central line	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.
R00199/01	john attew	-	-	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The consultation period is inadequate & totally flawed.The 'drop in' session i attended was farcical.No meaningful discussion with members of The public was achievable.Demand a more robust attempt be made to notify The residents before proceeding further! *Soundness Improvements? See above *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Lack of robust consultation with residents Perhaps a Meeting for local residents @ Hawkey Hall *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Residents have been willfully disregarded	Have a more robust consultation before continuing	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.

R00201/01	Roberta and Duncan McWatt	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Totally ineffective and misguided regarding the South Woodford and Snaresbrook area. Designated for over 650 homes but no improvements or additional provision for transport, schools and other infrastructure such as doctors surgeries all of which are already straining to cope.</p> <p>No account taken of incremental development by means of extensions/additions to existing houses. The plan focuses on infrastructure improvements at Borough level which would mean people from South Woodford/Snaresbrook travelling right across the Borough to get to schools, leisure facilities, hospitals, swimming pool thus putting more strain on transport. Also a huge strain on peoples' own time and resources</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01. Policy LP30 sets out the Councils approach to Household Extensions	
R00201/02	Roberta and Duncan McWatt	32	Para 3.6.1	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Each time planning permission is granted for an additional bedroom, due allowance must be made for extra people living and moving around in the area. Facilities need to be provided close to where people live . Not only is that more convenient for everybody, it also reduces need for additional transport, parking and reduces pollution. South Woodford station estate would be better location for Business than residential.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? Unbalanced. Fails to protect , let alone enhance, local heritage including South Woodford's Victorian and Edwardian character although it pays lip service to it (para 3.6.1)</p>	impact of residential extensions	Noted. See response to R00108/11	
R00202/01	Richard Tipper	21	Paras 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00202/02	Richard Tipper	33	paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00202/03	Richard Tipper	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00202/04	Richard Tipper	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00202/05	Richard Tipper	32	paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00202/06	Richard Tipper	32	paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00202/07	Richard Tipper	21	Paras 1.4.2, 3.2.2	In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford. Please set out how you think the Local Plan could be changed in order to make it sound. • Please note you will need to say why this modification will make the Plan sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as detailed as possible.		The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	
R00202/08	Richard Tipper	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01.	
R00202/09	Richard Tipper	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00202/10	Richard Tipper	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00202/11	Richard Tipper	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00202/12	Richard Tipper	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? No	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18	

R00203/01	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00203/02	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00203/03	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00203/04	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00203/05	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11</p>	
R00203/06	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see responses to R00108/11-12</p>	
R00203/07	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford?</p>		<p>See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>	

R00203/08	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will “seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford’s) rich Victorian and Edwardian character”. How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		see response to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00203/09	Graham Watts	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford’s designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00203/10	Graham Watts	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a ‘land grab’ for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no’s 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00203/11	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00203/12	Graham Watts	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge’s part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00204/01	Quinlan Patrick	37	LP2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Redbridge is to be commended for subscribing to ambitious housing delivery targets in excess of those mandated by London Plan. These targets are particularly welcome in light of the low level of housing delivery within the Borough in recent years. It is important that this population increase is seen as an opportunity to leverage development to the benefit of both existing and future residents, as increasing densities across the existing built area can support improved provision of social, sporting, cultural and transport facilities. However, the soundness of the plan is potentially compromised by broader questions of fairness in where and how change and development are accommodated.	no change sought	Support noted.	No further change required.

R00204/02	Quinlan Patrick	37	LP2	<p>According to LP2: Delivering Housing Growth, the bulk of housing delivery (84% ex-windfall) is to be focused on Investment and Growth areas, which represent only a small fraction (10-15% by estimate) of the total land area of the borough. LP2 does not make reference to the manner in which the 16% of development that is not directed towards Investment and Growth Areas or Opportunity Sites will be facilitated. While the intention, set out under LP3: Affordable Housing (g) to monitor interest for self-build / custom build plots is welcome, the policy should propose positive support beyond mere monitoring. Items 7 and 8 of the implementation section in turn limit actions in this regard to plots made available by the Council, volume housebuilders and registered landlords, whereas much greater potential lies in the development of small, privately owned plots across the Borough.</p>	Further support for self build / custom build	<p>Noted. It is acknowledged that policy LP2 could benefit from some modification to recognise the contribution infill development can make towards new housing supply. Such development could potentially form a source of self build housing supply.</p>	<p>Insert new point (f) in LP2 to read: "Supporting infill development on previously developed land, subject to the criteria set out in polices LP7 and LP26"</p>
R00204/03	Quinlan Patrick	46	Policy LP5	<p>Policy LP5: Dwelling Mix, sets out targets that between 40-50% of all units delivered across all tenure types should be three or four bed units - a fair reflection of a housing need that is generally underprovided for in large, multi-unit developments. In practice, the aspiration of LP5 directly contravenes the intention under LP2 to provide 84% of new units in high / very high density developments in Investment and Growth Areas. Market realities and the drive for density will render the dwelling mix impossible to achieve, a fact already recognised in the 'Implementation' section of the policy. Small infill sites, suitable for the construction of individual 3-4 bedroom homes, offer a practical means of increasing the supply of this type of unit to assist in meeting the plan targets.</p>	LP5 contradicts LP2 regarding delivery of family homes	<p>Policy LP5 sets out a preferred dwelling mix and acknowledges a flexible approach will be required in town centre locations. Proposals for infill sites will be determined based on their impact on local character and amenity.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>

R00204/04	Quinlan Patrick	40	Policy LP3	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Hundreds of garage, corner and side garden sites exist across the Borough, many with the potential to accommodate one or two residential units without detriment to protected garden land or residential amenity. However, the investment of time and effort required to bring such sites forward for development is considerable, and easily outweighed if subjected to the zealous application of the entire gamut of planning policies devised with larger developments in mind.</p> <p>Positive reference should be made to principle of appropriately designed, small scale infill development on sites across the Borough, which can improve housing mix and choice without detriment to the character of local residential areas. In recognising the cumulative potential of small sites to contribute to the achievement of overall housing targets, the Plan should indicate how various policies, not least LP3: Affordable Housing, can be mitigated in their application so as not to present a disproportionate barrier to the development of small one and two unit sites – which can themselves form part of the affordable housing mix.</p>	Encourage appropriately designed small scale infill, in keeping with local character	Noted - see response to R00204/02. Policy LP3 only requires affordable housing on sites with a capacity to provide 10 homes or more.	
R00204/05	Quinlan Patrick	49	Policy LP7	<p>To provide greater clarity and assist in unlocking the potential of small plots around the Borough, Policy LP7: Back Gardens, should specifically state that side gardens and garage sites are regarded as previously developed land, and therefore not subject to the negative presumption that applies to back garden development. To provide flexibility to allow for appropriately designed infill development in challenging conditions, provision should be made that any minor loss in back garden area to facilitate a new development may be mitigated by positive measures to enhance biodiversity in the remaining area.</p>	LP7 should specify that side gardens and garages are not counted as "back gardens"	Private residential gardens are not classified as previously developed land as set out in the NPPF definition.	No further change required.
R00204/06	Quinlan Patrick	22	LP1A	<p>Given the ambitious targets for development in the Borough, the proposal to concentrate the vast bulk of new development within a small fraction of the land area disproportionately forces some communities to accommodate the effects of change, while exempting others who are privileged to already live at lower population densities in the interwar suburbs. Examining the potential of these suburbs to accommodate at least some of the population increase, while protecting their character and residential amenity as identified in the Redbridge Characterisation Study, is an important matter which the forthcoming plan must seek to address in order to be deemed fully sound.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Implied reference to LP1A (Ilford Town Centre)	See response to R00204/02	

R00204/07	Quinlan Patrick	98	LP26	Specifically, major potential exists across the Borough for the redevelopment of mews-lane garage sites within the inter-war suburbs. The redevelopment of mews plots has become a standard and accepted pattern of development in housing of all previous periods: Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian. Subject to the application of appropriate design standards and the resolution of practical issues of carparking on narrow lanes, the development of mews sites throughout the interwar suburbs offers the opportunity to contribute significantly to housing supply in the borough over the plan period. The approval in principle of one or more model designs would greatly assist practicability of unlocking such sites for development. Alternatively, there are some locations (to cite one example, the triangular backland block encompassing the Redbridge Social Centre and Limewood Court) where a plan-led approach could assist in delivering an orderly pattern of infill development and a model for elsewhere in the borough.	Encourage mews development on garage sites in inter-war suburbs with model design, subject to design and parking standards	See response to R00204/02	
R00205/01	Shaw Min Lim	32	Para 3.6, Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No Paragraph 3.6 South Woodford Investment and Growth area LP1D. I oppose to the creation of 650 new homes because the it will increase the burden on local transportation infrastructure such as the Central line which is already overcongested during peak hours. Furthermore, there is no outline on how local schools and medical facilities can accomodate the additional population which will inhibit these new homes.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? The local plan needs to consider how it will impact existing transportation, education and medical infrastructure and include accompanying infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Local Plan to consider impacts on transport, education, and medical facilities; and include infrastructure enhancements	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R00207/01	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	22	LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? We believe the Plan is not sound. It is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy because: THE PLAN DOES NOT FULFILL ITS OBJECTIVES OF INCREASING FAIRNESS AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL RESIDENTS PARAGRAPHS 1.13, 1.20; LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3 There will be a huge increase in population in Ilford South, which is already the most densely populated and deprived part of the borough. There are already problems with the traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. The schools are also overcrowded and are being expanded, with loss of open space. This is making them too large and impersonal, detrimentally affecting children's wellbeing. There are huge catchments for doctors and there is already a deficiency of open space in the area.</p>		See response to R00180/03	See response to R00180/03

R00207/02	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	93	LP24	<p>THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH THE EVIDENCE BASE IS POOR PARAGRAPH 1.8; LP24 Population projections and housing data have poor analyses and use insufficient and erroneous data. No population density, parking stress or pollution level surveys have been carried out in areas of high proposed development. The benefits of Crossrail to enhance train capacity are not scrutinized or quantified. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: DOING DETAILED, ROBUST ANALYSES OF POPULATION, HOUSING, PARKING AND POLLUTION LEVELS IN ILFORD SOUTH AND BY SCRUTINIZING THE TRUE IMPACT OF CROSSRAIL</p>	More robust analysis of Ilford South / Crossrail impacts	See response to R00180/04	See response to R00180/04
R00207/03	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	46	Paras 3.11, 3.12; Policy LP5	<p>THE DWELLING MIX WILL NOT ADDRESS LOCAL NEEDS PARAGRAPHS 3.11, 3.12, 7.7; LP5; The preponderance of 1 and 2 bedroom flats will not provide the dwelling mix required for the local area, where there is a major shortage of family housing. The council is, therefore, not addressing the specific housing needs in the borough, particularly for families, but is simply trying to meet housing unit numbers. Using council land predominantly for private, market rate housing is a strategy to generate income for the council and will not address the housing issues of the borough. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: MORE UNITS NEED TO BE FAMILY AND ELDERLY FRIENDLY. COUNCIL LAND SHOULD BE USED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE</p>		See response to R00180/11	
R00207/04	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	40	Para 3.34, Policy LP3	<p>THE POLICY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL NOT ADDRESS THE HUGE CRISIS OF AFFORDABILITY IN THE AREA PARAGRAPH 3.9.4; LP3 For affordable to be defined as 80% of market rate in Redbridge, which has some of the highest house prices in outer London, is simply unrealistic. A 30% affordable target is very low when there is such a need. The council is, therefore, not addressing the housing crisis in the borough but simply trying to meet housing targets and to generate income for the council. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: A HIGHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET LINKED TO AVERAGE INCOMES – WITH NO GET OUT CLAUSES</p>		See response to R00180/05	

R00207/05	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	98	Para 5.4, Policy LP26, LP27, LP29	<p>THE TALL BUILDINGS STRATEGY IS POORLY THOUGHT THROUGH PARAGRAPHS 5.4; LP26,LP27, LP29 The encouragement of high density tall buildings, primarily residential, predominantly in Ilford South, is a very dangerous gamble on the part of Redbridge Council. These developments will be overbearing and out of character with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing and height. This strategy is likely to cause the quality of life of the residents to degenerate. The town centres need a focus on employment rather than housing. It will exacerbate the many existing problems of an already crowded environment, along with the associated problems relating to the amenities of local residents, in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, and wind tunnelling. The policy standards of LP26 have been and, we fear, will continue to be constantly flouted with no regard to the amenity of existing residents. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: JUSTIFYING THE REASON FOR A TALL BUILDING ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS – NOT SPECIFYING A PARTICULAR AREA FOR THEIR LOCATION. HAVING ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE QUALITY DESIGN IS ADHERED TO.</p>	Require specific justification for tall buildings	. See response to R00166/03
R00207/06	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	52	Policies LP9, LP10, LP11	<p>THE TIMESCALES ARE NOT DELIVERABLE LP9, LP10, LP11 The timescales advocated within the Plan are not practicable. The plan proposes a high concentration of building sites in a number of limited areas, coming on stream at the same time. It will turn certain areas into permanent building sites for years. The phases are ill-thought, giving so much development to Ilford South in phases 1 and 2 and reserving development in other parts of the borough until phase 3. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: CHANGE THE PHASING ALLOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS IT DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE SOUND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLANNING.</p>	Change the phasing of housing delivery	See response to R00180/07
R00207/07	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	67	Para 3.24, Appendix 2	<p>PARAGRAPHS 3.24; APPENDIX 2 There are no visual plans of the infrastructure. To have such a detailed plan for housing sites in Ilford South for all phases before having an equally detailed and robust plan for infrastructure for the same time scale is highly irresponsible. Funding is still being secured for much of the infrastructure. Many things have yet to be confirmed and are listed as borough wide rather than area specific. There are too many get out clauses which, we fear, will lead to infrastructure not being put in place at all, as has happened in the past. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: GIVING MUCH GREATER DETAIL WITH INFRASTRUCTURE TIMESCALES LINKED CLOSER TO HOUSING TRAJECTORIES. DETAILED VISUAL PLANS REQUIRED.</p>	Show link between infrastructure and housing trajectory; show detailed visual plans of infrastructure	See response to R00180/08

R00207/08	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	47	Policies LP6, LP7, LP13	<p>ALLOWING HMOs (HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION) AND CONVERSION OF HOMES TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH WILL LEAD TO FURTHER DECREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL NEEDS LP6, LP7, LP13</p> <p>Allowing the further conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing, will continue to lead to the degradation of the Ilford South area.</p> <p>THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: NOT ALLOWING ANY FURTHER HMOS, BEDS IN SHEDS AND CONVERSIONS TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH</p>		<p>Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required. Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan.</p>	No further change required.
R00207/09	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	22	LP1A	<p>*Soundness Improvemens? HOW TO MAKE IT SOUND</p> <p>1) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH</p> <p>2) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: MORE UNITS NEED TO BE FAMILY AND ELDERLY FRIENDLY. COUNCIL LAND SHOULD BE USED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE</p> <p>3) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH</p> <p>4) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: DOING DETAILED, ROBUST ANALYSES OF POPULATION, HOUSING, PARKING AND POLLUTION LEVELS IN ILFORD SOUTH AND BY SCRUTINYING THE TRUE IMPACT OF CROSSRAIL</p> <p>5) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: A HIGHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET LINKED TO AVERAGE INCOMES – WITH NO GET OUT CLAUSES</p> <p>6) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: JUSTIFYING THE REASON FOR A TALL BUILDING ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS – NOT SPECIFYING A PARTICULAR AREA FOR THEIR LOCATION. HAVING ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE QUALITY DESIGN IS ADHERED TO.</p> <p>7)THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: CHANGE THE PHASING ALLOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS</p> <p>8) THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: GIVING MUCH GREATER DETAIL WITH INFRASTRUCTURE TIMESCALES LINKED CLOSER TO HOUSING TRAJECTORIES. DETAILED VISUAL PLANS REQUIRED.</p>	soundness improvements already listed	See responses to R00180/01-18	See responses to R00180/01-18

R00207/10	Sheikh Fahad Emirates Financial Consulting Ltd	32	Policy L1PD	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? We believe the Plan is not legally compliant because: CONSULTATION ON THE PLAN AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES HAS BEEN EXTREMELY POOR PARAGRAPHS 1.7</p> <p>In Ilford South, residents have only become aware of the draft Redbridge Local Plan in the last few months. This has meant considering a Plan in the last stage of its completion with virtually no room for change. Awareness raising was through the work of a resident's group and not the council. None of the preceding consultations were known about by the vast majority of people in Ilford South. It has simply been assumed that Ilford South will take 75% of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives to this strategy have been marked by their absence. Any debate in the last few years has been about a very small percentage of development that might be in other areas.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Have a consultation regarding alternatives to focussing housing growth within Ilford South	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00208/01	Betty Smallwood	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It is suggesting too many homes in an already seriously congested area. The traffic in the area is already at capacity and South Woodford underground is at breaking point. There is already a lack of school places for local residents and doctors and hospitals in the area are already struggling to cope. Leisure facilities are gradually being eroded and there is a very little space for outside activities as schools struggle to accommodate the influx into the area. All the improved leisure facilities are out of the South Woodford area and travel is difficult. Shops and businesses are closing due to the lack of access and congestion as car parks are closed or reduced in size. Tower blocks are not in keeping with the nature of South Woodford's predominantly Victorian and Edwardian buildings. Reconsider where tower blocks are built in the borough.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01, R00108/02, and R00108/11	

R00208/02	Betty Smallwood	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Target areas where there is less congestion like Hainault and Chigwell areas where also the underground is less crowded. Do not remove homeless those requiring shelter from their present environment but build accommoda, temporary or permanent in area where they are already familiar with the environment. Encourage businesses by helping with parking spaces and less restrictions.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? It does no take account of the requirements of current residents</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? I do not know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? It rides roughshod over local residents views which have already been expressed with a petition against tower blocks and also the request to refuse permission for the building of a mosque in an area where the worshippers do not live but commute from other areas</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.</p> <p>The Homelessness strategy, and determination of an individual planning application, falls outside the scope of the Local Plan. Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable transport.</p>	No further change required.
R00210/01	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00210/02	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	33	Site 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00210/03	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00210/04	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	155	Site 120	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	

R00210/05	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00210/06	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00210/07	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00210/08	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00210/09	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00210/10	Rukiye Shafiq NHS	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00214/01	Judy Linard	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area as although we have been allocated 650 homes there are no improvements to infrastructure. Local people are struggling to be seen at the doctors and get their children into the local schools. The planners acknowledge that the current footfall is too high at South Woodford Tube station but make no provisions for the extra people. The carparks around George Lane are to be developed into housing so where will the cars go?.	comment, no change sought	. See reponse R00108/01	
R00214/02	Judy Linard	32	Policy LP1D	Apart from the library there are no facilities in South Woodford supplied by the borough at all. No sports centre, no swimming pool and the Hawkey Hall (although in Woodford Green) is the only large space available for rent and that too, although missing from this plan, is threatened with demolition. *Soundness Improvements? Without the much needed infrastructure I feel it is an impossible task – as is probably in every London borough. *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.

R00215/01	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Redbridge Draft Local Plan (2015-2030)</p> <p>LFFF Role The London Playing Fields Foundation (LFFF) is a registered charity founded in 1890 and granted a Royal Charter in 1925. It is the main charity for the provision, protection and promotion of playing fields in London and over the past 125 years the LFFF have built up a great deal of knowledge and operational experience in running sports grounds and providing a range of sports development opportunities. We operate seven playing fields across the capital and continue to work with and provide advice to a variety of strategic organisations including Sport England, GLA, and Local Authority partners, National Governing Bodies of Sport, London Marathon Charitable Trust, Football Foundation and different Primary Care Trusts.</p> <p>By adopting a strategic approach, we advocate the need for better protection of playing fields to safeguard them for future generations of Londoners and are working with a range of key partners to reverse the cycle of playing fields decay. Once playing fields are lost to development they are lost forever and we believe that the best form of protection is by using the fields for the primary purpose of sporting and recreational activity. The LFFF oppose in the strongest possible terms the London Borough of Redbridge draft Local Plan 2015-2030. We believe that the plan is neither legally compliant or sound and that the council failed in its duty to co-operate. The plan is neither robust, effective or deliverable and lacks support from the local community and key stakeholders. It has not been positively prepared and has paid scant regard to due process and community consultation. In particular, the justification of the</p>	comment, no change sought	PAS self assessment toolkits (LBR 1.19) demonstrate that the plan is sound and legally compliant. Duty To Cooperate Statement (LBR 1.14) demonstrates that duty to cooperate requirements have been met.	No further change required.
-----------	--	----	------------	---	---------------------------	--	-----------------------------

R00215/02	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) 2016 was only undertaken when the council were challenged by Sport England and even then the process adopted was not properly executed. Two additional studies were commissioned by the council to test alternative provision, but these have not been approved by the recognised National Governing Bodies, the Football Association, England and Wales Cricket Board or Sport England and pre date the final version of the Redbridge Playing Pitch Strategy. There was a presumption that Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground are redeveloped even before the PPS was undertaken and this bias suggests that the plan has not been positively prepared. We are also aware of evidence that indicates the Council has sought to influence the consultant reports so the results and recommendations meet the Council's required independent assessment to inform the local plan process.</p> <p>The LPFF views reflect the comments made in previous correspondence with the council dated 14th May 2013, 1st October 2014 and 19th December 2014 regarding London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Review Options Report where we pointed out that the loss of the field would be in total contradiction of the London 2012 dream of inspiring a generation to play more sport. In the document produced in January 2013, and the subsequent Local Plan draft, there were and continue to be significant objections to the proposals that identified Oakfield Playing Fields as part of a major mixed use development opportunity site that could potentially include a new school, a health clinic and up to 800 new houses.</p> <p>The Oakfield site has also a restrictive crown covenant</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) was prepared in accordance with Sport England Guidance and signed off by Sport England. Policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing facilities as a prerequisite of development in recognition of their value. See also response to R01088/3</p>	No further change required.
-----------	--	----	------------	---	---------------------------	--	-----------------------------

R00215/03	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>National Planning Policy Framework The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so. It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. In achieving Sustainable Development there are three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; • and an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. 	comment, no change sought	Noted	No further change required.
-----------	--	----	------------	--	---------------------------	-------	-----------------------------

R00215/04	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>The facilities at Oakfield, used by over 1,000 people each week, provide a sustainable, high quality environment that acts as a community hub reinforcing the principle of sustainability and ensuring better lives for everyone including future generations. This was confirmed in the PPS that stated ' the playing pitches at Oakfield are of a higher quality compared to pitches that are of a poorer quality elsewhere in the borough.' The protection of this valuable site is necessary to deliver the policies of the Council outlined below.</p> <p>NPPF Promoting Healthy Communities Paragraph 73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required. The Redbridge PPS states it will ensure that the Council meets the requirements of paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (i.e. a robust up to date assessment).</p> <p>"Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or</p>	comment, no change sought	Policy LP35 in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing facilities as a pre-requisite of development in recognition of their value.	No further change required.
R00215/05	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	34	LP1E	<p>However, it singularly fails to report that the protection and provision of opportunities to participate in sport is seen as fundamental to the health and well-being of communities and means that local authorities must plan and provide accordingly through local planning policy and development management. Without robust and up-to-date evidence and policies, there is a risk that a local plan could be considered unsound. We believe that the Local Plan in its current format is unsound and should be amended.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework also makes the need for such consideration clear in its requirements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver community and cultural facilities to meet local needs; • protect existing sports and recreational buildings and land; • guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; • promote mixed developments; • plan positively to provide opportunities for outdoor sport in the Green Belt; and • ensure that decisions are based on robust and up-to-date assessment of need. 		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.

R00215/06	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>The Redbridge PPS fails to address paragraphs 70 and 74 of the NPPF that also place great emphasis on the protection of existing sporting facilities. Paragraph 70 "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs" Specifically, paragraph 74 of the NPPF also states that: "Existing open space, sports and recreational building and land including playing fields should not be built on unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment has been taken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements or • The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location or • The development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs of which clearly outweigh the loss." <p>In examining the Planning Policy Framework within the Redbridge PPS the proposals for the development of Oakfield are contradictory. The PPS report found that there is a need to retain all existing playing pitch provision and that there is a need to improve the quality of the ancillary provision and yet alternative playing pitch site assessments were undertaken before the completion of the PPS. The Cundall Report and a separate Agronomist Report produced by Peter Jones Associates were undertaken prior to the adoption of the Redbridge PPS and materially sought to influence the decision making process.</p>	PPS fails to address paragraphs 70 and 74 of NPPF	In accordance with paragraph 74 of the NPPF, the Local Plan, policy LP35, sets out that existing pitches should be re-provided before any redevelopment.	No further change required.
-----------	--	----	------------	---	---	--	-----------------------------

R00215/07	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	-	<p>Inaccuracies/Out of Date References The PPS document also has a number of inaccuracies and cannot be regarded as sound. The reference to the Governments Sports Strategy consultation has now been superseded by the actual publication of Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation. (December 2015) It will focus on social outcomes seeking how to measure success more effectively, asking not just what we should invest in but why, the need to put the customer first, to understand the differing needs of different groups and a stronger focus on children and young people, with a specific remit for encouraging sport outside of school as well as inside.</p> <p>In the future funding decisions in England will be made on the basis of the social good that sport and physical activity can deliver, not simply on the number of participants. Success in sport will be defined through five key outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical wellbeing • mental wellbeing • individual development • social and economic development • economic development <p>For mental wellbeing, individual development and social and community development, more work will be needed over the coming years to understand and evidence the exact impact that sport and physical activity can make on the overall outcomes. From this it is clear that there is a fundamental mind-set shift from looking at the number of adults playing sport to looking at how sport can contribute to national well-being and the economy.</p> <p>There will also be a focus on those people who do not</p>	PPS unsound due to superseded references	The Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) has been agreed to by all national governing bodies and Sport England, and is in accordance with Sport England guidance.	No further change required.
-----------	---	---	--	--	--	-----------------------------

R00215/08	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	128	Paras 6.2.7 to 6.2.9	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Further and fuller consultation with local community involvement should take place. The current information and evidence base provided by the Redbridge Playing Pitch Strategy is unsound and inaccurate and needs to be corrected. The information provided by the Cundall Report and Peter Jones Associates is not endorsed by the National Governing bodies of Sport or Sport England and should be refined and resubmitted. The Local Plan needs to further reflect the policies outlined in the NPPF and the London Plan with specific reference to the protection of Green Belt land and playing fields. Further consultation and endorsement from Sport England is required.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? LP35: Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces Paragraph 6.2.7 - 6.2.9 The Council will protect, enhance the quality and improve access to existing green spaces by: Ensuring the re-provision of playing pitches and facilities at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground to a suitable alternative location within the borough before the sites are redeveloped. This is based on the Redbridge PPS; Cundall Report and Peter Jones Report but these documents fail to provide the necessary justification or special circumstances required for the loss of playing fields within the Green Belt. The current draft local plan will not safeguard and enhance what is good and special about Redbridge in terms of the extensive open spaces and playing pitches.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. The Playing Pitch Strategy has been agreed to by all national governing bodies and Sport England, and is in accordance with Sport England guidance. The Cundall Report examines potential relocation sites for Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground. Further feasibility work has subsequently been undertaken in consultation with National Governing Bodies and Sport England.</p>	No further change required.
-----------	--	-----	----------------------	---	---------------------------	---	-----------------------------

R00215/09	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	-	PPS	<p>Health and Well Being</p> <p>The council aim to improve the health and well-being of Redbridge's population and reduce health inequalities through good spatial planning, supporting healthier lifestyles and environmental improvements, as well as ensuring appropriate access to health facilities; Addressing health inequalities and improving Redbridge's health and well-being, both physical and mental, goes beyond improving access to medical facilities and includes a range of measures to improve the social and physical environment. The development of Oakfield will not support this objective. Reducing obesity is a priority for Redbridge, as outlined in the borough's Health and Well-Being Strategy (2012-2015). One fifth of children aged 4-5 years and over a third of children aged 10-11 years are overweight or obese. It is estimated that 55% of adults are either overweight or obese. Improving the health and well-being of the borough's growing population is a key objective of the Local Plan, yet the level of physical activity among adults is lower than average, and levels of obesity in children are higher than average. Club membership in Redbridge at 16.7% was lower than the London average at 22.9% so removing the clubs working at Oakfield and it would be counterproductive. Residents in Redbridge are not satisfied with local sports provision. In 2013/14, 57% were very/fairly satisfied. In 2014/15 this had declined to 53%. Clubs perceive that they do not receive value for money when hiring Council pitches mainly due to pitch quality. Furthermore, what are the Council doing to address the decline in adult sports participation down from 40.6% in 2012/13 to 32% in 2014/15? Given the level of dissatisfaction with local sports facilities the council need to protect and retain facilities to improve the health and wellbeing of borough residents rather than potentially sell off well</p>		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.
R00215/10	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	-	PPS	<p>The Strategic Policy 9 Culture and Sports which states: "The cultural life of the Borough will be enhanced for residents and visitors by: a. Protecting open space, including allotments. d. Safeguarding the existing viable cultural, leisure, recreational and sporting facilities and supporting proposals for new and improved facilities. The current proposals in the document do neither of these. In adopting a holistic approach, the Local Plan should objectively assess the infrastructure requirements based on informed data. All the evidence suggests that the proposed robust evidence base used by the Council is unsound and is therefore not consistent with national policy. Finally, the Council are looking to protect the Wanstead Rugby Club site with a Deed of Dedication from Fields in Trust. This will be one of six sites protected in Redbridge. Why was Oakfield not considered?</p>		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.

R00215/11	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	124	Policy LP35	<p>The LPFF comments above are related to the following: LP35: Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces The Council will protect, enhance the quality and improve access to existing green spaces by: Ensuring the re-provision of playing pitches and facilities at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground to a suitable alternative location within the borough before the sites are redeveloped. This is based on the Redbridge PPS; Cundall Report and Peter Jones Report but these documents fail to provide the necessary justification or special circumstances required for the loss of playing fields within the Green Belt. The current draft local plan will not safeguard and enhance what is good and special about Redbridge in terms of the extensive open spaces and playing pitches. The plans should be based in favour of sustainable development, exactly what the clubs do at the site. Oakfield is rated one of the most important sites in the area with impressive facilities and utilisation rates.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations.</p>	No further change required.
R00215/12	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	120	LP34	<p>This is a unique case where the Council have already made a proposal to build on the site before the evidence is collected. For this reason, it was felt Sport England need to adopt a different approach to protecting the site following their own planning objectives to protect existing facilities. Through their opposition to development, Sport England aims to ensure that there is no further reduction in the supply of conveniently located, quality playing fields to satisfy the current and likely future demand. However, they also recognise that it is the inclusion of policies protecting playing fields in development plans which will have the greatest impact. In this instance seeking to ensure that such policies are an integral part of all development plans is paramount.</p> <p>We do not have confidence that the Redbridge Playing Pitch Strategy provides sufficient robust accurate information to render the draft local plan sound. It has not been positively prepared and cannot be justified. A clear failure of joint working and lack of transparency has compromised the objectivity of the plan and will not safeguard and enhance what is good and special about Redbridge.</p>		<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy has been agreed to by all national governing bodies and Sport England, and is in accordance with Sport England guidance.</p>	

R00215/13	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	-	PPS	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Further and fuller consultation with local community involvement should take place. The current information and evidence base provided by the Redbridge Playing Pitch Strategy is unsound and inaccurate and needs to be corrected. The information provided by the Cundall Report and Peter Jones Associates is not endorsed by the National Governing bodies of Sport or Sport England and should be refined and resubmitted. The Local Plan needs to further reflect the policies outlined in the NPPF and the London Plan with specific reference to the protection of Green Belt land and playing fields. Further consultation and endorsement from Sport England is required.</p>		<p>The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (2006). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. The Cundall Report examines potential relocation sites for Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground. Further feasibility work has subsequently been undertaken in consultation with National Governing Bodies and Sport England.</p>	No further change required.
R00215/14	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	128	Paras 6.2.7 to 6.2.9	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? LP35: Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces Paragraph 6.2.7 - 6.2.9 The Council will protect, enhance the quality and improve access to existing green spaces by: Ensuring the re-provision of playing pitches and facilities at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground to a suitable alternative location within the borough before the sites are redeveloped. This is based on the Redbridge PPS; Cundall Report and Peter Jones Report but these documents fail to provide the necessary justification or special circumstances required for the loss of playing fields within the Green Belt. The current draft local plan will not safeguard and enhance what is good and special about Redbridge in terms of the extensive open spaces and playing pitches.</p> <p>The plans should be based in favour of sustainable development, exactly what the clubs contribute at the site. It also fails to comply with Paragraphs 70;73 and 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework on the protection of existing sporting facilities. The alternative assessment for re-provision is unsound and does not mitigate the loss.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations</p>	No further change required.
R00215/15	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground proposals should be removed from the Local Plan as identified Opportunity sites. Further consultation with the local community and Sport England should be undertaken to ensure the long term protection of valuable playing pitches in the borough. A deed of dedication should be considered as a protection measure to compliment other sites afforded this status in the area.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00215/06	

R00215/16	Alex Welsh, London Playing Fields Foundation	-	PPS	<p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? The local authority has failed to act strategically and co-operate with the key stakeholders. The process adopted surrounding the procurement of the Playing Pitch Strategy, subsequent consultation and biased reporting illustrates a lack of transparency in the process. Freedom of Information requests have been necessary to obtain specific information and even these have provided with redacted elements. Subsequent alternative proposals have not been open to sufficient scrutiny and has led to the incorrect information being provided and ultimately to inaccurate assumptions and flawed policy adoption.</p>		The Council considers that it has met the duty to cooperate. Detailed information regarding how the Council has met its duty to cooperate is included in the separate Duty to Cooperate Statement (2017) for submission (LBR 1.14)	No further change required.
R00217/01	Emma Sharland	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00217/02	Emma Sharland	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00217/03	Emma Sharland	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00217/04	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00217/05	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident’s ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		see response to R00108/11	

R00217/06	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00217/07	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00217/08	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		see response to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00217/09	Emma Sharland	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00217/10	Emma Sharland	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00217/11	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00217/12	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00217/13	Emma Sharland	154	site 116	<p>5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00218/01	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All my comments relate to the plans for South Woodford. I believe that the plan is not effective for South Woodford for the following reasons: Infrastructure: In paragraph 3.2 South Woodford is designated as an Investment & Growth Zone with a proposal to build in excess of 650 homes, however there are no plans to improve Infrastructure in the area.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00218/02	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Public Transport: It has been acknowledged (paragraph 1.21.4) that South Woodford station is already under significant pressure and is not able to cope with the existing demand. I believe it would be more sustainable to develop housing areas closer in proximity to the stations on the Hainault branch of the Central line, which is less congested. Roads: It has also been recognised (paragraph 3.6.7) that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". Despite this acknowledgement the plan proposes the majority of large scale development in this area (sites 116, 118 & 119). I believe that the plans are particularly ineffective with respect to road infrastructure, Chigwell Road and the High Road are already subject to heavy traffic. Congestion and delays are an everyday occurrence, further pressure here will not only cause further traffic issues but will also add to the air pollution in the area.</p>		see responses to R00108/02-03. Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel, and LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	
R00218/03	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools: The plan is not positively prepared or effective with respect to the need for school places. It should be expected that an additional 650+ new homes will increase demand for school places and yet there are no plans to build new schools in the area. Existing school expansion schemes have been designed to meet current demands, the plan has not anticipated the increased demands that are inevitable under the growth proposal. Woodbridge High School has already sacrificed sports grounds to build new blocks and I believe will need to introduce staggered break times to ensure the large number of pupils can be managed. It is clear to that our schools will not be able to meet the proposed growth in the area, the plan is not sustainable.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00218/04	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other Infrastructure: There are no proposed improvements to other infrastructure in South Woodford, there are no plans for new doctors surgeries, childcare services, hospitals, community or leisure services. I understand that the plan focuses on infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however I believe it would be more effective if areas of population growth and infrastructure improvements were in close proximity. I do not believe that it is positive, effective or sustainable to increase population in a concentrated area without improving infrastructure. Furthermore as the area has already undergone numerous large scale developments over the last 10-15 years the infrastructure is already under immense pressure and there are fewer green areas and open spaces here, this is already impacting our quality of life.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00218/05	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Local Business: I understand that the plan proposes that business sites in South Woodford be replaced with residential development. I do not believe that this proposal is justified, positively prepared or effective. The requirements of small local businesses have been disregarded by this plan, if the developments go ahead this will not only have a negative impact economically on the area and the businesses concerned but will also result in further strain on roads and public transport if increasing numbers have to travel out of the area to get to work. South Woodford has lost a great deal of office and business space during the development of residential areas over last 10-15 years. I feel that it is extremely negative to force the relocation of profitable local businesses, increasing not only the costs of the businesses but also the travel costs for local people.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>
R00218/06	Clare Smallwood	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Proposed Landmark Building on Station Estate: I do not feel that the proposal for a Landmark building is justified. A petition has been submitted with close to 2000 signatures opposing this proposal. This proposal in paragraph 3.6.5 is in direct conflict with paragraph 3.6.8, which states that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. The proposal for tall buildings is completely out of keeping with the character of the area and yet paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character". I do not believe that the plan is effective or that it has been positively prepared in this aspect as these are extreme contradictions.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>

R00218/07	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Conclusion: The plan fails to meet the objective of growth in a sustainable manner laid out in paragraph 1.4.2. The aim is to balance homes, jobs and infrastructure (paragraph 3.22). It is clear that the only proposal for South Woodford is for new homes, no improvements to infrastructure and fewer jobs as businesses will be forced to relocate. This plan is the reverse of balanced, it is disproportionate with respect to the increase in population, neglects the needs of the existing population and ignores the heritage and character of the area.		The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth to sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of full range of policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.
R00218/08	Clare Smallwood	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00218/09	Clare Smallwood	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic prosperity and viability of the South Woodford business community, remove the designation of a number of business sites to be residential developments (sites 116, 117, 118 & 120)	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00218/10	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Recognise the character of the area and the feelings of residents by removing the reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00218/11	Clare Smallwood	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Designate development of Station Estate as specialist accommodation for the elderly, this would deliver a number of benefits: For the elderly population they will have access to housing that is closer to amenities and less reliance on high cost taxis if they are unable to drive. Elderly residents are less likely to use the Central Line in peak periods so this would decrease the likelihood of driving up congestion on the Central Line. It is observed in the plan that there is a lack of this type of accommodation (paragraph 3.10.1). I believe this is a sensible suggestion given that the site is part owned by Redbridge Council. I would also suggest that the development could include a small park of or community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/15, A pocket park could also be considered on the Station Estate as part of a proposal for the development of the site.	
R00219/01	Raheel Shafiq	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	

R00219/02	Raheel Shafiq	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00219/03	Raheel Shafiq	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00219/04	Raheel Shafiq	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	

R00219/05	Raheel Shafiq	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.		see response to R00108/10	
R00220/01	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All my comments relate to the plans for South Woodford. I believe that the plan is not effective for South Woodford for the following reasons: Infrastructure: In paragraph 3.2 South Woodford is designated as an Investment & Growth Zone with a proposal to build in excess of 650 homes, however there are no plans to improve Infrastructure in the area.		see response to R00108/01	
R00220/02	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Public Transport: It has been acknowledged (paragraph 1.21.4) that South Woodford station is already under significant pressure and is not able to cope with the existing demand. I believe it would be more sustainable to develop housing areas closer in proximity to the stations on the Hainault branch of the Central line, which is less congested.		see response to R00108/02	
R00220/03	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Roads: It has also been recognised (paragraph 3.6.7) that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". Despite this acknowledgement the plan proposes the majority of large scale development in this area (sites 116, 118 & 119). I believe that the plans are particularly ineffective with respect to road infrastructure, Chigwell Road and the High Road are already subject to heavy traffic. Congestion and delays are an everyday occurrence, further pressure here will not only cause further traffic issues but will also add to the air pollution in the area.		see responses to R00108/02-03.	
R00220/04	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Schools: The plan is not positively prepared or effective with respect to the need for school places. It should be expected that an additional 650+ new homes will increase demand for school places and yet there are no plans to build new schools in the area. Existing school expansion schemes have been designed to meet current demands, the plan has not anticipated the increased demands that are inevitable under the growth proposal. Woodbridge High School has already sacrificed sports grounds to build new blocks and I believe will need to introduce staggered break times to ensure the large number of pupils can be managed. It is clear to that our schools will not be able to meet the proposed growth in the area, the plan is not sustainable.		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00220/05	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other Infrastructure: There are no proposed improvements to other infrastructure in South Woodford, there are no plans for new doctors surgeries, childcare services, hospitals, community or leisure services. I understand that the plan focuses on infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however I believe it would be more effective if areas of population growth and infrastructure improvements were in close proximity. I do not believe that it is positive, effective or sustainable to increase population in a concentrated area without improving infrastructure. Furthermore as the area has already undergone numerous large scale developments over the last 10-15 years the infrastructure is already under immense pressure and there are fewer green areas and open spaces here, this is already impacting our quality of life.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00220/06	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Local Business: I understand that the plan proposes that business sites in South Woodford be replaced with residential development. I do not believe that this proposal is justified, positively prepared or effective. The requirements of small local businesses have been disregarded by this plan, if the developments go ahead this will not only have a negative impact economically on the area and the businesses concerned but will also result in further strain on roads and public transport if increasing numbers have to travel out of the area to get to work. South Woodford has lost a great deal of office and business space during the development of residential areas over last 10-15 years. I feel that it is extremely negative to force the relocation of profitable local businesses, increasing not only the costs of the businesses but also the travel costs for local people.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>
R00220/07	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Proposed Landmark Building on Station Estate: I do not feel that the proposal for a Landmark building is justified. A petition has been submitted with close to 2000 signatures opposing this proposal. This proposal in paragraph 3.6.5 is in direct conflict with paragraph 3.6.8, which states that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. The proposal for tall buildings is completely out of keeping with the character of the area and yet paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character". I do not believe that the plan is effective or that it has been positively prepared in this aspect as these are extreme contradictions.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>

R00220/08	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Conclusion: The plan fails to meet the objective of growth in a sustainable manner laid out in paragraph 1.4.2. The aim is to balance homes, jobs and infrastructure (paragraph 3.22). It is clear that the only proposal for South Woodford is for new homes, no improvements to infrastructure and fewer jobs as businesses will be forced to relocate. This plan is the reverse of balanced, it is disproportionate with respect to the increase in population, neglects the needs of the existing population and ignores the heritage and character of the area.		The Council consider the Plan fully justified in supporting growth to sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of the full range of policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.
R00220/09	Ed Smallwood	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00220/10	Ed Smallwood	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic prosperity and viability of the South Woodford business community, remove the designation of a number of business sites to be residential developments (sites 116, 117, 118 & 120)	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00220/11	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Recognise the character of the area and the feelings of residents by removing the reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00220/12	Ed Smallwood	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Designate development of Station Estate as specialist accommodation for the elderly, this would deliver a number of benefits: For the elderly population they will have access to housing that is closer to amenities and less reliance on high cost taxis if they are unable to drive. Elderly residents are less likely to use the Central Line in peak periods so this would decrease the likelihood of driving up congestion on the Central Line. It is observed in the plan that there is a lack of this type of accommodation (paragraph 3.10.1). I believe this is a sensible suggestion given that the site is part owned by Redbridge Council. I would also suggest that the development could include a small park of or community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15	

R00223/01	Thomas jennings	32	Para 3.6.4, Policies LP2, LP3, LP6	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>3.6 The South Woodford Investment and Growth Area Point 3.6.4 The strategy for growth in the South Woodford Investment Area is based on the concept of allowing for the intensification of development in town centres along transport corridors. The town centre is well served by public transport such as South Woodford Underground Station on the Central Line (Policies LP2, LP3 and LP6).</p> <p>I would argue that the Infrastructure constraints specific to South Woodford make the development proposal a poor option to adopt The South Woodford road traffic counts from the Department of Transport website (Ref http://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/cp.php?la=Redbridge) indicate in 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Count point 26199 on A104 / A1009 measured 48,035 vehicles per Day in 2015 • Traffic Count point 17022 on A406 (Just beneath High Road South Woodford) registered 143,179 per day The A406 Redbridge to Walthamstow is the ninth busiest stretch of Road in the UK Ref: http://www.uktrafficnews.co.uk/blog/post/2014/06/17/uk-top-10-busiest-roads 	no change sought	Noted. Policy LP22 seeks to promote sustainable transport. The plan is supported by a High Level Transport Study (LBR 2.51) which assesses the impact of proposed growth on the transport network.	No further change required.
R00223/02	Thomas jennings	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Perceiving South Woodford as a transport corridor requires a leap of imagination which I fail to make. Having lived in E18 for 30 years I have watched in dismay as the volume of traffic has increased year on year coupled with a single lane from Churchill roundabout to Green man Roundabout – distance of 2.4 miles (Google Maps). This road is, almost daily, heavily congested, aggravated by the Queen Mary Gate development, the Waitrose outlet, and the sheer volume of the traffic currently using this route. The present congestion is resulting in an ever increasing volume of traffic using side roads as ‘rat runs’. Any further development could adversely affect the South Woodford Town centre and the health of residents in the area</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00223/01	

R00223/03	Thomas jennings	32	Policy LP1D	<p>As for the Underground, we are indeed fortunate to have the Central line stopping at South Woodford However the Central line capacity is severely stretched Ref: http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/underground-services-performance 2015 stats indicate central line from Snaresbrook to Epping recorded 24.98 million entries and exits per annum Woodford 6.03 million South Woodford 5.15 million Snaresbrook 2.67 million There is no ability to increase capacity compared with the evident benefit which the brand New Cross Rail service running to the South of the borough will bring to the area of Ilford, Seven Kings, Goodmayes and Chadwell Heath.</p> <p>South Woodford is over five miles away from the nearest Crossrail station in Redbridge CrossRail - Sourced from</p>	no change sought	The Council will continue to work with TFL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both also identified as investment and growth areas.	No further change required.
R00223/04	Thomas jennings	32	para 3.6.5	<p>Redbridge website : http://www.redbridge.gov.uk/Map/crossrail-corridor-aap/crossrail-corridor-area-action-plan Point 3.6.5</p> <p>"Although South Woodford is largely residential in nature there are still opportunities to accommodate new homes and jobs. Key sites include Station Estate and 53-55 Marlborough Road (Appendix 1). The Opportunity Sites within the Investment and Growth Area have the potential to provide approximately 651 new homes. The Council will seek to create a contemporary landmark within the town centre at Station Estate. This building should be sympathetically designed to respect the local character of the surrounding area (Policies LP26, 27 and 33)."</p>	comment, no change sought	Noted	No further change required.

R00223/05	Thomas jennings	32	Policy LP1D	<p>in November 2014 Woodford/ South Woodford/ Wanstead corridor was considered as one of four options in the 'Help Shape the Future of Redbridge document issued by the Council. In that document the aim stated was to develop an extra 800 dwellings and in that same document the Council admitted " there wouldn't be enough space for community facilities " whilst at the same time "increasing building heights and densities and building more homes in town centres". The current plan now excludes Woodford and Wanstead but proposes to concentrate the development of 651 dwellings within the Church end ward in which South Woodford is located. That is 81.375% of the total dwellings previously proposed for the three areas. This is a shocking approach to addressing the needs of the borough. The 2011 Census outlines the already major contribution South Woodford has made in absorbing the increased number of dwellings developed in Redbridge Ref: http://www2.redbridge.gov.uk/cms/the_council/about_the_council/about_redbridge_council/2011_census/housing.aspx Of the total Households recorded, Church End indicated the largest percentage (21.3%) increase in the borough. Housing stock has increased by approximately 1000 between 2007 and 2014.</p>	comment, change sought	As set out in Policies LP1A-E, a higher proportion of growth is directed to Investment and Growth Areas other than South Woodford; with far higher levels of growth proposed for Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor	No further change required.
R00223/06	Thomas jennings	37	LP2	<p>A more general point to consider is the effect the Housing Density has on the general attractiveness an area has for the future families who wish to remain in London. Sourced from the Guardian and Telegraph websites: http://www.theguardian.com/theobserver/she-said/2014/apr/06/priced-out-of-the-capital-city-london-is-losing-its-lustre-for-younger-people http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/11266412/London-is-over...and-its-about-time-too.html London is losing an increasing number of residents in the critical category of the young professional. Figures released by the Office for National Statistics show that, between June 2012 and June 2013, 58,220 people aged 30-39 left the capital – the highest number on record and a 10% increase on 2010. The quality of life is diminished by overdevelopment and the younger generation are voting with their feet. Development should not be in already highly built up areas leaving the only option a vertical one. The Council have failed to invest in the services required by residents in the Church End ward and have accepted in the proposed plan, to which these objections are addressed, they will not do so even should development be undertaken on the scale they envisage.</p>	No change sought	The Council consider the Plan is fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.

R00223/07	Thomas jennings	68	LP17	<p>This is after there has already been extensive development as outlined above. The major issue for me is the failure to fund improved facilities to match the increase in residents. It's impossible to expect ever greater numbers of patients or schools to remain the same physical size whilst the pupil population grows. The extension of Woodford County High is only of interest to those who aspire to Grammar Schools. Finally neither the current roads or the Central Line are capable of being expanded to absorb increased traffic and footfall. The investment this Council makes should focus on catch up with the facilities before embarking on yet more housing development.</p>	No specific policy	<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (2017) (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.
R00223/08	Thomas jennings	68	LP17	<p>Soundness Improvements? Development plans should be driven by how effectively an area can absorb the consequences of the proposed change. The criteria for selection must answer the following: Infrastructure what development can be undertaken of each service to include, primarily medical, transport, and education. Secondary considerations to include fire brigade, police, Leisure and relevant Council services. Each identified location should be assessed and selection made on the basis of least overall impact to the residents of the area affected by the plan. I do not see evidence of this work being carried out, infact to the contrary , in the case of South Woodford, there is apparently a total lack of interest in addressing infrastructural issues which the proposal would cause to the area.</p>	Development should be determined by ability to provide infrastructure	<p>The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (2017) (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.

R00223/09	Thomas jennings	68	LP17	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Concerning the legal responsibilities of the Council, there exists an obligation on the Council to act in the best interests of all residents The Council should consider if they are failing in their duty to the residents of Church End ward and are guilty of misfeasance. The Crown Prosecution Service guidelines on this offence say that the elements of the offence are when: 1. A public officer acting as such. 2. Wilfully neglects to perform his duty and/or wilfully misconducts himself. 3. To such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office holder. 4. Without reasonable excuse or justification. The Council has a fiduciary duty to consider the welfare of their existing Redbridge electorate and point three above suggests they may be guilty of this offence.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Revisit the proposed plan and apply the suggestions made previously in my submission as regards the infrastructural requirements each area under consideration must have addressed to make it a viable option. The least impacted of the areas would be those short listed for the development(s) whilst any plan must include extra focus on how best the impact could be alleviated. In addition areas affected by the plan should have a moratorium on further developments for a set number of years whilst the rest of the Borough absorbs further development should it arise</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	Revise infrastructure	See response to R00223/09	See response to R00223/09
R00227/01	Sandra Reekie	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Clearly the question of infrastructure has not even been considered seriously nor have reasonable alternatives been looked into, for example the Hainault branch of the Central Line is much less used than is the Epping branch.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? A comprehensive study of the number of residences which have been built in South Woodford "illegally", i.e. garage conversions into homes, bungalows at the ends of gardens purporting to be sheds etc., will show that the area is far more populated than realised. When the Queen Mary site was developed with a huge number of dwellings, no increase in schools, doctors, police, etc., etc., was even considered let alone provided and the area is now at crisis point.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>The plan is not sustainable I cannot be made legally compliant as the scheme does not take into account that South Woodford is at breaking point.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	undertake survey into illegally built residences	The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both identified as investment and growth areas. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.

R00229/01	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All my comments relate to the plans for South Woodford. I believe that the plan is not effective for South Woodford for the following reasons: Infrastructure: In paragraph 3.2 South Woodford is designated as an Investment & Growth Zone with a proposal to build in excess of 650 homes, however there are no plans to improve Infrastructure in the area.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00229/02	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Public Transport: It has been acknowledged (paragraph 1.21.4) that South Woodford station is already under significant pressure and is not able to cope with the existing demand. I believe it would be more sustainable to develop housing areas closer in proximity to the stations on the Hainault branch of the Central line, which is less congested. Roads: It has also been recognised (paragraph 3.6.7) that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". Despite this acknowledgement the plan proposes the majority of large scale development in this area (sites 116, 118 & 119). I believe that the plans are particularly ineffective with respect to road infrastructure, Chigwell Road and the High Road are already subject to heavy traffic. Congestion and delays are an everyday occurrence, further pressure here will not only cause further traffic issues but will also add to the air pollution in the area.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00229/03	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Schools: The plan is not positively prepared or effective with respect to the need for school places. It should be expected that an additional 650+ new homes will increase demand for school places and yet there are no plans to build new schools in the area. Existing school expansion schemes have been designed to meet current demands, the plan has not anticipated the increased demands that are inevitable under the growth proposal. Woodbridge High School has already sacrificed sports grounds to build new blocks and I believe will need to introduce staggered break times to ensure the large number of pupils can be managed. It is clear to that our schools will not be able to meet the proposed growth in the area, the plan is not sustainable.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00229/04	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other Infrastructure: There are no proposed improvements to other infrastructure in South Woodford, there are no plans for new doctors surgeries, childcare services, hospitals, community or leisure services. I understand that the plan focuses on infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however I believe it would be more effective if areas of population growth and infrastructure improvements were in close proximity. I do not believe that it is positive, effective or sustainable to increase population in a concentrated area without improving infrastructure. Furthermore as the area has already undergone numerous large scale developments over the last 10-15 years the infrastructure is already under immense pressure and there are fewer green areas and open spaces here, this is already impacting our quality of life.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00229/05	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Local Business: I understand that the plan proposes that business sites in South Woodford be replaced with residential development. I do not believe that this proposal is justified, positively prepared or effective. The requirements of small local businesses have been disregarded by this plan, if the developments go ahead this will not only have a negative impact economically on the area and the businesses concerned but will also result in further strain on roads and public transport if increasing numbers have to travel out of the area to get to work. South Woodford has lost a great deal of office and business space during the development of residential areas over last 10-15 years. I feel that it is extremely negative to force the relocation of profitable local businesses, increasing not only the costs of the businesses but also the travel costs for local people.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/11	
R00229/06	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Proposed Landmark Building on Station Estate: I do not feel that the proposal for a Landmark building is justified. A petition has been submitted with close to 2000 signatures opposing this proposal. This proposal in paragraph 3.6.5 is in direct conflict with paragraph 3.6.8, which states that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. The proposal for tall buildings is completely out of keeping with the character of the area and yet paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character". I do not believe that the plan is effective or that it has been positively prepared in this aspect as these are extreme contradictions.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/14	

R00229/07	James Edwards	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Conclusion: The plan fails to meet the objective of growth in a sustainable manner laid out in paragraph 1.4.2. The aim is to balance homes, jobs and infrastructure (paragraph 3.22). It is clear that the only proposal for South Woodford is for new homes, no improvements to infrastructure and fewer jobs as businesses will be forced to relocate. This plan is the reverse of balanced, it is disproportionate with respect to the increase in population, neglects the needs of the existing population and ignores the heritage and character of the area.	no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00229/08	James Edwards	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment & Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00229/09	James Edwards	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic prosperity and viability of the South Woodford business community, remove the designation of a number of business sites to be residential developments (sites 116, 117, 118 & 120)	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00229/10	James Edwards	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Recognise the character of the area and the feelings of residents by removing the reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00229/11	James Edwards	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Designate development of Station Estate as specialist accommodation for the elderly, this would deliver a number of benefits: For the elderly population they will have access to housing that is closer to amenities and less reliance on high cost taxis if they are unable to drive. Elderly residents are less likely to use the Central Line in peak periods so this would decrease the likelihood of driving up congestion on the Central Line. It is observed in the plan that there is a lack of this type of accommodation (paragraph 3.10.1). I believe this is a sensible suggestion given that the site is part owned by Redbridge Council. I would also suggest that the development could include a small park of or community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See responses R00108/15, A pocket park could also be considered on the Station Estate as part of a proposal for the development of the site.	
R00230/01	Emily Potter	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Pressure on public transport (have you been on the central line lately?), traffic and congestion will increase, schools are not able to adapt. This will ruin the area with tall housing blocks, unsightly and not in keeping with what attracted many to the neighbourhood in the first place.		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00230/02	Emily Potter	154	Policy LP1D, sites 116, 117, 118, 120	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth zone Stop mass residential development, particularly 116,117,118 and 120	Remove policy LP1D and other references to South Woodford Investment and Growth Area, and sites 116, 117, 118, 120	See response R00108/01.	

R00230/03	Emily Potter	32	Policy LP1D	Concentrate on creating a village feel like Wanstead rather than overrunning the community with building sites, tower blocks and little thought for how the current population will be impacted *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No	Parity between South Woodford and Wanstead	. The Council recognises the special character of South Woodford and the centre. Preserving that character is a key aim of the strategy for South Woodford Investment and Growth Area. The Local Plan strategy is about positive economic and physical improvement, so that the area only gains economically and environmentally and does not lose any of the features that make it special. This involves a balanced approach to development and the preservation of local heritage assets and their setting. See also response to R00100/03	See response to R00100/03
R00231/01	Audrey Shorer, Seven Kings Park Users Group	120	Policy LP34	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The proposed changes to the Green Belt boundaries go against all the policies set out of NPPF para 79+ ie, to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. As a voluntary group working in Seven Kings Park and the Happy Valley area we appreciate the value of the facilities available. The cycling and walking path through Happy Valley to King George Hospital was developed to encourage these activities. We have just been awarded Green Flag Status for the excellent services and state of the park and it is well used by all sections of the community. To develop part of it for housing would be a betrayal of Green Belt policies.		All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R00231/02	Audrey Shorer, Seven Kings Park Users Group	124	LP35	*Soundness Improvements? Councils and central government must look to 'New towns' outside Greater London (as in Basildon after the war) *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? It does not comply with Green Belt policies. NPPF para 79 Refer back to the Green Belt policy 2015 Don't know	Designate new towns outside Greater London	New towns outside Redbridge are beyond the scope of the Local Plan	No further change required.
R00233/01	Lesli Miller	22	LP1A	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Insufficient consultation and no proper consideration of alternatives The plan does not meet objectives of providing fairness and quality of life for residents The mix of proposed dwellings does not address local needs The policy of affordable housing does not address local housing needs, particularly for social housing The concentration of high-rise blocks in Ilford will cause problems The plan does not provide proper planning for infrastructure to support the development The timescale of development is not practical - large scale development in Ilford will cause problems for local residents		The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) sets out proposals for infrastructure to support growth. Policy LP5 sets out the Councils referred dwelling mix , which includes a range of household sizes. Policy LP3 seeks affordable housing in new developments.	No further change required.
R00233/02	Lesli Miller	22	Policy LP1A	*Soundness Improvements? Proper consultation and consideration of alternatives to concentration of housing in Ilford town centre	Revise plan to examine alternatives to concentrating growth in Ilford	See response to R00233/01	
R00233/03	Lesli Miller	46	LP5	Provide more housing units for families and the elderly	Revise LP5 Dwelling Mix for larger proportion of family homes	See response to R00233/01	
R00233/04	Lesli Miller	40	LP3	Use council land to build affordable housing and social housing	Use council land to provide social and affordable housing	Affordable housing will be sought on Council owned land in accordance with Policy LP3	No further change required.
R00233/05	Lesli Miller	40	Policy LP3	Greater proportion of properly affordable housing i.e. linked to average incomes	Link definition of affordable housing to average incomes in borough	Policy LP3 seeks as range of affordable housing products	

R00233/06	Lesli Miller	138	LP41	Proper plans are needed for the infrastructure to support the development before the building work starts	Ensure infrastructure is phased with development	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00233/07	Lesli Miller	22	Policy LP1A	The phasing of the development should be extended to avoid major disruption for residents *Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? No	comment, no change sought	Appendix 1 sets out estimated phasing of new developments based on site constraints	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.
R00234/01	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Q5. Detail of why we believe the plan is not legally compliant or sound and fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate: We strongly object to proposals to release Green Belt for housing as per paragraphs 6.17 to 6.19 (and related paragraphs and policies set out above): • Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) • Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) • Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) • Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) • King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and • Billet Road (parcels GB14c)	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/02	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	We object on the following grounds: Proposals to release large areas of Green Belt for housing developments directly contradict both national government and London Plan policy 1. The Green Belt sites proposed for housing DO meet NPPF green belt purposes and LB Redbridge's statement at 6.1.7 that they do not is factually incorrect. The Green Belt review results referred to at 6.1.7 are highly questionable and do not reflect the importance of these sites in terms of Green Belt purposes. The results appear to have been reached with a view to finding sites for housing development, rather than genuinely assessing the sites in terms of their importance for Green Belt. Even a cursory look at a map shows the all of the sites meet Green Belt criteria: this is not difficult to see: the sites proposed all clearly form part of bigger Green Belt sites, are open and holding back towns from merging and containing sprawl. For example, the 2010 Green Belt Review by Buchanan shows that Oakfield continues to meet two of the purposes of Green Belt as laid down in NPPF paragraph 80. Oakfield prevents urban sprawl. Oakfield separates Barkingside from Hainault as per the LBR Local Plan Policy LP34(c).	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	

R00234/03	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>2. It cannot be said (and has not been proven by LB Redbridge) that the benefit of releasing large tracts of Green Belt within the Greater London area outweigh the harm. The harm which would be done locally, but also in terms of the strategic importance of these sites for the whole of London, is extensive. It includes removing legitimate Green Belt which exists to contain urban sprawl (and the significant human impacts in terms of pollution etc) but also for their sports, environmental, health, amenity and social value. LB Redbridge has failed to consider or take account of the harm which would be caused by releasing large tracts of Green Belt for housing. Government issued a clarification in 2016 that: 'Unmet housing need ... is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.' Elsewhere it states that "The Framework is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies ... Such policies include ... land designated as Green Belt'.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/04	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>LB Redbridge's approach has not recognised in any way the significant harm of removing large tracts of Green Belt for housing, despite there being a clear environmental and social impact for both Redbridge and for the whole of London – Green Belt being of strategic importance for the whole of London. To be specific, the negative impacts, the 'harm' – which will be caused. These sites are of strategic importance for the whole of London, and LB Redbridge's proposals contradict London Plan policy and a stated Mayoral commitment to protect London's Green Belt. No attempt has been made by LB Redbridge to reflect the wider importance of these sites for the whole of London – either in terms of environmental, amenity or social value.</p> <p>For Oakfield in particular, with cricket and football clubs based there, but for the other sites too (Ford for example being a site used by the East London and Essex League for children), they serve most of East London and Essex and are of strategic importance to sports in the region. Local campaigners have demonstrated time and again that (a) the moving of Oakfield site will destroy years of work building up community sports clubs and (b) that the proposed alternatives are incomparable with Oakfield in terms of quality or accessibility.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	

R00234/05	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>3. The government has said that demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing Green Belt boundaries but LB Redbridge is clearly justifying the release of Green Belt by arguing it is needed for housing</p> <p>The Secretary of State has indicated that Green Belt should be 'absolutely sacrosanct' and has issued guidance and statements in letters to MPs e.g.: "we have been repeatedly clear that demand for housing alone will not change green belt boundaries" referring directly to the Local Plan preparation process. [Letter from Brandon Lewis to MPs 7 June 2016]. But LB Redbridge is proposing to release large tracts of Green Belt for housing development in direct contradiction to this stated government policy.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/06	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>4. Green Belt should have been taken into account as a constraint when setting housing targets, but has not been. National guidance clearly states that councils should take account of policies like Green Belt which indicate development should be restricted. "Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need." It also states that councils should take account of constraints like Green Belt when establishing housing targets.</p> <p>However, instead of taking account the constraint they face (30% of land being Green Belt in Redbridge), LB Redbridge has by its own admission created a target which it states can only be met through building on Green Belt, rather than reduce the target to ensure Green Belt is protected. This approach shows disregard for national policy aimed at protecting Green Belt. Paragraph 3.8.3 in Redbridge's Draft Local Plan states that the council is required to meet housing need in full. This is incorrect. See above – they should take into account constraints including Green Belt.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/07	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>5. LB Redbridge has failed to look adequately at alternatives to Green Belt including failing to cooperate with neighbours to find brownfield sites under the Duty to Cooperate.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	

R00234/08	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>6. The Playing Pitch Strategy (Paras 6.27, 6.28 and 6.29) is unsafe. Much of its evidential data is wrong. No direct account has been taken of growth in the youth population in Redbridge and East London. The new Government Sport Policy published in December 2015 is ignored as are the consequent changes in Sport England policies. Redbridge Council has made no contact with other Boroughs to establish future demand over the period of the Local Plan 2015 – 2030 for grass roots football and cricket pitches. Of particular concern is the heavy reliance for the whole of East London on the easily accessible pitches of Oakfield</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/09	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>Other reasons 7. It is unnecessary to release Green Belt for housing in Redbridge when East London has extensive brownfield land: there is huge potential, by the council's own admission, for high density developments on previously developed land.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00234/10	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>8. This and previous public consultations relating to the Green Belt sites mentioned are and have been misleading: earlier consultations giving options for housing sites did not give a clear indication that the sites were Green Belt and little has been done to set out the harm which would be done to London and Redbridge by building on them. For example, paragraphs 3.47 and 3.48 do not mention that the proposed 'opportunity sites' are Green Belt and fail to mention any potential down sides of losing these areas of Green Belt.</p> <p>Policy LP34 states that it is about managing and protecting Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land but in fact sets out how Green Belt land is needed for housing (paragraphs at 6.1 and in particular 6.1.6 and 6.1.9 which state that housing need forms the exceptional circumstances needed to release Green Belt: this statement contradicts NPPF government guidance, as stated above). This policy is meant to be about protecting the spaces but in fact is largely about removing the protection and building over large areas of Redbridge's protected green spaces. This is misleading.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	

R00234/11	Alice Roberts, CPRE London	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The plan should be modified so that the following areas Green Belt are not allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan.</p> <p>•Boding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) •Blaybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) •Bainault Fields (parcel GB13b) •Bairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) •King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and •Billet Road (parcels GB14c)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Please see comments under 'Unsound' *Legally Compliant Improvements? Please see previous comments under 'Unsound' *Duty to Cooperate? No Please see previous comments under 'Unsound'</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R01082/01 -10	
R00236/01	Amy Bullman	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? South Woodford does not have the services to cope with 651 new residents. The school's are extremely over subscribed and doctors appointments are hard to come by. Whipps Cross hospital is bursting at the seams and the queues at the station and on the roads are a nightmare in the morning. I cannot believe new homes are being suggested when the existing services are already overrun! South Woodford is an attractive area because it doesn't have any tower blocks. If you build one it will completely change the environment of the high street and take it away from a community to feel to that of a busy centre.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/01. Whipps Cross Hospital falls within London Borough of Waltham Forest	
R00236/02	Amy Bullman	-	-	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Build schools and hospitals before you build more homes! Put services first, put the residents first. You can't keep building homes when there aren't enough school places or doctors! Don't know I don't know how you can keep building homes when an area is over populated? *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? You don't care about the existing residents</p>	Phase education and healthcare before housing development	Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R00238/01	Anne Marino	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00240/01	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone: South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00240/02	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how its potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (sites no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00240/03	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00240/04	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctors' surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford. In the Plan (3.6.8) it states that 'the Council remains committed to preserving and enhancing the heritage and character of South Woodford' but this is in contradiction to the proposal to build 650 new homes in such a small area and to re-designate it as an Investment and Growth Area. In 3.6.2 it says 'The quality of buildings, trees and space makes South Woodford one of the more attractive parts of the borough'. Let's keep South Woodford as an attractive part of the borough and stop this huge expansion in buildings.</p>	no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Also see response R00108/01
R00240/05	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford: Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local residents' ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/11
R00240/06	Stephanie McCarthy	12	Para 1.17.8	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/11-12

R00240/07	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate: Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these buildings will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00240/08	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00240/09	Stephanie McCarthy	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00240/10	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00240/11	Stephanie McCarthy	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00240/12	Stephanie McCarthy	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/18.	
R00240/13	Stephanie McCarthy	155	site 116	6. Remove the proposal for 150 "temporary" units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	The Council has no plans for 150 temporary accommodation (TA) units to be located on the site at 120 Chigwell Road. The Council is developing a strategy for TA to help tackle homelessness across the borough, on more than one site These plans are yet to be confirmed by the Council, and so have not been reflected in the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00241/01	Barry Cansfield Ilford High Road Ltd c/o Agent	-	-	*Soundness? Yes *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00242/01	R Callway	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The Plan is unsound because of the proposed release of the following areas of Green Belt, as per paragraphs 6.17 to 6.19. These areas are strategically important to all of London for environmental, social and amenity reasons and to ensure the human costs of urban sprawl, including increased pollution, are avoided. Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and Billet Road (parcels GB14c)</p> <p>I believe the Plan is unsound on the following grounds: Proposals to release large areas of Green Belt for housing developments directly contradict both national government and London Plan policy The Green Belt sites proposed for housing DO meet NPPF green belt purposes and LB Redbridge's statement at 6.1.7 that they do not is factually incorrect It cannot be said (and has not been proven by LB Redbridge) that the benefit of releasing large areas of Green Belt within the Greater London area outweigh the harm The government has said that demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing Green Belt boundaries but LB Redbridge is clearly justifying the release of Green Belt by arguing it is needed for housing Green Belt should have been taken into account as a constraint when setting housing targets, but has not been in the local plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00381/01-07
R00242/02	R Callway	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The plan should be modified so that the following areas Green Belt are not allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan. Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and Billet Road (parcels GB14c)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? It is not adequately accounting for green belt as required under the NPPF.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? See earlier response</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00381/01-07

R00243/01	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00243/02	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00243/03	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00243/04	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00243/05	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11</p>	
R00243/06	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00243/07	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00243/08	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01	
R00243/09	ALISON SCOLLAN	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00243/10	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00243/11	ALISON SCOLLAN	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00243/12	ALISON SCOLLAN	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00245/01	Martin Clinton	18	Paras 2.2, 3, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.6, 6.2.8, 6.2.9	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1. My representations relate primarily to Section 3 of the Draft Local Plan (Promoting and Managing Growth) and to Policies LP1 and LP1B (King George and Goodmayes Hospitals opportunity site No.46 and Ford Sports Ground opportunity site No.66). The representations also relate to paragraphs 2.2 (Table 2), 3.8.3, 3.8.4, 3.8.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.9, 6.2.8 and 6.2.9.</p>	Noted	No further change required.
R00245/02	Martin Clinton	20	Policies LP1, LP1B	<p>2. It is considered that the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant and is not 'sound'. It does not justify the aspirations in draft policies LP1 and LP1B, relying on erroneous evidential documentation or misinterpretation of such and in many areas the Draft Local Plan is not consistent with National and Regional policies.</p>	The Council consider the Plan fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The plan is supported by an extensive evidence base, and is considered consistent with higher level policies.	No further change required.
R00245/03	Martin Clinton	26	Para 6.1.6, Policy LP1B	<p>3. Redbridge has put forward the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment, prepared by Opinion Research Services, as justification for removing the sites of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, Seven Kings Park and other adjoining lands (hereinafter referred to as the LP1B Lands) from Green Belt designation. It suggests that since the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment demonstrates that there are insufficient potential sites to meet the housing needs numbers for Redbridge for the period of the Local Plan, and as referred to in the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment report, this demonstrates 'exceptional circumstances' to justify removing from Green Belt designation various parcels of land around the borough including the LP1B lands. However, it is clear from Section 2 of the Draft Local Plan (the Plan) and, in particular Table 2, that the declared Objective of Redbridge is to deliver up to 18,500 new homes over the plan period (although Policy LP2 refers to 16,845 new homes over the period of the Plan) as opposed to the 31,977 new homes over a similar period referred to in paragraph 6.1.6 of the Plan. (It should be noted that Appendix 1 to the Plan does not list all possible opportunity sites and therefore it creates a false base from which to conclude there is insufficient land to meet the Policy LP2 housing needs.)</p>	Targets in the Local Plan seek to close the gap on full housing need as identified by the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Meeting the full need identified by that document would require further release of Green Belt land that has been identified through the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) as meeting NPPF Green Belt purposes.	No further change required.
R00245/04	Martin Clinton	18	Table 2	<p>4. Whilst the housing and population numbers in Section 1 of the Plan are inconsistent and, in at least one instance, mathematically incorrect, these are the numbers which have been used to guide the new housing target in Objective 1 of Table 2. Thus, the only purpose of the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment is to try and justify 'exceptional circumstances'.</p>	The purpose of the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market assessment is to identify Objectively Assessed Housing Need in the housing market area, in accordance with the NPPF.	No further change required.

R00245/05	Martin Clinton	26	Policy LP1B	5. The Draft Green Belt Review prepared by Wardell Armstrong, and which Redbridge is using to justify removing the LP1B lands from Green Belt designation, is flawed in many respects. It suggests that the National Planning Policy Framework is different in its approach to Green Belt issues than was the case in Planning Policy Guidance 2 but case law states that the NPPF made no changes to the guidance in PPG2.	comment, no change sought	An addendum to the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) has been prepared to clarify how areas of green belt perform against NPPF green belt tests.	
R00245/06	Martin Clinton	26	Policy LP1B	6. The Wardell Armstrong Green Belt Review states that the area of Green Belt land which they have numbered GB16 (being the LP1B lands) no longer meet Green Belt purposes and should be de-designated. A view of an aerial photograph of the area shows the connectivity with other Green Belt lands. The majority of the housing backing onto the LP1B lands was built prior to 1950. Whilst there have been some changes in the locality (not least the building of the new King Georges Hospital, replacing the one previously located in Eastern Avenue to the west of Newbury Park station; and the Ambulance station) the character of the area remains much as it was when it was first designated as Green Belt.	comment, no change sought	An addendum to the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) has been prepared to clarify how areas of green belt perform against NPPF green belt tests.	No further change required.
R00245/07	Martin Clinton	26	Policy LP1B	7. To take the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation will clearly be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Green Belt Protection), the London Plan (chapter 7) and the Plan Policies LP18 (Health and Well-being), LP21 (Water and Flooding), LP34 (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land), LP37 (Green Infrastructure and Blue Ribbon Network) and LP39 (Nature Conservation and Biodiversity).	comment, no change sought	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)	No further change required.
R00245/08	Martin Clinton	26	Policy LP1B	8. Within the Greater London Authority document Green Infrastructure and Open Environments; The All London Green Grid – Supplementary Planning Guidance, the LP1B lands are shown in Figure 16 of that document as being in an area with Metropolitan Park opportunities. Thus the proposals from Redbridge ignore the GLA Green Infrastructure objectives.	comment, no change sought	Developments will be required to provide new green infrastructure i.e. open space on site in accordance with Policy LP1	No further change required.
R00245/09	Martin Clinton	85	Figure 19	9. Seven Kings Water, which runs through the middle of the LP1B lands, is designated as part of the GLA Blue Ribbon Network. Figure 17 in the Draft Plan does not clearly show this important Blue Ribbon waterway. The Draft Plan also makes no mention of the regular flooding either side of Seven Kings Water and the related flood plain as set out is Redbridge's own Flood Risk Assessment.	comment, no change sought	The Blue Ribbon Network is shown on Figure 19. A map of flood risk zones (figure 18) clearly shows the varying flood zones around Seven Kings Water. Development within this area is subject to a flood risk assessment as per Policy LP21.	No further change required.

R00245/10	Martin Clinton	17	Figure 6	10. Within the Draft Plan Redbridge has designated various areas around the borough as Investment and Growth Areas (Section 3 of the Plan refers). One of these is referred to as The Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area. As the accompanying plan (Figure 6) clearly demonstrates, far from being a 'corridor' Redbridge has stretched the imagination to create something which looks nothing like a 'corridor'. It is suggested that this Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area has been drawn in this particular manner in a contrived attempt to justify taking the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation – but this will not satisfy the tests set out in case law.	comment, no change sought	Sites proposed for green belt release are based on their performance against NPPF green belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)	No further change required.
R00245/11	Martin Clinton	149	sites 46. 66	11. There are inconsistencies in respect of the measurement of the LP1B lands which it is proposed should be released for housing development. In Appendix 1 to the Draft Plan, Opportunity site No.46 has no site size shown despite the Council having been in discussions with the site owners for some time. In Appendix 1 Opportunity site No.66 is shown as being 26.8 hectares. However, the Ford Sports Ground is only about 16 hectares. This means that the rest of the proposed development site is made up of the Ambulance station land (and there is nothing to say that this will be available at any time in the future) and, in greatest part, a large part of Seven Kings Park. The BNP Paribas Real Estate Local Plan Viability Assessment of May 16 puts the site area as 27.04 hectares.	Inconsistencies regarding size of development sites	Proposed updates to appendix 1 are set out in the Redbridge Local Plan Schedule of Proposed Modifications (LBR 1.01.2)	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.
R00245/12	Martin Clinton	32	Policy LP1B	12. If the LP1B lands were to be taken out of Green Belt designation and large parts developed for housing then Redbridge would be in breach of its own Plan by creating a further area of open space and playing field deficiency.	comment, no change sought	Policy LP35 identifies that reprovision of existing pitches and facilities is a pre-requisite of development of Ford Sports Ground.	No further change required.
R00245/13	Martin Clinton	32	Policy LP1B	*Soundness Improvements? i. Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. ii. Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance.	comment, no change sought	The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations.	No further change required.
R00245/14	Martin Clinton	20	Policies LP1, LP1B	*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? It does not justify the aspirations in draft policies LP1 and LP1B, relying on erroneous evidential documentation or misinterpretation of such and in many areas the Draft Local Plan is not consistent with National and Regional policies.	Remove Policy LP1B and remove references to sites therein	See response to R00245/02	
R00245/15	Martin Clinton	32	Policy LP1B	*Legally Compliant Improvements? i. Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. ii. Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance. *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	See response to R00245/13	

R00246/01	Peter musgrave	78	Para 4.2.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is not justified or effective because: LP 19 states that domestic and transport emissions are higher than the national average (4.2.1) Over 16,000 new homes are planned in the next 5 years, a large proportion of these are in S. Ilford. These developments will dramatically increase the already high carbon emissions unless very strong positive measure are taken to prevent this. Homes LP (a) states that the borough will "Promote" zero carbon emissions in new homes. This is not strong enough.	comment, no change sought	Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. Policy LP32 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable design and construction.	No further change required.
R00246/02	Peter musgrave	78	Para 4.2.2	Transport 4.2.2. suggests that by building new developments near to public transport emissions from cars will be reduced as residents will use public transport more. Whilst that is a start, on its own it is nowhere near enough to lower transport emissions as most of the new residents will also have cars and use these regularly as well as using public transport.	comment, no change sought	Locating new development in areas accessible by public transport is only one part of the overall strategy to reduce emissions from transport; Policy LP22 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" contains a more comprehensive range of methods, and LP23 "Cycle and Car Parking" allows for lower levels of off-street parking in more accessible locations.	No further change required.
R00246/03	Peter musgrave	78	Policies LP19, Para 4.3.1	LP19 Para 4.3.1 points out the challenges of a high level of rented accommodation in reducing carbon emissions. Although this sector is harder to work with, a strategy needs to be in place for making landlords take responsibility for making their properties carbon neutral.	More emphasis on reducing carbon emissions in rented properties	These matters are beyond the scope the Local Plan. No further change required.	No further change required.
R00246/04	Peter musgrave	78	Para 4.3.7, Policy LP19	In LP19 on Climate change Para 4.3.7 identifies the problems of organising decentralized energy in the borough, and concludes that large scale energy schemes (eg wind) may only be possible in the NE of the borough. The paragraph says "Most renewable energy opportunities are likely to be at a domestic scale and through solar hot water, solar photovoltaic and heat pumps " If the Council is going to focus on the domestic level for decentralised energy production then it will need a robust set of measure to make this happen.	Robust set of measures for decentralised / domestic energy production	Policy LP19 requires new developments to meet London Plan energy targets	No further change required.
R00246/05	Peter musgrave	20	Policy LP1	*Soundness Improvements? LP 1 a New homes must be built so that they are as near to carbon neutral as possible. The council should be insisting that new homes are as near to carbon neutral as possible not simply "promoting" this, especially as I understand that the council has set up its own development company so is able to make these decisions.	Require (rather than just promote) ultra low / zero carbon homes; use the council development company to facilitate this	Policy LP19 requires new developments to meet London Plan energy targets	No further change required.
R00246/06	Peter musgrave	78	Paras 4.2.1, 4.2.2	Para 4.2.2 The plan needs to be much more proactive in reducing use of cars and encouraging cycling, walking and use of public transport. This is mentioned in 4.2.1 but I cannot see any specific measure to make this happen.	comment, no change sought	Policy LP22 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" contains a range of measures that will enable a modal shift to walking, cycling, and public transport.	No further change required.

R00246/07	Peter musgrave	78	Para 4.3.7, Policy LP19	<p>LP19 Para 4.3.7 If setting up decentralised energy schemes is a problem then the Plan needs to spell out how the Council will support the installation of solar panels domestically and the development of very localized community energy schemes run by community organisations. This needs to be spelled out in much more detail.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	More detail around how community energy schemes and domestic solar panels will be supported	Policies LP19 and LP20 set out the Councils approach to supporting climate change mitigation and renewable energy, in conformity with London Plan requirements	No further change required.
R00247/01	Valerie Cummins	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00247/02	Valerie Cummins	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. The plan mentions South Woodford as being an ideal location for town centre development as it has a tube station. This makes no sense when Wanstead which has 2 tube station on either end of the high street as well as being within walking distance of Redbridge tube station has not been earmarked for this level of development being planned in our locality.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00247/03	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00247/04	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	

R00247/05	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12
R00247/06	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18
R00247/07	Valerie Cummins	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00247/08	Valerie Cummins	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.

R00247/09	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00247/10	Valerie Cummins	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00247/11	Valerie Cummins	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00247/12	Valerie Cummins	32	Policy LP1D	6. Reconsider Wanstead for the 650 homes based on the Tube access.	Consider Wanstead as an additional / replacement investment area to South Woodford.	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.
R00248/01	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00248/02	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00248/03	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00248/04	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth.</p> <p>The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	

R00248/05	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00248/06	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00248/07	P McCarthy	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00248/08	P McCarthy	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	

R00248/09	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00248/10	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00248/11	P McCarthy	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00248/12	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Legally Compliant Comments? If it is legally compliant it is certainly undemocratic as it does not cater for the wishes of the existing voting population of South Woodford *Legally Compliant Improvements? The consultation process is also verging on the illegal as the process has done EVERYTHING POSSIBLE to avoid direct engagement with residents on the plan and more importantly its implementation		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00248/13	P McCarthy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Residents as the community most effected by the plan appear to have been ignored as key stakeholders in this "consultation". There is no evidence that many of the stakeholders listed have agreed that they can cope with the increased demand on services that 650 extra homes will bring to south woodford including 1. Transport for London increased frequency tube services 2. Local Doctor surgeries 3. Local Dentists 4. Local Schools 5. Local Hospitals - A&E 6. Local Leisure facilities		See response to R00248/12	
R00249/01	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	

R00249/02	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00249/03	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00249/04	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00249/05	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00249/06	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00249/07	Mark Balcomb	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00249/08	Mark Balcomb	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00249/09	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00249/10	Mark Balcomb	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00252/01	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	

R00252/02	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00252/03	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00252/04	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00252/05	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00252/06	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00252/07	Odile Thomas	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00252/08	Odile Thomas	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00252/09	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00252/10	Odile Thomas	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00252/11	Odile Thomas	154	site 116	<p>5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00252/12	Odile Thomas	32	LP1D	6. South Woodford really lacks a good park with facilities for older children. We also do not have enough sports facilities. Perhaps the Council could talk to the Corporation of London about using land around Snaresbrook boating lake and/or in the forest to create an exciting play area for children and teenagers.	Council to discuss with Corporation of London around building play area	Noted. Policy LP35 seeks to protect and enhance open spaces, which could include through partnership working with other organisations such as Corporation of London	No further change required.
R00253/01	Robert Oakes	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00253/02	Robert Oakes	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	
R00253/03	Robert Oakes	154	Site 116	Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00253/04	Robert Oakes	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00253/05	Robert Oakes	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00253/06	Robert Oakes	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00253/07	Robert Oakes	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00253/08	Robert Oakes	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00253/09	Robert Oakes	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00253/10	Robert Oakes	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00253/11	Robert Oakes	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00254/01	Sheila Oakes	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00254/02	Sheila Oakes	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00254/03	Sheila Oakes	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00254/04	Sheila Oakes	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00254/05	Sheila Oakes	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00254/06	Sheila Oakes	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'.</p> <p>Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00254/07	Sheila Oakes	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00254/08	Sheila Oakes	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00254/09	Sheila Oakes	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00254/10	Sheila Oakes	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00254/11	Sheila Oakes	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00257/01	Anita Keen	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00257/02	Anita Keen	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00257/03	Anita Keen	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00257/04	Anita Keen	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. But why should our town be forced to travel out of the area to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, and the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. It just creates more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport, plus there are too many people trying to get places at too few a venues. This is not sustainable growth, and it seems that South Woodford's leisure, educational and business needs are being ignored and destroyed? We are not purely a commuter belt, we should be a self supporting town. I note that the only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00257/05	Anita Keen	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and 'affordable' areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This means that you are targeting economically viable business space to be under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00257/06	Anita Keen	32	Policy LP1D	<p>The Station Estate, the Travis Perkins area and the Charlie Brown roundabout businesses (on both sides of the A406) in South Woodford are long established commercial premises that provide South Woodford with local resources from childcare to building supplies. These local businesses provide very positive benefits to the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local jobs for local people• Reduction in transport pollution to go out of the area for these facilities• No impact on local resources• Income source for the local shops <p>They are the connecting link in the eco-system of South Woodford meaning that South Woodford is not just a housing hub, but a complete community that has homes for families nearby to retail shops, healthcare providers, educational establishments, recreational facilities and commercial employment. The buildings in these areas do not impact on the visual skyline of the area and in fact 'disappear' behind the viaduct and the housing areas in which they are sited. The suggestion that these areas should be designated as 'Opportunity sites' and potential 'Tall Build' areas is completely inappropriate and out of character with the surrounding area and the actual needs of South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/11	
-----------	------------	----	-------------	--	--	---------------------------	--

R00257/07	Anita Keen	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? The existing buildings on the aforementioned 'Opportunity sites' sites are no higher than 3/4 storeys, anything taller on Station Estate would have a substantial adverse impact on the skyline visible from George Lane, the residential homes bordering the viaduct and for the occupiers of Daisy Road as you look up the street. Tall Builds on the Travis Perkins site would create an offensive alteration to the skyline of Station Approach and would similarly affect residents of Marlborough Road and Pultney Road. To allow numerous high rise flats to be built would create another 'Broadmead Estate' whose flats are a complete eyesore and which have created their own host of social problems within them.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17. Policy LP27 sets out criteria for assessing proposals for tall buildings and Policy LP26 promotes high quality design	
R00257/08	Anita Keen	32	Policy LP1D	<p>South Woodford has already had numerous flats squeezed in to the area in the last 20 years since I have been resident here. Below are listed, but a few, that have taken over commercial, educational & recreational sites: • a large block of flats at the top of George Lane (on a previous insurance company office building) • masses of flats on the old Queen Mary's college site (therefore moving from a transient population of students (who had little impact on the local community facilities) to a permanent group of residents (who have had a huge impact on our infrastructure) • flats were built on the old Jaguar's repairs garage on Cleveland Road • more on The George Pub's car park • more on the Gymnastics club site at the back of Pultney Road (losing a fantastic resource for the children in the area) • more on the site of a petrol station on the High Road alongside Derby Road • more on the Dairy Crest site • and more recently conversion of the KGM premises on Station Estate into flats. South Woodford has had it's fair share of flats</p>		Noted.	No further change required.

R00257/09	Anita Keen	32	Policy LP1D	<p>With regard to the conversion of the KGM offices from business to residential use, this caused big grievances. KGM had wanted to stay as it was an ideal location for their staff to get into London for high level meetings, whilst maintaining a workforce in a local area in a reasonably priced rented business premise. However, they were forced to relocate to Romford and after numerous years of having staff who lived locally who could get to work via a 10 minute walk. Staff now struggle to get to Romford in under an hour on the A12 each day. They can no longer assist with childcare as they don't get home in time. It has had a detrimental and damaging effect on family life, loss of time and increased traffic on the roads. Given the length of time KGM was in residence, and that local people were employed, it proves that Station Estate is a viable location for business users. South Woodford is ideal for an out of central London hub for commercial users. It should be allowed to continue to provide this facility. Plans should be to enhance this, not strip out this valuable commercial resource to our community.</p>		Conversion of KGM offices to residential use did not need planning permission, as a result of central government changes to the Uses Class Order.	No further change required.
R00257/10	Anita Keen	154	site 116	<p>Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford. We can't cope with any more influx of people into this area. We need to ensure that we have local business premises to support jobs for local people which has no impact on our community facilities.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/11, and R00108/18.	
R00257/11	Anita Keen	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00257/12	Anita Keen	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	<p>2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120</p>	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	See response R00108/11.	

R00257/13	Anita Keen	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would only be acceptable if for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. No rebuild should be permitted above the height of the original/surrounding buildings. They should be sympathetic to the character of the existing buildings in George Lane and neighbouring properties.	comment, no change sought	See responses R00108/14 and R00108/15. With regard to the suggestion that Station Estate could be used as specialist accommodation, the Local Plan does not preclude that possibility. The emerging Local Plan does not make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford. New policy for tall buildings in the borough propose the removal of tall building designations in South Woodford. New proposals for development on the site like Station Estate will be come forward under the new Local Plan policies.	
R00257/14	Anita Keen	32	Para 3.6.5	4.. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/18.	
R00258/01	Shilpa Patel	22	Policy LP1A	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Not positively prepared - Not enough consultation given to local people. Redbridge Council knows this and is pushing this plan in speedily. Justified - no because South Ilford is going to have 75% of the housing in an already crowded area Effective - no because there is no increase in health and social care services in the plan to meet the increased number of people to the area.		The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00258/02	Shilpa Patel	22	Policy LP1A	Consistent with National policy - This is a labour borough why are you going the conservatives bidding. Have some backbone and be a proper opposition party. Don't build so many in Ilford Town centre. Share out the house around the borough. Please do not make an area that is already deprived worse.		The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough.	No further change required.
R00258/03	Shilpa Patel	22	Policy LP1A	*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? It must be illegal to build so many units so close together. Local people have not been given enough time to know about this plan. Give more time to residents to respond to consultation. The unfairness that South Ilford will bare the brunt of such a large increase in population when south Ilford is already so crowded. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Not cooperated with residents to let them know of their plans.	Ilford South	The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.

R00259/01	Neill Keen	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00259/02	Neill Keen	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00259/03	Neill Keen	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford but the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00259/04	Neill Keen	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. But this is not sustainable growth and the number of people trying to utilise these services outweighs the available spaces. Waiting lists wait times mean that in many instances children will miss out on opportunity's as they will have become too old before a space becomes available for them. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00259/05	Neill Keen	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00259/06	Neill Keen	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00259/07	Neill Keen	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01	
R00259/08	Neill Keen	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00259/09	Neill Keen	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00259/10	Neill Keen	44	Para 3.10.1	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00259/11	Neill Keen	154	site 116	<p>5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	.See response R00108/18.	

R00260/01	Diana Neslen	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I believe that the concentration of housing in Ilford South has not taken into consideration population stress in the most overpopulated part of the borough. There are issues of facilities, namely parking, open spaces, schools, traffic congestion, gp facilities and present overcrowding. The plan is for one and two bedroom flats when the need in the area is for family housing. Also the affordable housing quotient is unrealistic. 80% affordable housing is not appropriate when this borough has such expensive housing already. A more robust analysis of needs is now necessary. There should be more family and elderly friendly units and a higher affordable housing target linked to average income without get out clauses. The plan should be changed by justifying a reason for tall buildings on a case by case basis without specifying a specific area and safeguards to ensure quality design.</p>		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy. Policy LP5 requires a mix of dwelling types including family housing, and Policy LP3 requires a range of types of affordable housing.	No further change required.
R00260/02	Diana Neslen	138	LP41	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The plan should be made sound by changing the phasing allocation for developments. There should be much greater detail about infrastructure developments linked closer to housing trajectories.</p>	Phasing for developments should have been changed; infrastructure linked to housing	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00260/03	Diana Neslen	47	Policies LP6, LP7	<p>And finally the plan should be changed by enforcing no beds in sheds, limiting houses in multiple occupation and hotels in Ilford South</p>	Enforce ban on beds in sheds, limit HMOs and hotels in Ilford South	Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required. Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00260/04	Diana Neslen	22	Policy LP1A	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? The time scale for consultation was poor. Residents were asked to consider the plan in the last stages of completion with virtually no room for change. It was the residents group that worked on this topic more than the council. It was assumed that Ilford South would take 75% of future housing in the borough. There was no prior consultation about the feasibility of putting 75% of the housing in the south of the borough</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? It should be made legally compliant by having a thorough and open consultation about the alternatives to putting 75% of the housing in the south of the borough</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Ilford South	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	
R00261/01	Gill Crew	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All my comments relate to the plans for South Woodford. I believe that the plan is not effective for South Woodford for the following reasons: Infrastructure: In paragraph 3.2 South Woodford is designated as an Investment & Growth Zone with a proposal to build in excess of 650 homes, however there are no plans to improve Infrastructure in the area.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00261/02	Gill Crew	14	Para 1.21.4	Public Transport: It has been acknowledged (paragraph 1.21.4) that South Woodford station is already under significant pressure and is not able to cope with the existing demand. I believe it would be more sustainable to develop housing areas closer in proximity to the stations on the Hainault branch of the Central line, which is less congested.		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both also identified as investment and growth areas.	
R00261/03	Gill Crew	33	Para 3.6.7	Roads: It has also been recognised (paragraph 3.6.7) that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". Despite this acknowledgement the plan proposes the majority of large scale development in this area (sites 116, 118 & 119). I believe that the plans are particularly ineffective with respect to road infrastructure, Chigwell Road and the High Road are already subject to heavy traffic. Congestion and delays are an everyday occurrence, further pressure here will not only cause further traffic issues but will also add to the air pollution in the area.		See response to R00104/02	
R00261/04	Gill Crew	68	LP17	Other Infrastructure: There are no proposed improvements to other infrastructure in South Woodford, there are no plans for new doctors surgeries, childcare services, hospitals, community or leisure services. I understand that the plan focuses on infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however I believe it would be more effective if areas of population growth and infrastructure improvements were in close proximity. I do not believe that it is positive, effective or sustainable to increase population in a concentrated area without improving infrastructure. Furthermore as the area has already undergone numerous large scale developments over the last 10-15 years the infrastructure is already under immense pressure and there are fewer green areas and open spaces here, this is already impacting our quality of life.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00261/05	Gill Crew	61	LP14	Local Business: I understand that the plan proposes that business sites in South Woodford be replaced with residential development. I do not believe that this proposal is justified, positively prepared or effective. The requirements of small local businesses have been disregarded by this plan, if the developments go ahead this will not only have a negative impact economically on the area and the businesses concerned but will also result in further strain on roads and public transport if increasing numbers have to travel out of the area to get to work. South Woodford has lost a great deal of office and business space during the development of residential areas over last 10-15 years. I feel that it is extremely negative to force the relocation of profitable local businesses, increasing not only the costs of the businesses but also the travel costs for local people.		see response to R00108/11-12	

R00261/06	Gill Crew	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Proposed Landmark Building on Station Estate: I do not feel that the proposal for a Landmark building is justified. A petition has been submitted with close to 2000 signatures opposing this proposal. This proposal in paragraph 3.6.5 is in direct conflict with paragraph 3.6.8, which states that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. The proposal for tall buildings is completely out of keeping with the character of the area and yet paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising South Woodford's rich Victorian and Edwardian character". I do not believe that the plan is effective or that it has been positively prepared in this aspect as these are extreme contradictions.		SOUTH WOODFORD) see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00261/07	Gill Crew	21	Para 3.2.2	Conclusion: The plan fails to meet the objective of growth in a sustainable manner laid out in paragraph 1.4.2. The aim is to balance homes, jobs and infrastructure (paragraph 3.22). It is clear that the only proposal for South Woodford is for new homes, no improvements to infrastructure and fewer jobs as businesses will be forced to relocate. This plan is the reverse of balanced, it is disproportionate with respect to the increase in population, neglects the needs of the existing population and ignores the heritage and character of the area.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth	
R00261/08	Gill Crew	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00261/09	Gill Crew	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00261/10	Gill Crew	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00261/11	Gill Crew	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00262/01	Hannah Emmett	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It has not been shown that the benefit of releasing large areas of Green Belt within the Greater London area outweigh the harm. The government has said that demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing Green Belt boundaries but LB Redbridge is clearly justifying the release of Green Belt by arguing it is needed for housing. Green Belt should have been taken into account as a constraint when setting housing targets, but has not been.</p>		<p>All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.</p> <p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	
R00262/02	Hannah Emmett	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The following areas of Green Belt should not be allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan. •Boding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) •Blaybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) •Blainault Fields (parcel GB13b) •Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) •King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and •Billet Road (parcels GB14c)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>		<p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	
R00263/01	Jeff Barber	37	Policies LP2, LP36	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? LP36 omits some policy guidelines necessary for allotment disposal. The extent of Green Belt protection removal is unparalleled among London boroughs even boroughs in Outer London (e.g. Bromley).</p> <p>Section 4 is totally inadequate. It merely addresses specific issues that are causing environmental deterioration. Redbridge like other councils is merely acting as a deckchair attendant on the Titanic. LP2 does assume that housing supply is the only issue in "the housing crisis". The demand side is not considered. 6% of London's population have second homes. Legal but with an impact. Brownfield site alternatives not fully examined.</p>	General objection to second homes	<p>Policy LP36 seeks to protect allotments on the basis of high demand for their use. All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41). All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Outer North East London SHMA (LBR 2.01) does not identify a strong presence of 2nd homes in the borough.</p>	
R00263/02	Jeff Barber	37	Policy LP2	<p>*Soundness Improvements? LP 2 Identify potential brownfield sites for possible development.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Development Opportunity Sites are listed in Appendix 1.</p>	
R00263/03	Jeff Barber	129	Policy LP36	<p>LP 36 add to the criteria "taking the waiting list into account" and "the authority has actively promoted the availability of allotment sites" Redbridge may well have done that but it is a policy criterion for disposals.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? A leading question.</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>Noted. Policy LP36 seeks to protect existing allotment plots.</p>	

R00264/01	Clive & Ann Wilderspin	153	Site 99	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The Billet Road development is ill conceived. A development of this size will have an impact not just on the local area but on a far wider scale. The public services in the area are already stretched and the road system is also at breaking point. Local residents already find it difficult to access a doctor or dentist and the local hospitals are struggling to reach their target figures, let alone the problems with A & E units. Public transport systems are dangerously over crowded during peak times which is unlikely to change much when Crossrail opens. The effect of this development will spread to Aldborough Hatch, Barkingside, Collier Row and further.</p> <p>Air quality in the Billet Road area has deteriorated over the last few years due to the large amount of stationary/slow moving traffic during long periods of the day, to add to this will only be detrimental to the health of not only the local residents but also the pupils at Little Heath School.</p>	Billet Road will impact on health services, air quality and transport	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21)	
R00264/02	Clive & Ann Wilderspin	120	Policy LP34	<p>The Green Belt needs to be kept sacrosanct. It creates "breathing" spaces to allow for pollution levels to be kept at more manageable levels.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Green belt to be kept sacrosanct	<p>All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.</p> <p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	
R00265/01	Sharon Slater	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford area, for the following reasons:- Paragraph 3.2 designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. South Woodford has been designed for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area has been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00265/02	Sharon Slater	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Transport: South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6,7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the Council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no. 116, 118 and 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00265/03	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	<p>Schools: There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no. 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00265/04	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other Infrastructure: The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level, however, it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>
R00265/05	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business Sites in South Woodford: Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well as increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00265/06	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark Building on the Station Estate: Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must "respect the established residential characteristics". Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these buildings will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the Council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion, the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (Paragraph 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job and infrastructure (Paragraph 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00265/07	Slater Sharon	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00265/08	Slater Sharon	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00265/09	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. ee response R00108/14.	
R00265/10	Slater Sharon	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	.. See response R00108/15.	

R00266/01	Sarah Grogan	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness? Don't know</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Green belt is not negotiable, there are many "brown belt" sites in the area which can just as well be redeveloped to meet the housing quota without compromising the areas green areas. by building on the green belt areas you are not creating a sustainable environment or prosperous rural economy. National policy has been pretty much ignored completely by even proposing to use green belt to build houses on. National policy states the requirement for promoting sustainable transport, The development of Fairlop Waters Racecourse was rejected due to the inadequate road and transport network.</p>	objection, no specific change sought	<p>All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.</p> <p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	
R00266/02	Sarah Grogan	153	Site 99	<p>Billet Road and Hainault Road are already straining under the pressure of the current weight of traffic, the roundabout by the A12 is permanently blocked for people trying to get in or out of Billet Road by people going straight down Hainault Road. and the queues regularly stretch the entire length of Hainault road and Billet Road, and not just during peak times. The 296 and 66 buses are full during peak hours, a sue to speeding and dangerous driving, cycling is not a safe option.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	objection, no specific change sought	<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21)</p>	
R00268/01	Roger Hammond	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The Plan is totally ineffective for the South Woodford Area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	

R00268/02	Roger Hammond	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00268/03	Roger Hammond	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00268/04	Roger Hammond	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years?</p> <p>The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00268/05	Roger Hammond	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00268/06	Roger Hammond	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00268/07	Roger Hammond	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00268/08	Roger Hammond	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00268/09	Roger Hammond	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00268/10	Roger Hammond	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00269/01	Brenda Hammond	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00269/02	Brenda Hammond	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00269/03	Brenda Hammond	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00269/04	Brenda Hammond	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00269/05	Brenda Hammond	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00269/06	Brenda Hammond	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00269/07	Brenda Hammond	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01	
R00269/08	Brenda Hammond	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00269/09	Brenda Hammond	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00269/10	Brenda Hammond	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. see response R00108/15.	
R00270/01	Bharat Dasoar	20	Policies LP1, LP1B	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? 1. My representations relate primarily to Section 3 of the Draft Local Plan (Promoting and Managing Growth) and to Policies LP1 and LP1B (King George and Goodmayes Hospitals opportunity site No.46 and Ford Sports Ground opportunity site No.66). The representations also relate to paragraphs 2.2 (Table 2), 3.8.3, 3.8.4, 3.8.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.9, 6.2.8 and 6.2.9.</p>		Noted	

R00270/02	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B	<p>2. It is considered that the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant and is not 'sound'. It does not justify the aspirations in draft policies LP1 and LP1B, relying on erroneous evidential documentation or misinterpretation of such and in many areas the Draft Local Plan is not consistent with National and Regional policies.</p>		<p>The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified. LP1 is an overarching policy supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of other policies contained within the plan</p>
R00270/03	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policies LP1B, LP2	<p>3. Redbridge has put forward the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment, prepared by Opinion Research Services, as justification for removing the sites of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, Seven Kings Park and other adjoining lands (hereinafter referred to as the LP1B Lands) from Green Belt designation.</p> <p>It suggests that since the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment demonstrates that there are insufficient potential sites to meet the housing needs numbers for Redbridge for the period of the Local Plan, and as referred to in the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment report, this demonstrates 'exceptional circumstances' to justify removing from Green Belt designation various parcels of land around the borough including the LP1B lands. However, it is clear from Section 2 of the Draft Local Plan (the Plan) and, in particular Table 2, that the declared Objective of Redbridge is to deliver up to 18,500 new homes over the plan period (although Policy LP2 refers to 16,845 new homes over the period of the Plan) as opposed to the 31,977 new homes over a similar period referred to in paragraph 6.1.6 of the Plan. (It should be noted that Appendix 1 to the Plan does not list all possible opportunity sites and therefore it creates a false base from which to conclude there is insufficient land to meet the Policy LP2 housing needs.)</p>		<p>See response to R00245/03</p>
R00270/04	Bharat Dasoar	18	Table 2	<p>4. Whilst the housing and population numbers in Section 1 of the Plan are inconsistent and, in at least one instance, mathematically incorrect, these are the numbers which have been used to guide the new housing target in Objective 1 of Table 2. Thus, the only purpose of the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment is to try and justify 'exceptional circumstances'.</p>		<p>See response to R00245/04</p>
R00270/05	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B	<p>5. The Draft Green Belt Review prepared by Wardell Armstrong, and which Redbridge is using to justify removing the LP1B lands from Green Belt designation, is flawed in many respects. It suggests that the National Planning Policy Framework is different in its approach to Green Belt issues than was the case in Planning Policy Guidance 2 but case law states that the NPPF made no changes to the guidance in PPG2.</p>		<p>See response to R00245/05</p>

R00270/06	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B	<p>6. The Wardell Armstrong Green Belt Review states that the area of Green Belt land which they have numbered GB16 (being the LP1B lands) no longer meet Green Belt purposes and should be de-designated. A view of an aerial photograph of the area shows the connectivity with other Green Belt lands. The majority of the housing backing onto the LP1B lands was built prior to 1950. Whilst there have been some changes in the locality (not least the building of the new King Georges Hospital, replacing the one previously located in Eastern Avenue to the west of Newbury Park station; and the Ambulance station) the character of the area remains much as it was when it was first designated as Green Belt.</p>		See response to R00245/06	
R00270/07	Bharat Dasoar	26	LP1B	<p>7. To take the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation will clearly be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Green Belt Protection), the London Plan (chapter 7) and the Plan Policies LP18 (Health and Well-being), LP21 (Water and Flooding), LP34 (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land), LP37 (Green Infrastructure and Blue Ribbon Network) and LP39 (Nature Conservation and Biodiversity).</p>		See response to R00245/07	See response to R00245/07
R00270/08	Bharat Dasoar	26	LP1B	<p>8. Within the Greater London Authority document Green Infrastructure and Open Environments; The All London Green Grid – Supplementary Planning Guidance, the LP1B lands are shown in Figure 16 of that document as being in an area with Metropolitan Park opportunities. Thus the proposals from Redbridge ignore the GLA Green Infrastructure objectives.</p>		See response to R00245/08	See response to R00245/08
R00270/09	Bharat Dasoar	85	Figure 19	<p>9. Seven Kings Water, which runs through the middle of the LP1B lands, is designated as part of the GLA Blue Ribbon Network. Figure 17 in the Draft Plan does not clearly show this important Blue Ribbon waterway. The Draft Plan also makes no mention of the regular flooding either side of Seven Kings Water and the related flood plain as set out in Redbridge's own Flood Risk Assessment.</p>	Draft Plan fails to mention flooding of Seven Kings Water	See response to R00245/09	See response to R00245/09
R00270/10	Bharat Dasoar	17	Figure 6	<p>10. Within the Draft Plan Redbridge has designated various areas around the borough as Investment and Growth Areas (Section 3 of the Plan refers). One of these is referred to as The Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area. As the accompanying plan (Figure 6) clearly demonstrates, far from being a 'corridor' Redbridge has stretched the imagination to create something which looks nothing like a 'corridor'. It is suggested that this Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area has been drawn in this particular manner in a contrived attempt to justify taking the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation – but this will not satisfy the tests set out in case law.</p>		See response to R00245/10	

R00270/11	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B; Sites 46, 66	11. There are inconsistencies in respect of the measurement of the LP1B lands which it is proposed should be released for housing development. In Appendix 1 to the Draft Plan, Opportunity site No.46 has no site size shown despite the Council having been in discussions with the site owners for some time. In Appendix 1 Opportunity site No.66 is shown as being 26.8 hectares. However, the Ford Sports Ground is only about 16 hectares. This means that the rest of the proposed development site is made up of the Ambulance station land (and there is nothing to say that this will be available at any time in the future) and, in greatest part, a large part of Seven Kings Park. The BNP Paribas Real Estate Local Plan Viability Assessment of May 16 puts the site area as 27.04 hectares.	Inconsistencies regarding size of development sites	See response to R00245/11	
R00270/12	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B	12. If the LP1B lands were to be taken out of Green Belt designation and large parts developed for housing then Redbridge would be in breach of its own Plan by creating a further area of open space and playing field deficiency.	Development of LP1B sites would result in more locations having an open space deficiency	See response to R00245/12	
R00270/13	Bharat Dasoar	26	Policy LP1B	*Soundness Improvements? To satisfy my objections to the Draft Local Plan I would expect the following to happen: i. Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. ii. Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance. Please let me know when the Draft Local Plan is submitted.	LP1B Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area has contrived shape to include Green Belt land	The Council consider the Plan and policy LP1 are fully justified in supporting growth in sustainable locations.	
R00271/01	Claire Croad	32	para 3.6.5	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Re 3.65- demolishing station estate where there are several thriving businesses, essential car parking for the existing businesses on George lane and replacing with dense housing plans is not sustainable. There are also no provisions within the plans to enhance the existing infrastructure such as doctors, schools and leisure facilities to enable the area to cope with such a swell in population without having a detrimental impact on the quality of life of existing residents.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/11, R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00271/02	Claire Croad	32	para 3.6.5	Public transport in South Woodford is already at or near capacity and increasing the density of the populas in the area will again have detrimental effects on those already resident here. The plan should have reviewed the areas on the loop of the central line where footfall in dramatically less than that of snakesbrook, South Woodford and Woodford. There is more land that could be developed in the areas of the borough around Fairlop, Barkingside, Hainault where increasing the density of the population will not have so much of an impact and will bring jobs and prosperity to the area.	comment, no change sought	The Growth and Investment Areas of Gants Hill, Crossrail Corridor (at Newbury Park), and Barkingside are all served by the Hainault Loop.	No further change required.

R00271/03	Claire Croad	32	para 3.6.5	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Don't know I wouldn't imagine that plans to develop land around Charlie Browns Roundabout for housing would be compliant with health and safety regarding air quality. Charlie Browns is reputed to have a lower level of air quality than Oxford Street (where the mayor of London is urgently seeking a way to reduce levels of pollution) knowingly building homes in that vicinity surely is contra to his policies of safe guarding Londoners health.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	<p>LP24: Pollution states that all new major development schemes will require an Air Quality Assessment, whereby a key consideration will be its location within an area of poor air quality, identified by the Council's Community Protection Team. Proposals will also be assessed on the impact they have on air quality, through trip generation for example, as well as the impact that demolition and construction phases will have on the local environment.</p>	No further change required.
R00272/01	Ian Price	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? As a South Woodford Resident for the last 17 years I am commenting on this area in particular. Even though the area of South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 new homes I can find no corresponding improvements to the area's infrastructure to allow such an increase to be manageable without detriment to existing and future residents quality of life.</p>	South Woodford	<p>. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)</p>	No further change required.
R00274/01	Liddiard Mark The Football Association	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The Football Association (The FA) and Essex County Football Association (ECFA) wish to object to the London Borough of Redbridge Local Plan specifically around the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of current football pitches at Oakfield's Playing Fields, Jack Carter Pavilion and the Ford Sports and Social Club without any fully developed alternatives • The process the London Borough of Redbridge as the local planning authority has conducted in relation to the potential loss of these sites and the lack of adequately assessed viable alternatives which enhances the overall provision in the borough. Both Associations accept that Local Authorities are under huge competing pressures in terms of growth whilst trying to maintain public services in the face of a reduction of income sources and we are delivering models to sustain grass roots football participation in light of this. In early 2015 The FA and ECFA were invited along with other National Governing Bodies and Sport England to develop a Playing Pitch Strategy with the London Borough of Redbridge. This strategy looks at the current levels of sports participation, quality of existing facilities and the future requirements of provision to meet projected population growth. The development of a Playing Pitch Strategy should be used by a Local Authority as an evidence base to direct an emerging local plan. It should be afforded the same weight as other supporting documents around employment, transport and environmental plans to name a few examples. 	comment, no change sought	<p>Noted. Further feasibility studies (LBR 2.44.1 and LBR 2.44.2) have been carried out to support the plan since the Playing Pitch Strategy was completed.</p>	

R00274/02	Liddiard Mark The Football Association	-	PPS	<p>The PPS started in unusual circumstances because the London Borough of Redbridge had already identified potential sites for development including Oakfield's Playing Fields, Jack Carter Pavilion and the Ford Sports and Social Club. The steering group involving Council Officers, Sport England, London Sport and National Governing Bodies of Sport worked through the various PPS stages to develop an accurate evidence base of current participation level and facilities in the Borough. The quality of football pitches in the borough is hugely variable with poorer quality pitches tending to be located at LA owned public open spaces and the higher quality pitches at secure clubs sites such as Oakfield's Playing Fields, Jack Carter Pavilion and the Ford Sports and Social Club. In The FA and ECFA view, the PSS steering group was restricted in its ability to objectively assess the playing pitch provision due to the public intention of the Local Authority to put forward for development the highest quality football facilities in the borough.</p>		<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) has been agreed to by Sport England and all national governing bodies.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>
R00274/03	Liddiard Mark The Football Association	-	PPS	<p>At numerous meetings Officers from The FA and ECFA challenged the Councils proposal to develop these sites for residential/commercial use before the PPS due process had been completed and viable alternatives had been considered. Due to the London Borough of Redbridge publically declaring its intention to develop the above sites, it forced the PPS steering group into a position where we had to attempt to find a proposed solution or replacement provision through a method of scenario testing alternatives sites that would heavily impact on the footballing infrastructure of the borough. All 3 sites due to their high quality, have a high carrying capacity ie they are able to take 3-4 games per week of match play. In comparison a poorly maintained pitch might only be able to take 1 game a week. Football in urban areas is often operated from central venue sites for mini soccer and youth football ie clubs without security of a home ground will travel to these sites to play matches. All 3 sites operate as central venues for a variety of clubs and leagues and therefore their importance to the local footballing community is paramount. The FA and ECFA would like it noted by the Inspector that the PPS group were not aware that the London Borough of Redbridge commissioned in January 2016 an alternative PPS report by Cundalls Johnson and Partners LLP and subsequent agronomist report by Peter Jones Associates. At the last PPS steering group meeting in March 2016, enquiries were made of Officers representing the Council if they knew if any additional work was being undertaken to which they did not know. The FA and ECFA accepts that Officers representing the Council on the group might not have known about this work because it was commissioned by the Councils Planning Policy or Property Team which undermined the findings of the PPS and has created an alternative evidence base that the London</p>	<p>Disputes validity of "alternative" PPS used within Local Plan</p>	<p>Value of existing pitches and facilities is recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to ny development as set out in Policies LP1 and LP35. Since the Playing Pitch Strategy (LBR 2.43) was completed, the Cundall Report (LBR 2.44) examined potential relocations sites, and subsequent feasibility studies (LBR 2.44.1 and LBR 2.44.2) have been carried out.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>

R00274/04	Liddiard Mark The Football Association	-	PPS	<p>The FA and ECFA recognise that there is often pressure to rationalise playing pitch stock especially in urban areas, however this comes with severe risk of negatively affecting participation patterns which are lost when sites are relocated or redeveloped. This is due to the severe impact on volunteering, travel and club infrastructure a relocation can lead to which will result in a loss of football participation and consequently upon public health targets. One has to remember that grass roots sport is often built upon the passionate volunteers giving up their time free of charge to the public purse. A well led PPS process we would expect to be able to evaluate fully developed replacement provision proposals at the time of agreeing to the loss of any existing football pitches and their supporting facilities. In this case The FA and ECFA wish to object to the proposed re-development of Oakfield's Playing Fields, Jack Carter Pavilion and the Ford Sports and Social Club Yours sincerely Mark Liddiard - Regional Facilities and Investment Manager (Greater London), The Football Association Brendan Walshe – County Development Manager – Essex County Football Association</p>		Noted.	No further change required.
R00274/05	Liddiard Mark The Football Association	-	PPS	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? As above *Legally Compliant Improvements? The Local Plan should clearly set out its green recreational infrastructure in a transparent manner. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Whilst The FA is not a Local Authority, we believe the Local Authority has a duty to be transparent with all sport National Governing Bodies with regards to the sporting infrastructure in the borough.</p>		See responses to R00274/01-04	See responses to R00274/01-04
R00275/01	Adam Gostling M Akbar c/o Agent	146	Appendix 1	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Appendix 1 of the Local Plan is not justified as it fails to include Land Adjoining 2 Woodville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1LE as a potential residential redevelopment site. The site is sustainably located and will assist in meeting the boroughs housing targets. *Soundness Improvements? Include Land Adjoining 2 Woodville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1LE in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan as a residential redevelopment site. *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Appendix 1 does not include Land Adjoining 2 Woodville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1LE *Legally Compliant Improvements? Appendix 1 should be updated to include Land Adjoining 2 Woodville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1LE. *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R01086/01	

R00276/01	Allyson Wright	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are no improvements to infrastructure. The area has almost no spare capacity to cope with increased demands associated with a higher population - doctors surgeries are already over-subscribed, the volume of traffic is already a huge issue as is the provision of school places.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00276/02	Allyson Wright	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged in paragraph 1.21.4. Said footfall is significantly higher than at stations along the Hainult branch - should housing growth not be focused there? Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116, 118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road & the Hight Road struggle to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00276/03	Allyson Wright	68	LP17	<p>Other infrastructure - the plan does not provide any improvements to areas such as doctors surgeries, community or leisure services, childcare and hospitals except at borough level. Residents of South Woodford will be expected to travel across the borough to access many of these services creating more traffic, more pollution & yet more strain on local transport options - where is the joined up thinking?</p>		See response to R00108/01	See response to R00108/01
R00276/04	Allyson Wright	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford. Our business sites provide decent and affordable ares for business to operate profitably & thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development when the area has already lost a huge amount of office & business space as freeholders convert to residential use. This has done untold damage to local residents' ability to work locally & had a detrimental knock-on effect on other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers on a daily basis.</p>		see response to R00108/11	

R00276/05	Allyson Wright	33	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on Station Estate Residents made it clear with a petition of nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings - the paragraph setting out a proposal for a landmark building on Station Estate is in direct contradiction with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new development must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. As an investment and growth area tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these buildings will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will 'seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character' - how do tower blocks fit this character?		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00276/06	Allyson Wright	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00276/07	Allyson Wright	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00276/08	Allyson Wright	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00276/09	Allyson Wright	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00276/10	Allyson Wright	37	LP2	5. Emphasis needs to be placed on the regeneration or restoration of derelict/unoccupied houses & sites. The should be a move to catalogue all the borough's empty properties - commercial or residential with a view to tracing owners and offering incentives to bring these properties back into use. It is morally reprehensible to develop parks, community spaces & school playing fields when there are so many buildings (not only in Redbridge but London-wide) sitting empty *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	Register of empty properties and measures to incentivise re-use	Policy LP2 supports initiatives to bring empty properties back into use. However, housing need in the borough is such that a variety of sources of supply are needed, including significant new development.	No further change required.
R00277/01	WENDY TAYLOR ILFORD SUNDAY DROP IN FOR THE HOMELESS	-	-	*Soundness? No	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00278/01	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? 1. My representations relate primarily to Section 3 of the Draft Local Plan (Promoting and Managing Growth) and to Policies LP1 and LP1B (King George and Goodmayes Hospitals opportunity site No.46 and Ford Sports Ground opportunity site No.66). The representations also relate to paragraphs 2.2 (Table 2), 3.8.3, 3.8.4, 3.8.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.9, 6.2.8 and 6.2.9.</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00278/02	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	<p>2. It is considered that the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant and is not 'sound'. It does not justify the aspirations in draft policies LP1 and LP1B, relying on erroneous evidential documentation or misinterpretation of such and in many areas the Draft Local Plan is not consistent with National and Regional policies.</p>		See response to R00245/02	
R00278/03	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	<p>3. Redbridge has put forward the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment, prepared by Opinion Research Services, as justification for removing the sites of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, Seven Kings Park and other adjoining lands (hereinafter referred to as the LP1B Lands) from Green Belt designation. It suggests that since the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment demonstrates that there are insufficient potential sites to meet the housing needs numbers for Redbridge for the period of the Local Plan, and as referred to in the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment report, this demonstrates 'exceptional circumstances' to justify removing from Green Belt designation various parcels of land around the borough including the LP1B lands.</p> <p>However, it is clear from Section 2 of the Draft Local Plan (the Plan) and, in particular Table 2, that the declared Objective of Redbridge is to deliver up to 18,500 new homes over the plan period (although Policy LP2 refers to 16,845 new homes over the period of the Plan) as opposed to the 31,977 new homes over a similar period referred to in paragraph 6.1.6 of the Plan. (It should be noted that Appendix 1 to the Plan does not list all possible opportunity sites and therefore it creates a false base from which to conclude there is insufficient land to meet the Policy LP2 housing needs.)</p>		See response to R00245/03	
R00278/04	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	<p>4. Whilst the housing and population numbers in Section 1 of the Plan are inconsistent and, in at least one instance, mathematically incorrect, these are the numbers which have been used to guide the new housing target in Objective 1 of Table 2. Thus, the only purpose of the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment is to try and justify 'exceptional circumstances'.</p>		See response to R00245/04	

R00278/05	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	5. The Draft Green Belt Review prepared by Wardell Armstrong, and which Redbridge is using to justify removing the LP1B lands from Green Belt designation, is flawed in many respects. It suggests that the National Planning Policy Framework is different in its approach to Green Belt issues than was the case in Planning Policy Guidance 2 but case law states that the NPPF made no changes to the guidance in PPG2.		See response to R00245/05	
R00278/06	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	6. The Wardell Armstrong Green Belt Review states that the area of Green Belt land which they have numbered GB16 (being the LP1B lands) no longer meet Green Belt purposes and should be de-designated. A view of an aerial photograph of the area shows the connectivity with other Green Belt lands. The majority of the housing backing onto the LP1B lands was built prior to 1950. Whilst there have been some changes in the locality (not least the building of the new King Georges Hospital, replacing the one previously located in Eastern Avenue to the west of Newbury Park station; and the Ambulance station) the character of the area remains much as it was when it was first designated as Green Belt.		See response to R00245/06	
R00278/07	Mosheraf Ashraf	26	LP1B	7. To take the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation will clearly be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Green Belt Protection), the London Plan (chapter 7) and the Plan Policies LP18 (Health and Well-being), LP21 (Water and Flooding), LP34 (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land), LP37 (Green Infrastructure and Blue Ribbon Network) and LP39 (Nature Conservation and Biodiversity).		See response to R00245/07	
R00278/08	Mosheraf Ashraf	27	Policy LP1B	8. Within the Greater London Authority document Green Infrastructure and Open Environments; The All London Green Grid – Supplementary Planning Guidance, the LP1B lands are shown in Figure 16 of that document as being in an area with Metropolitan Park opportunities. Thus the proposals from Redbridge ignore the GLA Green Infrastructure objectives.	Contradiction with London Plan's identified Metropolitan Park opportunities	See response to R00245/08	
R00278/09	Mosheraf Ashraf	85	Figure 19	9. Seven Kings Water, which runs through the middle of the LP1B lands, is designated as part of the GLA Blue Ribbon Network. Figure 17 in the Draft Plan does not clearly show this important Blue Ribbon waterway. The Draft Plan also makes no mention of the regular flooding either side of Seven Kings Water and the related flood plain as set out is Redbridge's own Flood Risk Assessment.	area near Seven Kings Water (within LP1B) floods regularly	See response to R00245/09	

R00278/10	Mosheraf Ashraf	27	Figure 6	<p>10. Within the Draft Plan Redbridge has designated various areas around the borough as Investment and Growth Areas (Section 3 of the Plan refers). One of these is referred to as The Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area. As the accompanying plan (Figure 6) clearly demonstrates, far from being a 'corridor' Redbridge has stretched the imagination to create something which looks nothing like a 'corridor'. It is suggested that this Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area has been drawn in this particular manner in a contrived attempt to justify taking the LP1B lands out of Green Belt designation – but this will not satisfy the tests set out in case law.</p>	LP1B Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area has contrived shape to include Green Belt land	See response to R00245/10	
R00278/11	Mosheraf Ashraf	149	Sites 46, 66	<p>11. There are inconsistencies in respect of the measurement of the LP1B lands which it is proposed should be released for housing development. In Appendix 1 to the Draft Plan, Opportunity site No.46 has no site size shown despite the Council having been in discussions with the site owners for some time. In Appendix 1 Opportunity site No.66 is shown as being 26.8 hectares. However, the Ford Sports Ground is only about 16 hectares. This means that the rest of the proposed development site is made up of the Ambulance station land (and there is nothing to say that this will be available at any time in the future) and, in greatest part, a large part of Seven Kings Park. The BNP Paribas Real Estate Local Plan Viability Assessment of May 16 puts the site area as 27.04 hectares.</p>	Inconsistencies regarding size of development sites	See response to R00245/11	
R00278/12	Mosheraf Ashraf	18	Paras 2.2, 3, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.6, 6.2.8, 6.2.9	<p>12. If the LP1B lands were to be taken out of Green Belt designation and large parts developed for housing then Redbridge would be in breach of its own Plan by creating a further area of open space and playing field deficiency. To satisfy my objections to the Draft Local Plan I would expect the following to happen: i. Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. ii. Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	Delete LP1B as it creates a further area of open space and playing field deficiency; remove other inconsistencies with national and GLA policy	See response to R00245/12	See response to R00245/12
R00282/01	Therese Clancy	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? South Woodford is already over populated and building more housing will put more of a strain on school, parking and other amenities *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.

R00283/01	Matthew shaw	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? My comments specifically relate to South Woodford. South Woodford has been designated in the draft plan as a growth and development area. However, there are no specific details about any infrastructure improvements. Also during the appraisal of the Woodford - Wanstead corridor option it was concluded that transport could not be improved (how can the Central Line increase its capacity).	Woodford - Wanstead corridor option concluded transport could not be improved	The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel. Gants Hill and Barkingside on the Hainault loop are both also identified as investment and growth areas.	No further change required.
R00283/02	Matthew shaw	68	LP17	Additionally, whilst some of the Councillors talk about increasing infrastructure it appears to be at borough level rather than local. Particular concerns are lack of school places and doctors. Regarding development in south Woodford some of the areas selected are bizarre. Including the Rose Avenue Park and Station Car Park. Residents are concerned about high rise buildings however, the area being in a development zone puts the area at more risk. Also, there are massive concerns about having a landmark building, why is such a specific detail included in the draft plan?	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01, R00108/14, R00108/17, R00108/18	
R00283/03	Matthew shaw	154	site 116, 120	*Soundness improvements? Remove Rose Avenue Park and Station Car Park as being suitable for development.	Remove sites 116, 120 from list of Opportunity Sites	. See response R00108/18.	
R00283/04	Matthew shaw	32	Policy LP1A, para 3.6.5	Remove reference to a landmark building and do not designate south Woodford as a growth and development zone.		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00283/05	Matthew shaw	68	LP17	Ensure that there are specific infrastructure improvements at a local level are planned if the number of houses are going to be increased.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R00283/06	Matthew shaw	46	Policy LP5	Aim to build houses and not flats to be in keeping with the demographics of the area.	Build houses, rather than flats in South Woodford	Policy LP5 sets out the Councils preferred dwelling mix, which includes family housing	No further change required.
R00283/07	Matthew shaw	32	para 3.6.5	Consider on Station Estate the possibility of flats for the elderly and maybe even a pocket park *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/15	
R00284/01	Paul Pounds	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	

R00284/02	Paul Pounds	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00284/03	Paul Pounds	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00284/04	Paul Pounds	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00284/05	Paul Pounds	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00284/06	Paul Pounds	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00284/07	Paul Pounds	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00284/08	Paul Pounds	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00284/09	Paul Pounds	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00284/10	Paul Pounds	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00284/11	Paul Pounds	154	site 116	Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00285/01	Linda Morson	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is set out by a Council who have consistently ignored key factors raised time and again by local people. E.g. existing over development in a small area. Lack of infrastructure to sustain it. Transport over crowding at S.Woodford Central Line. Severe Pollution from A406 and Southend Arterial road to local people and nearby schools. Despite this - plans to site temporary cabin houses for immigrants or others under the motor way where black rubber dust from the cars settles. This will go into lungs and then the NHS will suffer too!</p>	no change sought	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement (LBR 1.15). The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. See also responses to R00108/01-02.	
R00285/02	Linda Morson	154	Site 109	<p>Site 109. How noisy is this going to be to live under and what happens if a crash causes vehicles to land on these temporary houses? Utter Madness. Clearly this housing means you are bringing more people into the area unsupported. This is not justified. You are also removing businesses/jobs from the area to do this - where is the sense in this?</p>	no change sought	Conversion of KGM offices to residential use did not need planning permission, as a result of central government changes to the Uses Class Order.	No further change required.
R00285/03	Linda Morson	154	Sites 109, 117	<p>Sites 109 and 117 - Destroy local business and jobs - great idea, good for local economy - and brilliant for local people who need local jobs. How is increasing density, spoiling the area's aesthetic appeal and pleasantness and increasing the crush of people and cars, the strain on doctor's surgeries etc. be Effective planning???</p>	no change sought	See response to R00285/02, R00108/01, and R00108/11	
R00285/04	Linda Morson	155	Site 120	<p>Site 120 - build on the LUL car park - another great idea - where do commuters go? Some people work unsociable hours and there is no bus to their road - driving to the station is the only option. How many car parks are there in S.Woodford - x 2 on the east bound side but very small - none on the west bound side.</p>	no change sought	Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.	No further change required.
R00285/05	Linda Morson	37	LP2	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Renovate empty buildings - e.g. old offices above shops that are unused e.g. above Pizza Express on George Lane.</p>	Renovate offices above shops	Existing Change of Use regulations allow for office space to be converted into residential housing.	No further change required.
R00285/06	Linda Morson	32	LP1D	<p>Provide more green oasis for S. Woodford - increasing housing projects will make flooding from the Roding worse as there will be no where for the water to go. We need to green S. Woodford to deal with the pollution. Flats built near the flyover are difficult to sell - building more will not help.</p>	Provide more green spaces for flood prevention	Policy LP35 seeks on site provision of open space in new developments, whilst policy LP21 encourages the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) - which can be multipurpose and have amenity/ biodiversity benefits	No further change required.
R00285/07	Linda Morson	154	sites 118, 119	<p>People do not want to breathe in polluted air. Sites 118 and 119? label over no. on plan! Whipps Cross Hospital has not been developed and as a result for over 30 years has remained a vast track of land of old empty derelict buildings and container cabins and a hotch potch of interconnected buildings of varying ages and state of repair. Further the grounds have a series of temporary car parks which are spread around the site. Would it not be possible to find a developer to develop the hospital in exchange for a portion of this land for building flats and sheltered housing? Both the NHS and the need for housing would be served. I think this wasted land is disgraceful.</p>	comment, no change sought	Whipps Cross Hospital falls within the London Borough of Waltham Forest	No further change required.

R00285/08	Linda Morson	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I have not had time to study this in detail. As always, the local residents do not get enough time to consider these plans as the Council keeps it under wraps as long as possible before presenting with very short deadlines. A more open and longer consultation would be fairer and more honest.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? Again, I have not had time to study this in detail.</p>		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00286/01	Janice Folley	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I agree the plan is basically sound. However, with Redbridge school places already being a problem, I am conscious of the need for more schools to accommodate any increase in accommodation in the area. The two go very much hand in hand - you cannot have one without the other. To that end, I would like to draw the planners' attention to the following since this would go a little way towards alleviating the problem: Proposed Submission to Redbridge Local Plan Consultation (by 30/09/16) (To be co-ordinated with the Submission by the DfE) City Gates School Trust is proposing a Free School with a Christian ethos in Redbridge and was approved by the Department for Education (DfE) for pre-opening in March 2015.</p>	no change sought	Noted	No further change required.
R00286/02	Janice Folley	68	LP17	<p>The School will be an all-through school for children aged 4 to 16 years old with three forms in the Primary Phase and four forms in the Secondary Phase. The School will be non-denominational, however the Trust have entered into an affiliation relationship with the Board of Education of the Diocese of Chelmsford of the Church of England so as to access their expertise in running schools with a Christian ethos. Whilst demand for the School is from across the Borough, the main focus has been in the Goodmayes area.</p>	no change sought	Noted	No further change required.

R00286/03	Janice Folley	149	sites 46. 66	<p>The demand for the School is both from Christian families (roughly two-thirds), and from families of other and no faith (roughly one-third). A key issue for the Trust, together with the DfE, has been finding a suitable site for the School. The DfE have been unable to secure a site so far, mainly due to the lack of available land in the Borough, and as a result the School is on 'pause' until the DfE are able to acquire a suitable site. This is most likely to occur as land is released as part of the Redbridge Local Plan process. City Gates School Trust fully supports the Local Plans identification of the need for additional primary and secondary school places in the Borough, and of the need to release land, including where appropriate Green Belt land, to accommodate new schools to meet this demand.</p> <p>In particular, City Gates School Trust supports the release of Green Belt land in the Goodmayes Hospital area for education as well as housing and other uses as this is the Trust's preferred location, given the demand for the School. The Trust, with support from the DfE, is keen to partner with the Borough to see the School opened as soon as possible to help provide additional school places to meet the growing demand in the Borough. Subject to the Local Plan process, it could be ready to open as soon as Autumn 2018 if land can be released before the end of 2017 for the DfE to acquire for the School. This submission has been co-ordinated with the DfE who are also making a submission to the Local Plan Consultation.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Legally Compliant Comments? This has clearly been thought through and legal compliance has been checked carefully. The plan shows integrity. *Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	no change sought	Support noted	No further change required.
R00287/01	Paul Myles	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	

R00287/02	Paul Myles	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00287/03	Paul Myles	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00287/04	Paul Myles	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00287/05	Paul Myles	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>	

R00287/06	Paul Myles	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford?</p> <p>As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00287/07	Paul Myles	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00287/08	Paul Myles	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00287/09	Paul Myles	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00287/10	Paul Myles	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00287/11	Paul Myles	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I think it is very easy for a plan to appear compliant, however I can offer numerous instances where its implementation has not adhered to the Statement of Community Involvement which is intended to include members of the community in the planning process as just this month, I have received feedback from my neighbours that they did not receive formal notices or information about an intended residential development at Old Mill Court which adjoins each of our back gardens. When an item as close to home as this has failed to be compliant it is difficult to believe that a multi-ward, multi-year plan will achieve compliance. The implementation of plans should follow the guidelines as indicated.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	South Woodford	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00288/01	Kate Pugh J A Kemp	32	LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? South Woodford is already very congested with Chigwell Road having lots of long queues outside our house. There aren't enough schools and GP surgeries are overloaded. It's very hard to be able to get a doctors appointment. I can't imagine what it will be like if these homes are built! I think if they are it would be ruining a very nice area! Please listen to South Woodfords residents and keep it as it is.</p> <p>And the homeless housing part of the plan is even worst especially as I live very near to the proposals and this could effect value of my home!</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements Don't build any more houses/ flats etc!</p>	Don't build any homes	see response to R00108/01	
R00288/02	Kate Pugh J A Kemp	-	-	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Because you are making it too difficult for residents to understand all the legal parts! This is defiantly the case with this questionnaire!</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? By not building any more homes/ flats etc!</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? By not building any more homes!</p>	Don't build any homes	The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan	No further change required.
R00289/01	Pugh Jason J A Kemp	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? South Woodford is already very congested with cars in Chigwell Road having lots</p>	Don't build any homes	see response to R00108/01	

R00290/01	pavlina wilkin	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. In excess of 650 homes are planned however there is no infrastructure to cope. (para 1.21.4). The central line is overcrowded (recently reported in the press as the line with most delays). No new schools are included in the plans and the existing schools will be overloaded. There are less busy stations along the Hainaul branch that indicate less dense population. Remove south woodford as a designated investment and growth zone.</p>		see response to R00108/01-02	
R00290/02	pavlina wilkin	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	Remove policy LP1D and other references to South Woodford Investment and Growth Area	. See response R00108/01.	
R00290/03	pavlina wilkin	154	Sites 116, 117, 118, 120	<p>Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120.</p>	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00290/04	pavlina wilkin	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford</p>	Section 3.6.5: remove "The Council will seek to create..." onwards	. See response R00108/14.	
R00290/05	pavlina wilkin	68	LP17	<p>Create a community centre that young people and other groups can use, Currently the salvation army provides the only such place (and does a good job)</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Create a community centre in South Woodford	. Noted. The Council supports new community infrastructure as part of growth within the borough under Local Plan LP17 Delivering Community Infrastructure.	No further change required.
R00292/01	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	120	LP34	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? + Is and was Green Belt + Communities regrowing and need social cohesion space + Infrastructure around Fencepiece Road and Fullwell are over capacity + Pollution levels are above average, infact extremely high in this area. Many have sought Doctors advice + 5000 resident objectives are ignored</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? A robust idenpendent study with disclose of the source and their credibility. Redbridge Borough have been very covert about the sources, when they will share who is leading this plan and advising. Redbridge as always driving things through when it suits them.</p>		A full list of sources is provided within the Evidence Base (Appendix 10). These documents are in turn available on the Council's website and are expected to cite their own sources.	No further change required.

R00292/02	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Asset of Community Value: Oakfield is listed as such by the LBR due to its role in community wellbeing. This will not be continued if Oakfield facilities are re-located from Barkingside. The 2010 Green Belt Review by Colin Buchanan shows Oakfield meets two Green Belt purposes laid down in NPPF paragraph 80. Oakfield prevents urban sprawl and encroachment as development "would break the urban edge". Oakfield separates Barkingside from Hainault as per the LBR Local Plan Policy LP34(c). The 2016 Wardell Armstrong report shows Oakfield is important, open, local (green) space and so is protected by the NPPF paragraph 78. There are insufficient exceptional circumstances that outweigh the undoubted benefits of Oakfield such that LBR can claim a necessity to develop it for housing.</p> <p>The Oakfield proposal is less than 3% of the Borough's "objectively assessed" need in the Plan period. This is a population projection based on sustained high immigration which the government has said will be reduced. The amount of social and affordable housing will have negligible impact. The immense value to the community will continue if the well organised, volunteer led sports & social hubs remain at Oakfield.</p>		<p>The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.</p> <p>The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35</p> <p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	No further change required.
R00292/03	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	-	-	*Legally Compliant Comments? Modifications are required as follows:	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00292/04	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	(i) Remove Oakfield from the list of Opportunity Sites.	Remove site 135 from list of Opportunity sites	See response to R00292/02	
R00292/05	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	(ii) Remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5 in the Local Plan.	remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5	See response to R00292/02	
R00292/06	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	120	Policy LP34	(iii) Retain LP34: (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Land) but add to Implementation, "2 The Council will seek to enhance the accessibility and opportunities on Hainault Plain, in particular at Oakfield."	comment, no change sought	New open space will be required as part of the proposed redevelopment of Oakfield, as set out in Policy LP1	

R00292/07	Nilesh Vadher IAMYOURDESIGNER LIMITED	124	Policy LP35	(iv) In LP35: (Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces) remove Oakfield from paragraph (g) which is inconsistent with and indeed reverses the policies in the previous paragraphs (a) to (f). No Duty to Cooperate: LBR has not meaningfully cooperated with other Boroughs to identify brownfield sites elsewhere to help meet its objectively assessed housing needs. o) In December 2008, LBR's Cabinet approved deals on Oakfield leases including granting a freehold swap for a leasehold and a £6.4m relocation as this would "enable Redbridge Council to support its Capital Programme by enabling longer-term future land sales". There was no mention of housing. p) There are three secondary and nine primary schools, six primary care or medical centres within one mile of Oakfields. The proposal for a school and a medical centre at Oakfield has no basis in need.	comment, no change sought	See response to R00292/01. Duty To Cooperate Statement (LBR 1.14) sets out how the Council has met its duty to cooperate requirements. Infrastructure requirements for the site are based on the findings of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No further change required.
R00294/01	Cheryl Weeks	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00294/02	Cheryl Weeks	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how its potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00294/03	Cheryl Weeks	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00294/04	Cheryl Weeks	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00294/05	Cheryl Weeks	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Furthermore, SW is already overcrowded and, unlike the very similar but apparently untouchable areas of Wanstead, Aldersbrook and Woodford Bridge, SW is classified in Figure 4, Page 127 of the Plan as an area of Open Space Deficiency. Redbridge appears t</p>	comment, no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge’s expected growth. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application of policies contained within the plan	No further change required.

R00294/06	Cheryl Weeks	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00294/07	Cheryl Weeks	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00294/08	Cheryl Weeks	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00294/09	Cheryl Weeks	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00294/10	Cheryl Weeks	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00295/01	Christopher Lewis	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00295/02	Christopher Lewis	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00295/03	Christopher Lewis	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00295/04	Christopher Lewis	155	Site 120	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00295/05	Christopher Lewis	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00295/06	Christopher Lewis	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00295/07	Christopher Lewis	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00295/08	Christopher Lewis	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00295/09	Christopher Lewis	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00295/10	Christopher Lewis	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00299/01	Anthony Graham	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments are based on South Woodford The Plan is totally ineffective for the South Woodford Area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00299/02	Anthony Graham	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00299/03	Anthony Graham	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00299/04	Anthony Graham	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years?</p> <p>The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	see response R00108/01. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.
R00299/05	Anthony Graham	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12

R00299/06	Anthony Graham	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00299/07	Anthony Graham	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00299/08	Anthony Graham	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00299/09	Anthony Graham	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00299/10	Anthony Graham	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? There is significant local opposition to the Plan for South Woodford that proposes substantial development without addressing and improving an already over-stretched infrastructure. The Authority has not apparently sought to address the major concerns.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00301/01	Zoe Davis	32	Paras 3.6.2, 3.6.8	<p>*Soundness Comments? The Plan is not sound as it is self contradictory, unjustified and ineffective in relation to South Woodford (SW). Paragraph 3.6.2 of the Plan identifies SW as 'one of the more attractive parts of the borough' and Paragraph 3.6.8 states that 'protection of the character of SW as a whole remains a key priority'. If SW is attractive and the protection of its character is a priority then by extension it is a place that is special and has value.</p> <p>Plans for SW therefore must be viewed in the light of the statement in Paragraph 1.23.1 of the Plan that 'growth and change must respect the character and distinctiveness of Redbridge's special and valued places'. It is interesting that photographs of Wanstead - presumably to show a characterful shopping parade - and Aldersbrook - presumably to show some elegant houses - were chosen to illustrate this section of the Plan. Photographs practically identical to these could easily have been taken in and around George Lane in SW.</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00301/02	Zoe Davis	127	Figure 24	<p>Furthermore, SW is already overcrowded and, unlike the very similar but apparently untouchable areas of Wanstead, Aldersbrook and Woodford Bridge, SW is classified in Figure 4, Page 127 of the Plan as an area of Open Space Deficiency. Redbridge appears to be happy to classify SW as an area that can be utterly destroyed simply because the process has already been started. SW has already been subjected to recent significant over development (along the High Road, the Queen Mary's Gate site, Marlborough Road etc) and to continue in this mode would ruin the attractiveness, character and distinctiveness that remain.</p> <p>This is entirely contrary to the Council's own stated aims as quoted above and therefore it cannot possibly be the most appropriate strategy. Hence the proposed continued overdevelopment of SW cannot be justified. The Plan maintains that SW has 'substantial capacity to accommodate new homes' (Para 3.2.2). Arguably the ground space for building upon might be there, but the issue is that such homes would then contain people. In SW medical and dental appointments and school places are already difficult if not at times impossible to come by, parking and traffic congestion is a nightmare and travel on the Central Line is hell.</p>	South Woodford classified as area of open space deficiency	Policy LP35 seeks the protection and enhancement of open spaces, including through supporting investment in them through new developments. Also see response to see response to R00108/01-02	

R00301/03	Zoe Davis	162	Appendix 2	<p>However, the Infrastructure Development Plan (Appendix 2) has no scheduled health or school infrastructure projects for the SW area and, unlike in other parts of the borough where development is proposed, travel problems in SW will not be alleviated by Crossrail. The Plan is therefore ineffective as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the existing residents of SW, and there is no evidence that the infrastructure needed to support them plus a further increase in local population can be delivered over the Plan period, indeed if at all. Simply because the capacity for something exists (which is debatable in the case of SW) this does not mean it has to be utilised.</p>	no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00301/04	Zoe Davis	22	Policy LP1A, para 1.23.1/3.2.2/3.6.2/3.6.8	<p>*Soundness Improvements? In order to make the Local Plan sound, the contradictions with some of the Plan's stated aims in relation to South Woodford (SW) which render the Plan unjustified and ineffective must be removed. To do so SW must be declassified as an Investment and Growth area. There may be room for some further limited development of the area, but only if definite infrastructure improvements are made concurrently and not at some unspecified, and possibly non-existent, point in the future. SW should be treated in the same way and by the same standards as other local, similar areas such as Wanstead, Snaresbrook and Woodford Bridge.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	<p>Remove Policy LP1D and references to South Woodford Growth and Investment Area</p> <p>South Woodford, should be treated the same as Wanstead, Snaresbrook, and Woodford Bridge</p>	<p>See response R00108/01.</p>	<p>See response R00108/01.</p>
R00302/01	Michael Smith	-		<p>*Soundness? No *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00303/01	Andrew Cook	124	LP35	<p>*Soundness? Don't know *Soundness Comments? From the grounds of Goodmayes Hospital there is a view going across to the water tower at the top of Shooters Hill in SE London (located at TQ 438765). I would like this strategic view to be safeguarded. This view is from a footpath/cycle route north of a playing field (location approximately at Grid Reference TQ 462888). This playing field, and the land to the south of it, should be kept free of any buildings that would obstruct this view across to Shooters Hill. Andrew Cook.</p>	<p>Preserve view of Shooters Hill water tower from Goodmayes Hospital</p>	<p>Views across multiple London boroughs fall into the remit of the London Plan, and the London View Management Framework; therefore it is outside of the scope of the Local Plan, however tall buildings are subject to the requirements of Policy LP27.</p>	

R00303/02	Andrew Cook	124	LP35	<p>I am a resident of Goodmayes. I am therefore concerned about the future of Goodmayes Park Extension. My main concern is that there should be a presumption in favour of safeguarding Goodmayes Park Extension as a green open space. There should be a presumption against any substantial building work that would reduce the park extension as a green open space. There should also be a presumption against any flood lighting around the football pitches. Plus there should be a presumption against artificial turf being used on the pitches. Football could continue to be played on the existing football pitches. In addition to football being played, kite flying events could be held. Open green spaces are vital for the well-being of residents. They provide for rest and relaxation. They are not to be thought of as something that can be disposed of to raised money for short term gain. Green open spaces need to be safeguarded for future generations.</p>	Safeguard Goodmayes Park Extension as a green open space; presumption against floodlighting or artificial turf	Goodmayes Park Extension is protected as open space as shown on the policies map. Policy LP35 sets out the Council's approach to protecting and enhancing open spaces. Investment in matters such as floodlighting and artificial pitches can help enable greater use of existing facilities.	No further change required.
R00303/03	Andrew Cook	124	LP35	<p>Another issue is the cycle route through Goodmayes Park Extension. I myself rely on the cycle route through the Goodmayes Park Extension as an important link in the traffic free cycle route from the main part of Goodmayes Park to Mayesbrook Park and on to Upney Station on the District Line. This traffic free cycle route must be safeguarded. Andrew Cook *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Safeguard traffic free cycle route through Goodmayes Park Extension	Noted. See response to R00303/02	
R00304/01	Heather Ward	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? As I live in South Woodford, all the comments are relevant to this area. Paragraph 3.2 includes South Woodford as one of "the Council's five investment and growth areas ... well connected to the borough's public transport network. They also offer a range of investment opportunities through identified developable and deliverable sites with substantial capacity to accommodate to accommodate new homes, jobs and infrastructure." New homes In 3.6.1. it says there will be 651 new homes in the development opportunity site. I fail to see how you are able to fit 651 homes into this space without substantially building upwards. There is no way you would get 651 low rise homes in this small area. (Reference figure 10: map of the investment and growth area in South Woodford.) This would be, in my view, detrimental to the area not an enhancement.</p>		Appendix 1 of the plan, along with the Policies Map, provides a breakdown of what sites new homes are anticipated on, along with an indicative amount for each site	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.

R00304/02	Heather Ward	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Local heritage Also in 3.6.1 it mentions that the Council will seek to enhance local heritage recognising the centre's rich Victorian and Edwardian character.</p> <p>Again, I fail to see how you can build 651 homes (or thereabouts) in this exact same area and not damage the local heritage. It will just look out of place unless you build in the same style and I don't see how this can be done (refer to paragraph above). You also mention in 3.6.5 that you intend to seek a contemporary landmark within the town centre at Station Estate. This is not in keeping with the local heritage and is a contradictory statement to the ones in 3.6.1 and 3.6.8 about preserving and enhancing the heritage and character of South Woodford. Contemporary buildings do not enhance old buildings and areas - they just stand out as something completely different.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00304/03	Heather Ward	33	Para 3.6.8	<p>You do say they should be sympathetically designed. The only example I have of this which I think works is in Repton Park, Woodford where the new buildings have been designed sympathetically to coexist with the older buildings. They are of a similar size and design. We, the residents, have made it clear in a petition with almost 2,000 signatures that we do not want tall buildings. Once again, I refer to 3.6.8 which says that the growth, protection and enhancement of the George Lane and South Woodford conservation areas, and the character of South Woodford as a whole remains a key priority for the Council. This does not match up with what you are proposing.</p>		see response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00304/04	Heather Ward	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.4	<p>Transport Under key infrastructure/projects in 3.6.1 and transport in 3.6.4, improved cycling infrastructure is mentioned but nothing is said about the impact 651 new homes would have either on the increase in vehicles in the area or available parking spaces for these homes.</p> <p>No mention of the impact of more residents using the Central line. Using the tube on a daily basis from South Woodford is becoming a grind - the platform is often so crowded. There has been an increase in 800,000 passenger journeys from South Woodford station in just three years, with no additional improvements made to the service. I fail to see how the transport situation has been addressed in the plan. You mention that you will seek improvements to Charlie Browns roundabout to reduce the level of traffic congestion and improve the pedestrian and cycle network. Experience to date (for example, Bow roundabout) traffic has got worse when the "improvements" happened. Although it is necessary to make the junction safer I don't know what is suggested that will improve congestion apart from diverting traffic to another area. Details are not given in the plan so it is very difficult to comment.</p>		The Council will continue to work with TfL and neighbouring authorities regarding the capacity of the central line. Furthermore, Crossrail will help relieve stress on the Central Line, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting all forms of sustainable travel.	No further change required.

R00304/05	Heather Ward	68	LP17	Schools The impact that 651 new homes would have on the local schools. I live right next to a junior school and the area is already congested with cars at school times (to the point that it is difficult to get out of my road at these times). I fail to see how the local schools (including the one near me) can expand - there is a lack of space for new buildings and this would be detrimental to the children already attending this school, for example.		The Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which includes information on new schools and the school expansion programme	No further change required.
R00304/06	Heather Ward	68	LP17	Other infrastructure The impact on doctor's surgeries and other community services by the addition of 650 new homes. It's hard enough getting a doctor's appointment now (days to wait for this), so this will only get worse. The proposed site is very close to my doctor's surgery so this will only make their services decline even further. Whipps Cross is also completely overcrowded and can't cope now, as shown by the fact that Barts Health is in Special Measures.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00304/07	Heather Ward	32	Para 3.6.5	Local businesses By redeveloping the Station Estate, you will be driving out local businesses not developing them so I do not understand how you can call this an investment and growth area if you are actually making businesses move locations/closing them down to build homes. Once again, this is a contradictory statement. I'm sure many of these businesses would not want to move so I assume they will be forced to in the process. In summary, I fail to see how the Council's proposals are consistent and sustainable, balancing the needs for homes, local businesses and infrastructure, and preserving and enhancing the heritage and character of South Woodford. You mention that South Woodford is one of the more attractive parts of the borough (3.6.2), so please don't ruin it!		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00304/08	Heather Ward	32	Policy LP1D	1. Remove South Woodford as an investment and growth zone - there is not much spare space to develop anyway so it will just become more and more overcrowded.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00304/09	Heather Ward	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Do not force local businesses to move out to make way to residential homes. Homes are important but not at the sacrifice of businesses. Local businesses enhance the local area.	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00304/10	Heather Ward	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Investigate more brown sites to redevelop instead. I haven't seen a reference to this in the plan, so it looks like it hasn't been considered.	comment, no change sought	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.	No further change required.

R00304/11	Heather Ward	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Remove reference to "contemporary landmark within the town centre at Station Estate" within the town centre (3.6.5). South Woodford doesn't need one as it will look out of place and be detrimental to the local heritage. It is a thriving and nice place to live so I fail to understand why the Council thinks it needs investment and growth.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Legally Compliant Comments? It is very difficult for me to comment on whether it is/is not legally compliant as I am not a lawyer. *Legally Compliant Improvements? I do not think this question is suitable or appropriate for this audience. *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Once again, I am not a lawyer so I cannot comment on the legal obligations of the Council and whether they have/have not carried them out correctly.</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00307/01	Shah Afshan	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00307/02	Shah Afshan	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00307/03	Shah Afshan	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00307/04	Shah Afshan	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	

R00307/05	Shah Afshan	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12
R00307/06	Shah Afshan	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00307/07	Shah Afshan	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00307/08	Shah Afshan	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.
R00307/09	Shah Afshan	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.

R00307/10	Shah Afshan	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00308/01	Dave O'Leary	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00308/02	Dave O'Leary	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00308/03	Dave O'Leary	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00308/04	Dave O'Leary	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	

R00308/05	Dave O'Leary	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00308/06	Dave O'Leary	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00308/07	Dave O'Leary	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00308/08	Dave O'Leary	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00308/09	Dave O'Leary	154	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	Section 3.6.5: remove "The Council will seek to create..." onwards	. See response R00108/14.	

R00308/10	Dave O'Leary	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00309/01	Lisa Holt Virgin Atlantic	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? I just feel, why and try and take away green spaces, for kids and sports, to justify building more ugly houses to host more people, the kids will have nowhere to play and go, then the communities will become dysfunctional then you will see more crime etc. Basically not use green belt, look at other areas, I'm sorry we need green spaces it's so important to have somewhere to see and go, and not look at ugly badly built homes! *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>		The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. As set out in Policy LP35, the re-provision of existing pitches and facilities is a pre-requisite of redevelopment of sites where such facilities exist.	No further change required.
R00310/01	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00310/02	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00310/03	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00310/04	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	

R00310/05	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare. Plus the 100 new jobs that are expected to be created over the next 15 years seems a very small number and will be counter-balanced by the 100s of jobs that will be lost by relocating businesses from sites 118 and 192.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00310/06	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'.</p> <p>Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00310/07	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00310/08	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00310/09	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00310/10	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00310/11	Eleanor Glover Chatham House	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00311/01	Alan MacKenzie Ilford County High School Oakfield Trust	36	Para 3.7.5	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Ilford County High School Oakfield Trust, as leaseholder of approximately 17 acres of playing fields at Oakfield Playing Fields and sub leaseholder of approximately another 1.4 acres of land at Oakfield including the Old Parkonians' clubhouse, has as yet received no credible proposals for the relocation of its sporting facilities including its quality football and cricket pitches. *Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? No firm alternative locations provided, no proposals for relocation of clubhouse and facilities, no plan for the size or facilities of an alternative clubhouse provided, no plan for the provisioning of equal or higher quality pitches than already exist. *Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? See prior comments	Oakfield	Noted. The Council will continue to liaise with leaseholders regarding the relocation of existing pitches and facilities.	No further change required.
R00312/01	Robert Chung	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons :- Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	

R00312/02	Robert Chung	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00312/03	Robert Chung	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00312/04	Robert Chung	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however It means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>	
R00312/05	Robert Chung	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00312/06	Robert Chung	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00312/07	Robert Chung	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00312/08	Robert Chung	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00312/09	Robert Chung	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	.. See response R00108/14.	
R00312/10	Robert Chung	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00313/01	kamaljeet jutley	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? all comments focus on South Woodford the plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone, South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes however there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00313/02	kamaljeet jutley	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport : South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4 and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Browns roundabout is a major junction and experiences " higher levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale developments in this area (sites 116 118 and 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00313/03	kamaljeet jutley	154	Site 116	<p>Schools: There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes plus the temporary 150 units at site 116 will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. I personally have already been affected by the growth in South Woodford as when I first purchased my house in 2008 I would have been able then to get a space for my child at my local school Churchfields Infant school. However in recent years no one from my area has been able to secure a place at that school and are being offered spaces as far away as Ray Lodge - being 2 full time working parents this is incredibly stressful for me as I am not sure how I will be able to drop my child from school and pick up from a school so far away.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00313/04	kamaljeet jutley	68	LP17	Other Infrastructure the plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctors surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan outlines no such improvements over the next 15 years. ?		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00313/05	kamaljeet jutley	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00313/06	kamaljeet jutley	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00313/07	kamaljeet jutley	32	Para 3.6.5	3. remove referene to landmark buildings in Station Estate South Woodford *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00314/01	kamaljeet jutley inderjeet bhambhra c/o Agent	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? all comments focus on South Woodford the plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone, South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes however there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		see response to R00108/01	
R00314/02	kamaljeet jutley inderjeet bhambhra c/o Agent	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport : South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4 and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Browns roundabout is a major junction and experiences " higher levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale developments in this area (sites 116 118 and 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00314/03	kamaljeet jutley inderjeet bhambhra c/o Agent	154	Site 116	<p>Schools: There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes plus the temporary 150 units at site 116 will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils.</p> <p>I personally have already been affected by the growth in South Woodford as when I first purchased my house in 2008 I would have been able then to get a space for my child at my local school Churchfields Infant school. However in recent years no one from my area has been able to secure a place at that school and are being offered spaces as far away as Ray Lodge - being 2 full time working parents this is incredibly stressful for me as I am not sure how I will be able to drop my child from school and pick up from a school so far away.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00314/04	kamaljeet jutley inderjeet bhambhra c/o Agent	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	<p>Other Infrastructure the plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctors surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan outlines no such improvements over the next 15 years. ?</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01	
R00315/01	Keith Norman	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.

R00315/02	Keith Norman	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00315/03	Keith Norman	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00315/04	Keith Norman	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00315/05	Keith Norman	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00315/06	Keith Norman	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00315/07	Keith Norman	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00315/08	Keith Norman	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00315/09	Keith Norman	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00315/10	Keith Norman	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate Comments? The Plan proposes to substantially develop housing in South Woodford without addressing the already over-stretched infrastructure. The Authority appears not to have cooperated with our local community on this major issue</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00317/01	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/08	
R00317/02	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00317/03	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00317/04	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00317/05	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00317/06	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00317/07	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00317/08	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00317/09	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00317/10	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00317/11	Shehzad Khan Habib Bank AG Zurich	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00318/01	Julia Morgan	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00318/02	Julia Morgan	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00318/03	Julia Morgan	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00318/04	Julia Morgan	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>
R00318/05	Julia Morgan	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		<p>see response to R00108/11-12</p>

R00318/06	Julia Morgan	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00318/07	Julia Morgan	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00318/08	Julia Morgan	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00318/09	Julia Morgan	32	Para 3.6.5	3. remove reference to landmark buildings in station estate, South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00318/10	Julia Morgan	32	Para 3.6.5	4. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00320/01	Katie Brown	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone. South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/08	

R00320/02	Katie Brown	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00320/03	Katie Brown	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00320/04	Katie Brown	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The site at 192 currently houses a nursery that has received an 'Outstanding' Ofsted rating and is currently full. The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		See response R00108/01	
R00320/05	Katie Brown	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	
R00320/06	Katie Brown	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00320/07	Katie Brown	32	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00320/08	Katie Brown	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00320/09	Katie Brown	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00321/01	Richardson Julie	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All the comments refer to South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford area for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 designates South Woodford as an Investment and growth zone, South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are no improvements to infrastructure. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher populate and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area.	no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00321/02	Richardson Julie	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences 'high levels of traffic at peak times'. How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116, 118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00321/03	Richardson Julie	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes plus the 'temporary' 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they have to have staggered break times to managed the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06
R00321/04	Richardson Julie	155	Site 120	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth.</p> <p>The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 1.15). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.</p>

R00321/05	Richardson Julie	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a large amount of office and business space as freeholders convert too residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well as increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00321/06	Richardson Julie	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph of a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals of these buildings will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will 'seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character'. How do tower blocks fit next to this heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22) However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this for South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00321/07	Richardson Julie	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00321/08	Richardson Julie	32	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	
R00321/09	Richardson Julie	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	

R00321/10	Richardson Julie	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00322/01	Gerben Van Der Knaap	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Large scale developments in South Woodford are proposed without explaining how the required related infrastructural requirements and required services are recommended to be resolved. . The Central Line is already overcrowded and road traffic is a very big problem (already very high pollution levels around North Circular) and there is already a significant shortage of school places. Adding 651 new homes (which would be well over 1,000 additional people if not closer to 2,000) would also result in a very high number of cars that would come into the area (and no parking spaces). When proposals to increase the number of school places in South Woodford keep on getting voted down by the council, it seems difficult to see how having yet many more children coming to live in the area is going to work.</p>		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00322/02	Gerben Van Der Knaap	32	Policy LP1D	<p>Similar story for GP practices, where currently already very difficult to get appointments. Unless something done as part of the developments to increase number of GP options, it would be very difficult. Not sure about requirement for new employment floor space, there is quite a bit of empty space in South Woodford (as it is in various other parts of the borough). Unless all those numbers are based on replacement of previous commercial space to be used for residential purposes. But even then the net growth in number of jobs seems quite optimistic. Number of retail jobs in general is going down.</p>		see response to R00108/01	
R00322/03	Gerben Van Der Knaap	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Smaller scale residential development near South Woodford station, but only in combination with an increase in the number of school places within South Woodford and a provision for an increase in medical services. At some point in the future the only option will be to develop in greenfield sites and it would be a better plan to develop an entirely new area with all relates services while at the same time only develop smaller pockets in areas where already significant infrastructure and services problems.</p>	Find suitable greenfield sites and provide services for them	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Consultation Statement (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.

R00322/04	Gerben Van Der Knaap	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? High number of residential properties developed in South Woodford near an area where already pollution levels that exceed legal guidelines.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvements? Do not develop near areas where already significant breaches of pollution levels.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? A lot of authorities, studies and bodies are listed, but when looking at the results it seems that not a lot of consideration was given to several of them. Listing under 6.9 the Redbridge Playing Pitches Strategy while at the same time deciding to develop the Oakfield site (and making it virtually impossible for some of its current users to relocate and be able to continue to exist) seems odd. The net result of the Local Plan will be a reduction in Playing Pitches and it seems unlikely that the latest plan would not be classified as a deterioration by the bodies listed as supporting the 2013 PPS.</p>	South Woodford, PPS contradicts development of Oakfield	Policy LP24 requires Air quality assessments and mitigation in appropriate cases. Policy LP35 sets out that the relocation of pitches and facilities from Oakfield is a prerequisite of development	No further change required.
R00324/01	Chris Austin, Guide Dogs for the Blind Association c/o Agent	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p>	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00325/01	Mark Furnish, Sport England	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Objection to the loss of Oakfield Playing Field and Ford Sports Ground without equivalent replacement provision being identified.</p>		Potential sites for equivalent replacement provision are identified in the Local Plan. See responses to R00325/07 and R00325/09	See responses to R00325/07 and R00325/09
R00325/02	Mark Furnish, Sport England	36	Para 3.7.5	Both Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground are important for sport in the borough, particularly football and cricket and are identified in the PPS in order to meet current and future demand within the area.		Noted.	No proposed change.
R00325/03	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Whilst it is recognised that policies LP1B and LP1E state replacement pitches will be provided this falls short of the requirements of the NPPF and Sport England's expectations.		Proposals for pitch reprovision are consistent with NPPF requirements	No proposed change.
R00325/04	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Whilst it is agreed that the borough does not have 'surplus' pitch provision, the PPS this identifies current and future deficient in some playing pitches. Rather than address this deficit proposed allocation of Oakfield and Ford Sports ground will increase provision.		The PPS analysed the current and future supply and demand. The PPS has looked at the impact of the potential loss of Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground on supply and demand, and provides different scenarios for the replacement of these facilities, taking into consideration the quality and accessibility of the existing facilities and the quality and extent of facilities that would be required to replace them.	No proposed change.
R00325/05	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Draft Local Plan policies only require replacement to be within a suitable alternative location with no requirement replacement for this replacement to be equivalent or better.		Agree – Council to include the need for replacement to be of equivalent or better, in accordance with the NPPF.	No proposed change.
R00325/06	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Replacement of existing facilities fails to reflect the role that both Oakfield and Fords have in providing for current and future demand.		Value of existing pitches and facilities is recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision	No proposed change

R00325/07	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E, and LP35	The policies specify replacement playing pitches, not playing field which conflicts with the NPPF.		Policy wording amended for consistency with NPPF terminology	Amend policy LP35 part (g) as follows: <u>In accordance with the NPPF, the loss of playing fields resulting from proposed development at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground will be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location within the borough before the sites are redeveloped. Supporting facilities will also be re-provided. Ensuring the reprovision of playing pitches and facilities at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground to a suitable alternative location within the borough before the sites are redeveloped.</u> Amend policy LP1B – Ford Sport Ground, second bullet point as follows: <u>Reprovision of existing playing pitches In accordance with the NPPF, the loss of playing fields resulting from proposed development will be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. Supporting facilities will also be re-provided.</u> Amend policy LP1E – Oakfield, seventh bullet point as follows: <u>Reprovision of existing playing pitches In accordance with the NPPF, the loss of playing fields resulting from proposed development will be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. Supporting facilities will also be re-provided.</u>
R00325/08	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Policies LB1B and LP1E on require the reprovision of playing pitches and not supporting facilities.		Noted - see response to R00325/07	No proposed change.
R00325/09	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Clarification on where alternative sites would be provided. These sites should be protected to ensure they are not lost to other development. The draft Local Plan fails to do this.	Agree – The Council will include a 'safeguarding' designation on the proposals map to ensure identified alternative sites are not redeveloped for alternative uses.	Alternative sports sites should be clearly set out and designated/safeguarding in the Local Plan and Proposal Map	Policy map updated to show safeguarding designations
R00325/10	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	In is not clear if proposed alternative sites are deliverable. The draft Local Plan should be informed by a robust feasibility study to demonstrate this.		The Council has commissioned a detailed feasibility studies to demonstrate it is feasible that the sites can provide equivalent or better provision could be provided at alternative sites in the borough.	No proposed change
R00325/11	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Sport England does not consider the Alternative Playing Pitch Site Assessment to be the feasibility study advised in the PPS and is not a robust assessment. A robust fully collaborative feasibility study that builds on the PPS to establish if there is a replacement playing field of equivalent quantity, quality and accessibility as those proposed to be lost. The site must be deliverable prior to the site being lost.	A robust fully collaborative feasibility study that builds on the PPS to establish if there is a replacement playing field of equivalent quantity, quality and accessibility as those proposed to be lost.	Noted. See response to R00325/10.	No proposed change
R00325/12	Mark Furnish, Sport England	68	Policy LP17	Objection to development proposals that propose encroachment onto a school playing field.		Noted	No proposed change
R00325/13	Mark Furnish, Sport England	70	Para 3.24.10	Paragraph 3.24.10 broadly aligns with Sport England policy to Protect, Enhance and Provide.		Noted	No proposed change
R00325/14	Mark Furnish, Sport England	86	Policy LP22	Support for encouragement of walking and cycling through Green Travel Plans and Redbridge Walking Strategy Support for the principles of active design		Support noted	No proposed change.
R00325/15	Mark Furnish, Sport England	93	Policy LP24	In relation to LP24 there is concern that it may restrict floodlighting which would limit the use of AGP, MUGA and grass pitches during peak hours (evenings), limiting hours of use. Policy should be reworded in line with Sport England guidance.	Reword policy LP24 in line with Sport England's lighting guidance.	Policy LP24 states floodlights will be resisted where they unacceptably impact on amenity.	Insert at end of paragraph 4.17.1 " <u>Proposals for floodlighting should consider Sport England's lighting guidance</u> "
R00325/16	Mark Furnish, Sport England	26	Policies LP1B, LP1E	Support for policies LP34 and LP35 to protect green belt and MOL and open space and provision to improve access to outdoor sport and recreation. However, alterations to the green belt should not result in restricting the ability of these area accommodating playing field and or pitches and other sports facilities that are required to meet current and future demand.		Noted	No proposed change.

R00325/17	Mark Furnish, Sport England	126	Para 6.2.5	Support for the use of Community Use Agreements to secure the wider use of facilities at schools and other institutions. This should be informed by local need. *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know		Support noted.	No proposed change
R00326/01	Ellen Davis	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? This is an objection to the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030. The plan grossly underestimates the resources required to support additional homes in South Woodford, and is at high risk of destroying a unique and valuable character that is beneficial to Redbridge. While I do believe my area of South Woodford (SW) can theoretically support 650 new homes and more occupants, the plan does not follow on the expanding the supporting infrastructure with full capacity in infrastructure such as schools, transport in both tube and road networks, and oversubscribed local NHS services.	no change sought	see response to R00108/01	No proposed change.
R00326/02	Ellen Davis	154	Sites 110, 111, 113, 115, 118, 186	Opportunity areas highlighted on the South Woodford map include a nursery (118), and most others (186, 110, 111, 113, 115) are single housing plots on suburban streets that would be harm SW local character.	no change sought	LPD1 and LP33 outline the Councils commitment to preserve and enhance the heritage and character of South Woodford. Due to its heritage assets, less development is planned in the South Woodford growth and investment area compared to others. In addition, LP26 also sets criteria for achieving high quality design.	No propose change.
R00326/03	Ellen Davis	36	LP1D	The absence of a new school in the South Woodford Investment and Growth area completely ignores the full capacity of current schools, and puts tension of other parts of the borough that children have to travel to. Traffic and pollution and increased in the school run times. Tall buildings has been proved to be detriment to the urban environment since modernist architecture. It segregates and creates an isolating effect from the street. This will be devastating to the SW character, and should be exempt from tall buildings policy stated on p.102 1st full paragraph.	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/17	
R00326/04	Ellen Davis	100	Para 5.1.9	On p.100 paragraph 5.1.9, listing the Characterisation Study should identify South Woodford as a Suburban Terrace Typologies. This area is a low rise, medium density with characters and the study do its utmost to recognise this.	Paragraph 5.1.9 should identify South Woodford as a Suburban Terrace Typology	South Woodford is characterised in the Redbridge Characterisation Study (2014) as predominatly consisting of Suburban with some Grand Suburban typologies. Whilst there are some Suburban Terraces these are in a small minority, and the difference between these typologies is that Suburban and Grand Suburban are generally an older, owner occupied typology, whereas Suburban Terraces tend to be post-war public sector housing. Hainault has the largest area of Suburban Terrace housing in the borough.	No further change required.

R00326/05	Ellen Davis	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness Improvements? Indicate space for at least one school, both in Primary and Comprehensive levels in the local South Woodford area. The best place would be in the 117 opportunity area, probably in a mixed use development. This development should also be used to build elderly assisted homes, where a small community close to amenity can improve their quality of life. Reduce traffic pollution by more than half, especially at Charlie Browns Roundabout, and produce a detailed plan of flood management in the development of the 'temporary' housing. Add a separate, protected cycle lanes that link up to the Q6 Quietway at Stratford, providing a safe route of healthy commuting, passing through Hermon Hill to Charlie Browns Roundabout and beyond, and the South Woodford High road. Clearly state that South Woodford will not be a tall building Zone, and development will have a limit of 4/5 storeys. Development of 30% council homes, 30% affordable homes that directly target reducing overcrowding in Redbridge, and 40% of open market development.</p>	South Woodford, add a protected cycleway from Q6 Quietway at Stratford to Charlie Brown's, reduce traffic pollution at Charlie Brown's	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) sets out the Councils approach to provided for new school places; through new schools and expansions to existing. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. Policy L22 promotes sustainable transport. Planning applications in Flood Zones will be required to submit a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and appropriate mitigation as set out in Policy LP21. Also see response to R00108/15 and R00108/17	
R00326/06	Ellen Davis	81	LP21	<p>*Legally Compliant? No *Legally Compliant Comments? Trying to build on land with a high flood risk, which can legally only be used for water based activities. Does not promise enough to reduce Charlie Browns Roundabout to a legally acceptable level of pollution. The current level monitored in 33.7 ug/m3 out of 8.27 of black carbon density. *Legally Compliant Improvements? Raise the housing above the flood risk level. Reduce traffic flow on Hermon Hill, and create underpass on Charlie Browns Roundabout. Extend the Low emission Zone to the CB Roundabout.</p>	Extend LEZ to Charlie Brown's	The Plan is supported by a Flood Risk Sequential Test (LBR 2.60) and any proposals in areas of known flood risk will require a Site Specific Flood Risk assessment and to provide appropriate mitigation as set out in Policy LP21. The extent of the low emission zone falls beyond the remit of this Local Plan. See response to R00104/02 regarding Charlie Brown's roundabout.	No chabge required.
R00326/07	Ellen Davis	-	-	<p>*Duty to Cooperate? No *Duty to Cooperate Comments? Consultations did not source feedback from the local community. The timeline was insulting to people with children who did not have time to be fully informed over he school holidays. Every household should have received information DIRECTLY, not through the advertisement of local community. The council should have advertised it more than a simple banner on the website. ITS IS INSULTING AND DISGUSTING HOW RESIDENTS HAVE BEEN TREATED.</p> <p>Areas which are represented by Conservative Councillors have less infrastructure pledged in the plan than Labour Concillors, and many of the plans statements are not viable due to council planning cuts. This plan has been set up to be exploited as soon as it becomes effective.</p>	no change sought	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.

R00327/01	Kara Goodrich	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford.</p> <p>The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00327/02	Kara Goodrich	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00327/03	Kara Goodrich	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00327/04	Kara Goodrich	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00327/05	Kara Goodrich	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00327/06	Kara Goodrich	32	Para 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00327/07	Kara Goodrich	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See responsse R00108/01.	
R00327/08	Kara Goodrich	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00327/09	Kara Goodrich	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00327/10	Kara Goodrich	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00329/01	Louise Burgess	21	Para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.		See reponse R108/01	

R00329/02	Louise Burgess	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00329/03	Louise Burgess	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00329/04	Louise Burgess	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		See response R108/01	
R00329/05	Louise Burgess	33	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	

R00329/06	Louise Burgess	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00329/07	Louise Burgess	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00329/08	Louise Burgess	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00329/09	Louise Burgess	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00329/10	Louise Burgess	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation such as those for the elderly or physically disabled. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00331/01	Joy Debenhams-Burton	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? No infrastructure in place to cope with density of housing proposed will impact very unfavourably on health education & local amenities for the very stretched services available to current residents & families especially in South Woodford *Soundness Improvements? Suggested high rise developments already proven to be detrimental to established communities & building on green belt land which takes away community sport leisure & play areas scandalous *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No	South Woodford	. The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) The Local Plan does not propose the development of tall buildings in South Woodford, and proposes to withdraw the existing tall buildings designations in the area.	No further change required.
R00332/01	Diana Turpin	-	-	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments: The	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.

R00333/01	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? My comments refer to South Woodford. In my opinion, the plan, insofar as it relates to the South Woodford area, is ineffective as it is lacking a balance of population against infrastructure at the grass roots level. It is ludicrous to expand the population in pockets that are ill equipped to deal with a larger population. Making provision at borough level is not in keeping with a greener environment and detracts from residents' quality of life. Detailed reasons are listed below.</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00333/02	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	86	LP22	<p>INFRASTRUCTURE & TRANSPORTATION I am concerned that the proposed large increase in the number of residents will put even more pressure on local infrastructure and transportation – already at breaking point. The South Woodford underground station is heavily overused but particularly in rush hour – it is only a matter of time before a serious incident occurs due to overcrowding. In your document you accept that the Central Line cannot cope with the current footfall. So it begs the question, how will it cope with the proposed increase in passengers? Charlie Brown's roundabout appears to be a popular location (sites 116 and 118-119) for these proposed large scale developments. The lower part of Hermon Hill/Chigwell Road is often backed up from the Charlie Browns' almost to the junction with George Lane most mornings and evenings. Is the assumption that the new residents will only use public transport (in which case my previous paragraph is even more relevant)? I note the absence of any corresponding road improvements/traffic management scheme.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00333/03	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	93	LP24	<p>This location is also one of the most polluted areas in London; a situation which will only be exacerbated by additional car usage and yet, the Council is proposed to house people in this area! Doctors surgeries and Dentists are also under enormous ever increasing pressure. Where are the associated proposals for new surgeries? There is a distinct lack of leisure services in South Woodford and personally, I find I have to travel in my car to use leisure services – for example the swimming pool in Chingford and badminton courts at Wanstead Leisure Centre.</p>	no change sought	Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. Also see responses to R00108/01 and R00108/09	
R00333/04	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	68	LP17	<p>I note the absence of proposals for new school builds in South Woodford – again it begs the question: Where will the new resident children attend school? Whilst expansion has and is taking place, I do not believe it takes account of the proposed increase in residents. 651 new homes, even with an extremely conservative estimate of 1 child per home, would require 651 available school places and this assumes that the current demand stays constant!</p>	no change sought	see response to R00108/01	

R00333/05	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Disregard the business sites in South Woodford that have been identified for conversion to residential.	no change sought	Several existing employment areas are protected on the basis of the Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33), and new fit for purpose business space will be sought as part of mixed use developments	No further change required.
R00333/06	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	32	Para 3.6.5	2. Discard the proposal for landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford.	South Woodford	. See response R00108/14.	
R00333/07	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	68	LP17	3. Include within the plan, proposals for an improvement in infrastructure that corresponds to the proposed increase in residents.	Include infrastructure improvements in accordance with proposed increase in population	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R00333/08	Pearl Arbenser-Simmonds	-	-	*Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	no change sought	Noted.	No further change required.
R00334/01	Jessica Watts, Swan Housing Association	-	Policies LP1, LP2, LP26, LP27, LP34	*Soundness? Yes *Soundness Comments? Swan Housing Association supports the Pre-submission draft proposed by London Borough of Redbridge, and the intention to work proactively with land owners and developers to facilitate and promote housing development (LP2). Positively prepared - Swan is pleased to see the Council taking a proactive and pragmatic approach to the provision of housing over the next fifteen years. Care has been taken to focus development and growth in town centres and along infrastructure corridors (LP1), particularly taking on board the introduction of Crossrail and the positive economic effect it will have. The Council's attitude to a Green Belt review (LP34), given that it has been identified that brownfield sites cannot wholly deliver the level of housing required, is considered a fair approach and we would agree with the pragmatism of protecting existing urban boundaries whilst better utilising those sites closer to infrastructure. Swan is also supportive of the Council's focus on design quality (LP26) and the need for design to complement and be sensitive to the existing character of areas, whilst recognising the improved density achieved by tall buildings where deemed appropriate (LP27).	no change sought	Support welcomed	No further change required.
R00334/02	Jessica Watts, Swan Housing Association	40	Policy LP3	Justified - Swan is satisfied with the robustness of evidence presented, and the conclusions drawn by the Council that have fed its policies. Effective - Swan appreciates the Council promoting an affordable housing target of 30% (LP3) which acknowledges the viability difficulties that are often present in developments should this target be increased.	comment, no change sought	Support noted	No further change required.

R00334/03	Jessica Watts, Swan Housing Association	46	Policy LP5	<p>We note that the affordable split separates affordable rent and intermediate housing - can the Council clarify that intermediate refers only Shared Ownership (or otherwise specify) and clarify its intentions for its social rent levels - will there be a rent review of Framework Rents? What is the Council's stance on London Living Rent? Swan is similarly in agreement with the proposed approach to dwelling mix (LP5). Swan is supportive of the Housing Zone status of Ilford Town Centre and the drive to work with development partners to bring forward housing in this and other areas.</p>	clarify that intermediate refers to Shared Ownership; will there be a Framework Rents review?	A definition of intermediate housing is provided within the Appendix 9 definition of affordable housing. Any review of rent levels falls beyond the remit of the Local Plan. London Living Rent is a new product that will form part of the package of affordable housing products. Support for Housing Zone status noted.	No further change required.
R00334/04	Jessica Watts, Swan Housing Association	26	Policy LP1B	<p>What is the Council's intention regarding the review / subsequent release of other allocated sites mentioned in the Local Plan, such as the three large housing-led areas identified (Ford Sports Ground, King George & Goodmayes Hospitals, and land at Billet Road - LP1B), and other smaller development sites? Consistent with national planning policy - Will the Mayor of London's recent London Plan target of 35%+ affordable housing affect the Council's affordable housing policy? Can the Council also clarify its stance on London Living Rent, and how this might fit within its policy?</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes *Legally Compliant Comments? We have no concerns with the legality of the Local Plan. *Duty to Cooperate? Yes *Duty to Cooperate Comments? We have no concerns with the compliance with the Council's Duty to Cooperate.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R01213/07 regarding affordable housing targets. London Living Rent is a new product that will form part of the package of affordable housing products.	
R00335/01	DAVID LEE	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? These comments relate specifically to South Woodford. Reasons for the plan being unsound and ineffective from a local perspective include FAILURE TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT MATERIAL FACTORS AND EVIDENCE INFRASTRUCTURE The main reason that local residents remain implacably opposed to the tower block is not some romantic attachment to a Victorian / Edwardian idyll. It is because this plan, like all its predecessors, is unable to offer any assurance on infrastructure issues.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00335/02	DAVID LEE	86	LP22	<p>HIGHWAYS This is most obviously the case on the issue of highways. The intensity of the proposed development would inevitably generate significant amounts of additional road traffic. If the amount of parking for the development was to be planned in line with the nearby recent "Scenix" development on Chigwell Road, a substantial percentage of the available acre would have to be given over to parking space. The reality is that the local road system is often close to overload already at present – especially on the part of George Lane between the roundabout and the station. The relatively light amount of traffic that enters the Station Estate via the junction at the bottom of the viaduct also already causes regular safety issues, especially for pedestrians but also for car users. The prospect of this volume being substantially increased is very hard to comprehend. The plans give no serious indication that there is any proper understanding of the meltdown that would be visited on the local highway infrastructure, let alone any adequate mitigation in hand. Alongside the inevitable knock on impact on the High Road, Chigwell Road, Charlie Brown's and South Woodford station, there would be a strong case for rejecting the plan on the basis of the highways impact alone.</p>	no change sought	<p>The Plan is supported by a high level transport assessment of the impact of proposed levels of growth, and Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. See also responses to R00108/02-03.</p>
R00335/03	DAVID LEE	68	LP17	<p>SCHOOLS These proposals for 650+ new homes, alongside 150 more units nearby on Chigwell Road, will have a major impact on local schools. Again, local people have been offered absolutely no assurance that there will be any investment in local schools to cope with the extra numbers. It is well understood that the council cannot simply turn a tap on to deal with this, but this situation helps put the bigger picture in sharper relief. There is no basis for any optimism in the short and medium term that central government will free up any significant funds for investment in public service infrastructure of any sort in Redbridge. No one can be in any doubt about the extent to which many parts of this infrastructure is at breaking point already, which makes it all the more puzzling why such an intensive development is being promoted.</p>	no change sought	<p>Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail. Also see response to R00108/01</p>

R00335/04	DAVID LEE	68	LP17	<p>HEALTH The impact of the proposed development on its residents is described below (night tube). If there is one public service that is more over stretched than our schools, it is our NHS. The nearest GP surgery, Southdene, has seen a 38% increase in its patient numbers in the last 4 years alone. Our nearest hospital, Whipps Cross, is already judged by the regulator to be unsafe, and its performance on measures such as Accident and Emergency waits is among the poorest in the country. The public sector in general, and the council in particular, will be expected to pick up the tab for the extra demand on local infrastructure. Newcomers will be left to their own sleep deprived devices to compete with the existing community for road space, school space, healthcare and parking space. Why knowingly create such a negative and avoidable scenario?</p>	no change sought	<p>Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.</p>	No further change required.
R00335/05	DAVID LEE	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>PRECEDENT It is disappointing that officers have maintained their determination to impose a tower block. The decision to set aside the reasoned arguments of local residents over the years, including the recent ~2000 strong petition, is disappointing. The decision to ignore the clear decisions of successive planning committees, and indeed the planning inspector, based on unimpeachable and still extant rationale against a tower block and overly intensive development of the Station Estate is also disappointing.</p>	no change sought	<p>See response R00108/14 and R00108/17</p>	
R00335/06	DAVID LEE	93	LP24	<p>NIGHT TUBE Above all, the decision to ignore the recent independent evidence on the impact of the night tube is most troubling. The proposed development would undeniably be cheek by jowl with the Central Line, which already runs through the night at weekends, and soon may do so seven days a week. Independent, published risk assessment evidence, commissioned by TfL, includes explicit warnings that the service would mean an increase in overnight disturbance that could result in a "reduction in quality of life of residents through disturbed sleep" and even "threats of suicide". It identified a four in five risk that residents who live close to and above tracks would be disturbed at night by noise and vibration. The document also found a three in five chance that those near stations would also face disruption from passenger announcements throughout the night.</p>	no change sought	<p>Policy LP24 sets out the Councils approach to pollution, including matters such as noise and light pollution. TfL is aware of locations on the network where noise is an issue and undertakes work such as rail grinding to alleviate this.</p>	No further change required.

R00335/07	DAVID LEE	33	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.8	<p>INCONSISTENCY It is inconsistent to claim on the one hand that the plan will “enhance local heritage recognising rich Victorian and Edwardian character” (para 3.6.1) and then propose a tower block. Equally, para 3.6.8 commendably claims that new developments will ‘respect established residential characteristics.’ However this also cannot be squared with the tower block plan. Para 1.17.8 rightly identifies the issue of poor office space hindering development, but fails to offer any solution. In fact, officers failed to act on local objections when the extensive office space in KGM house was put up for conversion, refusing point blank to allow these concerns to be put before members. In fact the plan effectively earmarks all of the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This would be unjustifiable even if the government was not in the process of making local government finance overwhelmingly dependent on business rates. By going ahead with these plans, there is a deliberate restriction on the future income viability of Redbridge.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17. Conversion of KGM offices to residential use did not need planning permission, as a result of central government changes to the Uses Class Order.	
R00335/08	DAVID LEE	32	Policy LP1D	<p>CONCLUSION Redbridge planning officers have a long track record of seeking to impose a tower block on South Woodford. It has taken residents, members and the planning inspector to mitigate this before now. Changing policies under cover of darkness since the last proposal was rejected does not change the objective realities. The case for a tower block is in fact weaker now than it has been in the past, especially in view of (a) the new local government finance regime, which shifts the incentives on local authorities towards developing local business and away from a narrow residential development agenda (b) the advent of the night tube in South Woodford, and the strong evidence of the potential negative impact on people living very close to night tube lines (c) reduced population projections as a result of UK withdrawal from the EU (d) the realities of public finance in the short and medium term which leave little room for doubt that the prospect of major infrastructure investment is highly unlikely. In the absence of such infrastructure investment the viability and sustainability of the intensity proposed by the current plans carries no credibility with local residents. This is not a choice between unstoppable development and nimby locals. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is a strong local consensus in favour of a viable, sustainable, sensible, realistic, proportionate development of the Station Estate. Alongside that, there is an overwhelming local consensus against a tower block.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00108/14 and R00108/17	

R00335/09	DAVID LEE	93	LP24	Sources GP data 2012 https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/ann-b-reg.xlsx 2016 http://content.digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB21150/cc-g-reg-patients.csv "Noise from Night Tube 'could drive residents to threaten suicide', TfL report warns" – Evening Standard 25 February 2016 http://www.standard.co.uk/news/transport/noise-from-night-tube-could-drive-residents-to-threaten-suicide-tfl-report-warns-a3188671.html Whipps Cross https://www.cqc.org.uk/location/R1HKKH	no change sought	Noted	No further change required.
R00335/10	DAVID LEE	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. The designation of South Woodford as an 'investment and growth zone' should be removed	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00335/11	DAVID LEE	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. The plan should seek to build on and enhance the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford, instead of enticing a land grab for residential development. Business sites earmarked for development - site numbers 116,117, 118 and 120 - should be removed from this classification	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00335/12	DAVID LEE	32	Para 3.6.5	3. The reference to "landmark buildings" in Station Estate, South Woodford should be deleted	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00335/13	DAVID LEE	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Instead, the focus should be on a genuinely sustainable development of the site that is based on building a consensus with the local community. Such a development must take on board the realities of local infrastructure limitation of this bounded one acre site, considering a genuinely mixed and imaginative set of options potentially including retail, care and proportionate residential development. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/14	

R00336/01	Lauren Miller, London Borough of Havering	37	Policy LP2, 3.8.3	<p>The minimum housing delivery target of 16,845 new homes is in line with the minimum target set out for Redbridge in the London Plan. This falls below the objectively assessed need identified in the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment of 31,977 new homes over the plan period.</p> <p>The London Plan states that the annual average housing supply monitoring targets are a minimum target for each borough. In order to meet local need and contribute to meeting strategic need each London borough is expected to seek to exceed this target through the measures set out in London Plan Policy 3.3E, paragraphs 3.19 and 3.19i of the Plan and Section 1 of the Housing SPG. The London Plan makes clear that London should be treated as a single housing market and therefore any unmet housing need will be accommodated within London as a whole.</p> <p>We can confirm that in line with Redbridge's Duty-to-Cooperate Statement that we worked collaboratively with Redbridge and Barking and Dagenham on the Outer North East London SHMA. Havering have not yet formally published this document as we are undertaking further work to understand the implications of updated populations projections that have since been published. The level of engagement set out in Appendix 1 of the Statement does not fully reflect Havering's Duty to Co-operate records, in particular, we have no record of being asked if we can accommodate Redbridge's unmet need. However, we do not feel that this would be appropriate within the London context and in light of the London Plan and therefore do not feel that this has an impact on whether Redbridge has met its Duty.</p>	no change sought	<p>The Council has worked collaboratively with Havering and Barking & Dagenham on the production of the Outer North East London SHMA. In relation to housing need, Havering are able to rely upon strategic sites within the borough to meet both their London Plan requirement and housing need within their boundary derived from the Outer North East London SHMA. However, Redbridge is unable to meet in full their locally derived objectively assessed need for housing, but is able to meet and exceed the minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. The GLA have clarified this issue from a London single housing market area. The Council's approach taken in the draft Redbridge Local Plan to meeting housing need, by seeking to meet the London Plan minimum target, whilst seeking to close the gap on objectively assessed need has been agreed by the GLA and boroughs in the sub-region.</p> <p>Detail in relation to engagement with Havering is set out in the Council's Duty to Cooperate Statement (2017).</p>	No further change required.
R00336/02	Lauren Miller, London Borough of Havering	122	6.1.9	<p>With regards to the proposed release of Green Belt as set out in paragraph 6.1.9 of the Local Plan we note that no release is proposed directly adjacent to boundary with Havering and this is welcomed. It is for Redbridge to justify the release of Green Belt in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and London Plan.</p>	No change sought.	Noted.	No further change required.
R00337/01	Wendy Walsh	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are 0 IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>		See response R00108/01	

R00337/02	Wendy Walsh	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00337/03	Wendy Walsh	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>		See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00337/04	Wendy Walsh	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>		See response R00108/01	
R00337/05	Wendy Walsh	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>		see response to R00108/11-12	

R00337/06	Wendy Walsh	32	Paras 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford. Copy B - for online submission</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00337/07	Wendy Walsh	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00337/08	Wendy Walsh	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00337/09	Wendy Walsh	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00337/10	Wendy Walsh	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00340/01	Deanna Sidley	36	Para 3.7.5	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Oakfield Playing Fields is designated part of the green belt to prevent urban sprawl. The playing fields are an extremely valuable asset to the local community and beyond. Many young sportsmen and women rely on this precious open space to develop their sporting skills. There is one absolute, if the local planning authority is allowed to destroy these pristine playing fields then it will be destroyed for ever and countless generations will have lost their opportunity to play sport, either amateurly, professionally or just for fun. It will be total destruction and will further exacerbate the serious pollution problems we already suffer in the surrounding area, coupled with the added problems of the massive increase in the volume of traffic.</p>	comment, no change sought	The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) has found that Oakfield does not meet NPPF Green Belt tests and should therefore be removed from its Green Belt designation. Sports facilities are a green belt compatible use, and can therefore be relocated to an alternative Green Belt site.	No further change required.
R00340/02	Deanna Sidley	86	LP22	<p>Already Fencepiece Road, Forest Road and New North Road are impossible to travel on between 7.30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 4.30 p.m. because of the number of schools within the vicinity. There is also the question of quality of life for residents in the surrounding area. It will certainly deteriorate; there is the New North Square residential and office/shop development on the old Kelvin Hughes site on the New North Road; behind the houses on the New North Road, near the Fencepiece Road junction there is a small development of new houses; the old reservoir at the top end of New North Road has been developed in to a new housing estate.</p> <p>Quality of life will be compromised if this disastrous plan is allowed to go ahead. This plan is not justifiable for the reasons stated above.</p>		All major development is subject to a transport assessment and travel plan (see Policy LP22) to ensure that impacts on transport networks are calculated and can be mitigated appropriately, as well as a Travel Plan that demonstrates the measures developers have taken to ensure their development is less reliant on private car use and promotes sustainable modes.	No further change required.
R00340/03	Deanna Sidley	-	-	<p>*Soundness Improvements? There is no modification at all to be made. The plan will not and cannot be changed in order to make it sound. It must not happen. Redbridge do not have a good history of protecting open spaces and the previous local development framework document was changed by the Inspector in order to protect all the green open space in Redbridge as there was sufficient brownfields to be built on, see above. Has Redbridge Council carried out an up to date open spaces assessment and if not why not?</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know I am not legally trained so would be unable to make a legal judgment. A legal expert would have to be consulted.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	Previous LDF modified to protect green space, open space assessment?	The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base that justifies the approach taken, in accordance with NPPF requirements. This includes an up to date Open Space Assessment.	No further change required.

R00341/01	linda alefounder	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/08	
R00341/02	linda alefounder	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00341/03	linda alefounder	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00341/04	linda alefounder	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years?</p> <p>The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00341/05	linda alefounder	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00341/06	linda alefounder	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116;120 chigwell road & rose avenue park the map for proposed development of the business area includes rose avenue park. this is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00341/07	linda alefounder	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01,	
R00341/08	linda alefounder	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00341/09	linda alefounder	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00341/10	linda alefounder	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00341/11	linda alefounder	154	site 116	<p>5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	

R00343/01	Sarah Pounds	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments?</p> <p>The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/08	
R00343/02	Sarah Pounds	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00343/03	Sarah Pounds	154	Site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00343/04	Sarah Pounds	155	Site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00343/05	Sarah Pounds	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00343/06	Sarah Pounds	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5, 3.6.8	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00343/07	Sarah Pounds	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00343/08	Sarah Pounds	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00343/09	Sarah Pounds	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00343/10	Sarah Pounds	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00343/11	Sarah Pounds	154	site 116	Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response to R00108/18.	

R00344/01	Ian Price	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? As a South Woodford Resident for the last 17 years I am commenting on this area in particular. Even though the area of South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 new homes I can find no corresponding improvements to the area's infrastructure to allow such an increase to be manageable without severe detriment to both the existing and proposed new future residents quality of life.</p>	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00344/02	Ian Price	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7, Site 116	<p>Transport The Central Line at South Woodford is already very overcrowded and is struggling to cope with current demands (paragraph 1.21.4) and I see no suggestions as how this situation can be improved by the Plan, only made worse. The Epping branch of the Central Line is far busier than the Hainault branch and with the Epping Forest District proposed Local Plan also adding pressure to this route I would suggest areas along the Hainault branch may have a better chance of coping with the increased footfall that more housing would bring. Regarding road transport, I believe that Charlie Browns roundabout is a dangerously polluted part of the Borough and so I am surprised that the council are considering basing large scale developments around this area (site no 116,118 & 119), especially as Paragraph 3.6.7 states this roundabout experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". This can only have an even more detrimental effect on the air quality and associated health issues for those current and future residents of South Woodford. Most surprising is the proposed 150 Temporary units (116) at 120 Chigwell Road. Granted, some desperate people will have a short term place to stay but at what cost to their and their children's long term health? The Plan 3.6.7 also states "The Council will seek to reduce the level of traffic congestion" at Charlie Browns. The Council may "seek" to reduce the congestion but the reality is that when building so many new houses next to this roundabout it will only increase the congestion / pollution here, surely that is obvious to anybody.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00104/02-03. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	
R00344/03	Ian Price	154	Site 116	<p>Schools I see no proposals in the Plan for new schools in South Woodford to cope with the extra demand that 650 new homes plus 150 temporary homes (120 Chigwell Road) will surely bring. The increase to Woodbridge & Nightingale Primary school capacity is only in response to current demands, not to the future Local Plan proposals. Woodbridge pupils already have no green spaces/playing fields on the current site and the Council cannot seriously expect the school to take more pupils on this severely congested site. If any new schools that may subsequently be proposed are "out of area" then this would only add to the severe congestion and pollution suffered in the area, as people drive all around the Borough on the daily school run.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00344/04	Ian Price	155	Site 122	General Infrastructure concerns The Plan as I see it does not provide any improvements to infrastructure for areas such as doctors surgeries and hospital provision, nor does it provide additional leisure/community services. I see in the plan the only potential leisure facility will be the small car park (site 122), therefore I look forward to see what is proposed for this valuable and limited resource. I believe that without improving these facilities/services people will be forced to travel to find them in other parts of Redbridge or other neighbouring Boroughs. This once again leads us back to an increase in congestion and pollution which is not good news for either existing or future South Woodford residents.	no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00344/05	Ian Price	32	para 3.6.5	Business It seems that many of the proposed residential development sites will be to the detriment of current local business premises. Current successful local businesses will be forced to relocate taking valuable employment away from South Woodford. This will add to the pressure on transport including increased traffic as local people have to travel further distances to their place of work. This seems contradictory to the statement in 3.6.5 "opportunities to accommodate new homes and jobs".	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/11	
R00344/06	Ian Price	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Landmark building on Station Estate / Tall Buildings Also in 3.6.5 the Plan refers to a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate. This seems in conflict with 3.6.8 which states "respect established residential characteristics". This is a controversial proposal as there was a strongly supported petition from local residents voicing their opposition to any tall buildings in South Woodford. Another conflicting statement comes in 3.6.1 that states the Council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". I fail to see how modern style tower blocks will enrich the character of this area.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/14 and R00108/17.	
R00344/07	Ian Price	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone, as the proposed Plan does not provide the necessary infrastructure to support the level of growth described.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00344/08	Ian Price	154	Sites 116, 118, 119	Remove designated development areas around Charlie Browns roundabout (116,118,119), so as to prevent an unacceptable increase in congestion and pollution in this area in particular, and South Woodford in general. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/11.	

R00344/09	Ian Price	154	site 117	Remove reference to landmark buildings at Station Estate (site 117), South Woodford. Instead of a tower at the Station Estate low rise buildings would be much more in keeping with the surrounding area as well as create a much needed community space/facility as there is scant provision for this in the Plan, bar the previously mentioned small car park (site 122).	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/14	
R00345/01	Charmian Edelman	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00345/02	Charmian Edelman	33	para 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00345/03	Charmian Edelman	149	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00345/04	Charmian Edelman	150	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00345/05	Charmian Edelman	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day. Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years.</p> <p>Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00345/06	Charmian Edelman	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character".</p> <p>How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comments, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17 and R00108/18	
R00345/07	Charmian Edelman	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00345/08	Charmian Edelman	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00345/09	Charmian Edelman	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00345/10	Charmian Edelman	32	Para 3.6.5	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00345/11	Charmian Edelman	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00347/01	ELEANOR JENKINS	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00347/02	ELEANOR JENKINS	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.	comments, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00347/03	ELEANOR JENKINS	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00347/04	ELEANOR JENKINS	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00347/05	ELEANOR JENKINS	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00347/06	ELEANOR JENKINS	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comments, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00347/07	ELEANOR JENKINS	12	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00347/08	ELEANOR JENKINS	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00347/09	ELEANOR JENKINS	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00347/10	ELEANOR JENKINS	44	Para 3.10.1	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00350/01	Zoe Oldfield	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00350/02	Zoe Oldfield	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00350/03	Zoe Oldfield	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06
R00350/04	Zoe Oldfield	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01

R00350/05	Zoe Oldfield	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00350/06	Zoe Oldfield	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford?</p> <p>As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00350/07	Zoe Oldfield	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00350/08	Zoe Oldfield	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00350/09	Zoe Oldfield	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	

R00350/10	Zoe Oldfield	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00351/01	ceri alefounder	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00351/02	ceri alefounder	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	

R00351/03	ceri alefounder	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00351/04	ceri alefounder	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00351/05	ceri alefounder	32	paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/11-12	
R00351/06	ceri alefounder	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 chigwell road & rose avenue park the map for proposed development of the business area includes rose avenue park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00351/07	ceri alefounder	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	

R00351/08	ceri alefounder	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00351/09	ceri alefounder	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00351/10	ceri alefounder	44	Para 3.10.1	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00351/11	ceri alefounder	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00352/01	Michael Thomson	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00352/02	Michael Thomson	33	paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.		See response to R00104/02	

R00352/03	Michael Thomson	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00352/04	Michael Thomson	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00352/05	Michael Thomson	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17 and R00108/18	
R00352/06	Michael Thomson	32	paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/11-12	
R00352/07	Michael Thomson	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01	

R00352/08	Michael Thomson	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	See response R00108/11.	
R00352/09	Michael Thomson	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00352/10	Michael Thomson	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00352/11	Michael Thomson	154	site 116	5. Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.	
R00352/12	Michael Thomson	154	site 116	Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R1108/18	
R00354/01	T Hall-Andrews	68	LP22	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Referring to the development of Fords Sports Club and Goodmayes/King George Hospital sites - • The local infrastructure is currently struggling to cope with existing high volumes of traffic congestion, building 850 homes in such a dense area and another 650 round the corner will increase traffic congestion which is already at times saturated. • Aldborough Road South at junction of Meads Lane/Wards Road/ Benton Road/A12 is all congested during the morning and evening rush hour as at other times of the day.	no change sought	The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R00354/02	T Hall-Andrews	86	LP22	• We have 10 schools within approximately 1km which adds to the congested roads. Building 2 new schools within in this radius will increase the congestion 10 fold and make Aldborough Road South and Barley Lane will cause more havoc to local roads. • The Local bus service on A12 (top of Aldborough Road South) heading towards Gants Hill – the buses do not always stop outside Silverdale Post Office which is a mandatory stop because the buses are often too packed or will stop but not let passengers on during the morning rush hour traffic. • A12 right hand turn into Barley Lane experiences constant slow moving traffic and traffic jams. Barley Lane at Junction of A12 is also congested with long ques not only during rush hour but for most of the day.	no change sought	Noted	No further change required.

R00354/03	T Hall-Andrews	80	LP21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fords Sports Club grounds are in the flood plains and is in part on top of an underground river. Part of the grounds is prone to flooding each time there is a heavy down pour of rain. Building such a dense volume of homes on this site is not sustainable in the longer term can present a risk of flooding and damp to new homes but the surplus water could cause flooding to neighbouring homes outside the flood boundaries as the surplus water has to run off somewhere. Ford Sports Club is not surplus to requirements and should thus be preserved. It is a valuable local community 	Ford Sports Club at risk of flooding	The Local Plan is supported by an extensive evidence base including a Flood Risk Sequential Test. Individual planning applications will be required to provide a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and propose appropriate mitigation as set out in Policy LP21. Policy LP35 sets out that the reprovision of existing facilities is a pre-requisite of development.	No further change required.
R00354/04	T Hall-Andrews	124	LP35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newbury ward is an area of high deprivation and high obesity levels amongst primary and secondary school children. Building on this site will force the football club to relocate in other areas leading to a number of young people who walk to the venue to stop attending and miss out on being physically fit. well attended football club on Weekends will mean that lots of young people will miss out on the opportunity to improve their general health and wellbeing. Removing such a community resource and turning it into flats will increase deprivation as many of these families will not travel to another location but may stop their children from playing football. 	No change sought	The borough has a large level of housing need and a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan. All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The value of existing pitches is recognised in the Local Plan and Policy LP35 requires reprovision as a pre-requisite of development. Re-provision will be to a suitable site within the borough.	No further change required.
R00354/05	T Hall-Andrews	86	LP22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entrance to Fords is quite small the impact on the local community for the conversion of the site will be horrendous as trucks and lorries going and coming throughout the day for years will cause a lot of anxiety for the local residents especially those who live in front of Fords with the increase in noise and light pollution from the buildas well as a lot of dust and once all homes are occupied the noise it would create from the new homes. To add insult to injury Redbridge Council since the last constultation stated tha their was no objections from residents over the proposal plan which was clearly not true. 	no change sought	Hours of construction can be conditioned to planning applications in order to minimise disturbance to local residents	No further change required.
R00354/06	T Hall-Andrews	150	Site 66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Soundness Improvements? Build on a much smaller scale at Fords Social Club site to avoid the flood planes and reduce the volume of traffic. Relocate the schools to areas which do not have large volumes of schools within a much smaller amount of schools. *Legally Compliant? No *Duty to Cooperate? No 	Do not build on entirety of Fords Social Club (avoid flood plains); reconsider school sites.	Masterplanning for Fords site recognises the existing flood risk constraints impact on developable area. Limited land in the borough is available for new schools. Additional provision is planned for at Fords to align with projected growth in the Crossrail Corridor.	No further change required.

R00355/01	Louise Thomson	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00355/02	Louise Thomson	33	paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00355/03	Louise Thomson	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00355/04	Louise Thomson	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00355/05	Louise Thomson	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00355/06	Louise Thomson	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18
R00355/07	Louise Thomson	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00355/08	Louise Thomson	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.
R00355/09	Louise Thomson	32	Para 3.6.5	Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.
R00355/10	Louise Thomson	32	Para 3.6.5	Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.
R00355/11	Louise Thomson	154	site 116	Remove Rose Avenue Park from the map of proposed sites, no 116 *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/18.

R00356/01	debbie crowhurst	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00356/02	debbie crowhurst	33	paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00356/03	debbie crowhurst	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00356/04	debbie crowhurst	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00356/05	debbie crowhurst	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00356/06	debbie crowhurst	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00356/07	debbie crowhurst	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00356/08	debbie crowhurst	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00356/09	debbie crowhurst	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00356/10	debbie crowhurst	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. The South Woodford Society Registered organisation all rights reserved 2015</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See responsde R00108/15.	

R00357/01	Holly-Jane Williams, Kintreatment	-	-	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan is not considering the over population of the area....no new schools are planned for north Redbridge at all! Not sound and not justified!</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Include leisure and education facilities to accommodate the increase of the population.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? No</p>		<p>The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).</p>	No further change required.
R00358/01	Noreen Devey	120	Policy LP34	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? It is illegal to build on Green Belt land and wrong to take away any outdoor resources from local residents.</p> <p>*Soundness Improvements? Consider the resources of the community and do not build on areas already in use.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Building on Green Belt land</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Improvement? Do not build on Green belt land</p>		<p>All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs.</p> <p>The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release.</p> <p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41)</p>	No further change required.
R00359/01	Kevin O'Brien, Buckhurst Hill Parish Council	-	-	<p>*Soundness? Yes</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Well thought through.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>Seems to meet all the legal requirements.</p> <p>*Duty to Coordinate? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Coordinate Comments? The Parish Council has considered the document and have scrutinised any possible knock-on implications for the Parish Council very carefully. There appears to be no impact on us that has not been covered in the document.</p>	none sought	Support noted.	No further change required.

R00360/01	Jeremy Dagley Conservators of Epping Forest (City of London Corporation)	133	Para 6.6.2, Policy LP39	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? Policy LP39 Nature Conservation & Biodiversity and paragraph 6.6.2 of Local Plan (also paragraphs 5.3.2. - 5.3.8 of the HRA). The Conservators in general welcome this policy and the clear intent to protect the Forest SAC (and SSSI). They also would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Borough to enhance biodiversity and the links between wildlife-rich areas.</p> <p>However, they do not believe that the distinctions being drawn between developments inside and outside the 2km buffer zone are fully justified. The Epping Forest Visitor Survey is cited in the formulation of this 2km Buffer Zone but the data needs closer inspection as the survey was not designed to provide evidence of the effect of household distance on the recreational impacts on the SAC. Further examination of the data may reveal that the respondents who provided post codes may have been drawn disproportionately from a sample closer to the Forest. There is certainly evidence that visits to the Forest are drawn from further afield and a more bespoke survey may be required to provide such a hard-and-fast buffer zone limit. Other publicly accessible sites protected sites have been shown to draw the majority of their general casual visits (e.g. dog-walking) from up to 5km away. This is likely to depend on the availability of alternative open spaces and other factors but a fixed 2km Buffer may mean that significant impacts that are generated from further afield are not subject to scrutiny and this would not fulfil the requirements of the Habitats Directive/Habitats Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p>		HRA updated to provide a fuller explanation of the rationale for using a 2km buffer to define recreational impacts.	No further change required.
-----------	---	-----	----------------------------	---	--	---	-----------------------------

R00360/02	Jeremy Dagley Conservators of Epping Forest (City of London Corporation)	32	LP1D	<p>Furthermore, it would seem to The Conservators that the assessment 'of likely significant effects' should be done at a higher level than the project-by-project approach that seems to be taken in the HRA (see 5.2 Screening Table in HRA). There does not seem to be justification, for example, for the conclusion, as in HRA 5.2, that the additional planned 14,665 houses would have no effect on air pollution levels (through the generation of traffic) or recreational impacts on the Forest. Narrowing the assessment to the 692 houses planned for Woodford because they lie within 2km seems premature at least, especially in relation to the generation of traffic. The project-by-project approach (see 5.3.3 of HRA) seems to avoid a full 'in-combination' assessment of this significant increase in households.</p> <p>Finally, although the need for mitigation is recognised in the HRA and is particularly flagged up for the 692 houses in Woodford the HRA does not examine whether such mitigation, such as the favoured SANGs (or ANGsT) approach is actually possible with the size of development sites and density of houses proposed. From other studies of protected sites and publicly accessible sites it has been estimated that the average length of a dog walker's daily route is 2.5 km and requires tens of hectares of space (around 30 hectares in some estimates). In the London Borough of Redbridge the number of sites that could meet these types of criteria are limited. The Conservators would request that the Borough considers other mitigation options more closely, such as how sites are managed/staffed/promoted, and The Conservators would very much welcome involvement in future discussions of options for dealing with 'in combination' impacts of housing and other developments both here and in neighbouring LB</p>	<p>HRA updated to provide more explicit acknowledgement of the need to consider air quality as well as recreational impacts when assessing individual projects, and to recognise the impact of traffic growth from industrial as well as housing development. In terms of 'in combination' assessment, references also added of the Local Plans limitations in determining wider housing growth (due to the overarching role of the London Plan), and the role of the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and other emerging proposals from the current Mayor. HRA updated to provide further consideration of the deliverability of mitigation measures, including explicit reference to access management measures in the SAC as a potential mitigation option.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>
-----------	---	----	------	--	--	------------------------------------

R00360/03	Jeremy Dagley Conservators of Epping Forest (City of London Corporation)	133	Policy LP39	<p>*Soundness Improvements? The wording of Policy LP39 1a) could be modified to read: "(a) Not permitting development which would adversely affect the integrity of Epping Forest SAC, except for reasons of overriding public interest, and only where adequate compensatory measures are provided. As a precautionary approach, developments within 2km of the boundary of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation have been limited to reduce the potential risks of recreational and air pollution impacts.</p> <p>However, for both these and other developments further from the SAC, the potential for 'in combination' impacts of the developments will be scrutinised, ensuring a screening assessment under the Habitat Regulations Assessment is carried out where there is evidence of likely significant effects to assess the impact of the developments on the SAC; trans-boundary impacts on the SAC will be examined and the Council will endeavour to work with its neighbouring authorities, Natural England and The Conservators of Epping Forest to pro-actively avoid or mitigate any such adverse impacts".</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Yes</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? Although the Plan is legally compliant the HRA Report (2016) has not fully addressed the issues of 'in combination' effects and mitigation options.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Yes</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate Comments? The Conservators would welcome more detailed engagement with the Local Plan where appropriate.</p>	Need to deal with in-combination impacts of development	HRA updated and no change to policy wording considered necessary. See responses to R00360/01-02	
R00361/01	Patrick Berry	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00361/02	Patrick Berry	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00361/03	Patrick Berry	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00361/04	Patrick Berry	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00361/05	Patrick Berry	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00361/06	Patrick Berry	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00361/07	Patrick Berry	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00361/08	Patrick Berry	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11
R00361/09	Patrick Berry	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.
R00361/10	Patrick Berry	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.

R00362/01	Louise Berry	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00362/02	Louise Berry	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00362/03	Louise Berry	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00362/04	Louise Berry	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00362/05	Louise Berry	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00362/06	Louise Berry	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00362/07	Louise Berry	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00362/08	Louise Berry	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00362/09	Louise Berry	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00362/10	Louise Berry	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	

R00363/01	Margaret McGuigan	68	LP17	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? The plan does not meet infrastructure requirements. Much housing has been planned for, some business, a few schools. There is no plan for education in a full sense or health. There are not enough hospitals for the residents of Redbridge as it is. Major roads are gridlocked across Redbridge for most of every day. How will this be alleviated by the plan? The amount of development in the plan is not justified in Redbridge, that is already over crowded. Potentially there could be tower blocks built in South Woodford and these will be eyesores given the type of housing in the locality and will endanger the character of the area. The plan needs to build in development of the infrastructure as much as the building of houses.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? No</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? The local community has not been involved in the planning process. Residents have not been consulted for their ideas on what would be a good local plan for us. Consultations on the plan have been attended by officers who were unable to answer concerns and queries of local residents. The plan itself has not been effectively presented and explained to residents and is complex for many lay people to understand. The LA needs to go back into Redbridge communities and ensure that residents understand the plan and then that their concerns and questions are fully answered to their satisfaction.</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	South Woodford	The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00364/01	Tim Carson	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All the comments refer to South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	

R00364/02	Tim Carson	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. The plan mentions South Woodford as being an ideal location for town centre development as it has a tube station. This makes no sense when Wanstead which has 2 tube station on either end of the high street as well as being within walking distance of Redbridge tube station has not been earmarked for this level of development being planned in our locality. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>		See response to R00104/02	
R00364/03	Tim Carson	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00364/04	Tim Carson	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/01	
R00364/05	Tim Carson	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00108/11-12	

R00364/06	Tim Carson	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? Site 116; 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park The map for proposed development of the business area includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed from the proposal. In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14, R00108/17, and R00108/18	
R00364/07	Tim Carson	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00364/08	Tim Carson	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00364/09	Tim Carson	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00364/10	Tim Carson	44	Para 3.10.1	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00366/01	P Bramah	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? South Woodford: Insufficient infrastructure for proposed development.		See response R108/01	
R00366/02	P Bramah	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements 1. Declassify South Woodford as an 'Investment and Growth Zone'.		. See response R00108/01.	

R00366/03	P Bramah	32	para 3.6.5	2. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate E18. *Legally Compliant? Yes *Duty to Cooperate? Yes		. See response R00108/14.	
R00369/01	Mark Hollebon	124	LP35	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? Although I think the plan reads very well and seems to 'tick all the boxes', I find it contradictory. It advocates the enhancement of green spaces, but plans to build houses over a large swathe of green belt land. This is not acceptable. These green spaces may need to be enhanced for better use, but not with more houses; oxymoronic. A better part of the plan advocates building higher rise near to tube and rail stations. Good. Why not on top of stations too, seriously. There are sites such as the Youth service offices near Barkingside station which could also be developed. The hospital site, Ford sports ground, and Oakfields should be preserved as green space not sold off for an easy profit. Think harder please. see above *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Yes *Duty to Cooperate Comments? You are consulting, but whether you take more notice of local residents or developers remains to be seen.	Don't develop Oakfields, Ford Sports Ground, or Whipps Cross; Build on the Youth service offices near Barkingside station	The borough's minimum housing targets as set out in the London Plan, and its full development needs, cannot be met without Green Belt release. All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects of development have been included in the Plan. Station Road Centre in Barkingside houses a variety of Council teams and is required for operational purposes.	No further change required.
R00370/01	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	21	para 3.2	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00370/02	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	14	Para 1.21.4	Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00370/03	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06
R00370/04	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01

R00370/05	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12
R00370/06	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00370/07	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00370/08	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.
R00370/09	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	32	para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.

R00370/10	Lee Bishop, JPMorgan Chase	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00371/01	Laura Morris	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00371/02	Laura Morris	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00371/03	Laura Morris	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00371/04	Laura Morris	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00371/05	Laura Morris	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident’s ability to work locally and damaged the local business base and the quality of life for</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00371/06	Laura Morris	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00371/07	Laura Morris	44	Para 3.10.1	4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility. *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00371/07	Laura Morris	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	
R00371/07	Laura Morris	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00371/07	Laura Morris	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00373/01	Amy Walker	-	-	*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? It has not taken into account the pressure already placed upon the local infrastructure. The area can't sustain another possible 100 people *Soundness Improvements? Increase the local infrastructure first *Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? No	"Increase the local infrastructure"	Insufficient clarity regarding which area is referred to.	No further change required.

R00374/01	Ian D'Souza Government	122	Paras 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? I believe the Plan is unsound because of the proposed release of the following areas of Green Belt, as per paragraphs 6.17 to 6.19. These areas are strategically important to all of London for environmental, social and amenity reasons and to ensure the human costs of urban sprawl, including increased pollution, are avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) • Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) • Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) • Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) • King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and • Billet Road (parcels GB14c) 	comment, no change sought	See response to R00381/01-07	
R00374/02	Ian D'Souza Government	122	Para 6.1.7	<p>I believe the Plan is unsound on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Proposals to release large areas of Green Belt for housing developments directly contradict national government and London Plan policy. 2. It goes against the commitments made by the London Mayor Sadiq Khan during his election campaign when he pledged that the Green Belt in London is sacred. 3. The Green Belt sites proposed for housing DO meet NPPF green belt purposes and LB Redbridge's statement at 6.1.7 that they do not is factually incorrect. 4. It cannot be said (and has not been proven by LB Redbridge) that the benefit of releasing large areas of Green Belt within the Greater London area outweigh the harm. 5. The government has said that demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing Green Belt boundaries but LB Redbridge is clearly justifying the release of Green Belt by arguing it is needed for housing. 6. Green Belt should have been taken into account as a constraint when setting housing targets, but has not been.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00381/01-07	
R00374/03	Ian D'Souza Government	122	Paragraph 6.1.7 to 6.1.9	<p>*Soundness Improvements? I propose that the plan should be modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should be modified so that the following areas Green Belt are not allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) • Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) • Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) • Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) • King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and • Billet Road (parcels GB14c) <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00381/01-07	

R00375/01	Natasha Ludlow	32	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00375/02	Natasha Ludlow	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	
R00375/03	Natasha Ludlow	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the "temporary" 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	

R00375/04	Natasha Ludlow	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00375/05	Natasha Ludlow	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	

R00375/06	Natasha Ludlow	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs. Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage?</p> <p>In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17
R00375/07	Natasha Ludlow	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.
R00375/08	Natasha Ludlow	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.
R00375/09	Natasha Ludlow	32	para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.
R00375/10	Natasha Ludlow	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.

R00376/01	Sujitha Rajan	32	Policy LP1D	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? South Woodford is a beautiful part of Redbridge (of which there is becoming increasing few) and it has a real neighbourly feel (again having lived in Ilford) not something that is common in Redbridge. The plans will ruin what is a genuinely lovely place to live. There are parts of Redbridge where this is suitable e.g. Gants Hill where you could create additional housing etc and it wouldn't necessarily change the 'nature' of the surrounding area, in South Woodford it will - Why ruin what is a community driven local area??</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know</p> <p>*Legally Compliant Comments? I do not know sufficiently well if this plan is or isn't legally compliant, what I do know is that I found out about this by accident, so what notice was given about these plans?</p> <p>*Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough. The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00377/01	Hannah Houston	21	Para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No</p> <p>*Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	
R00377/02	Hannah Houston	32	para 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00377/03	Hannah Houston	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00377/04	Hannah Houston	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00377/05	Hannah Houston	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00377/06	Hannah Houston	32	Paras 3.6.1, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>		See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00377/07	Hannah Houston	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. Se response R00108/01.	
R00377/08	Hannah Houston	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00377/09	Hannah Houston	32	para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	

R00377/10	Hannah Houston	32	Para 3.6.5	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/15.	
R00378/01	Steven Houston	21	para 3.2	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? All comments focus on South Woodford. The plan is totally ineffective regarding the South Woodford Area, for the following reasons: Paragraph 3.2 Designates South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Zone South Woodford has been designated for in excess of 650 homes, however, there are NO IMPROVEMENTS TO INFRASTRUCTURE. The area has almost no ability to cope with the new demands associated with the proposed higher population and no improvements to the infrastructure of the area have been proposed in the plan.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/01	
R00378/02	Steven Houston	33	Paras 1.21.4, 3.6.7	<p>Transport South Woodford is heavily reliant on the Central Line, which is not coping with the current footfall as acknowledged by paragraph 1.21.4, and it is difficult to see how it's potential could be improved. The footfall at South Woodford station is significantly higher than the stations along the Hainault branch where attention for further housing growth should focus. Paragraph 3.6.7 notes that Charlie Brown's roundabout is a major junction and experiences "high levels of traffic at peak times". How can the council make improvements to this junction when they are proposing the majority of large scale development in this area? (site no 116,118 & 119). The plan demonstrates a lack of consideration to road infrastructure as Chigwell Road and the High Road are struggling to cope now</p>	no change sought	See response to R00104/02	

R00378/03	Steven Houston	154	site 116	<p>Schools There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford so the 651 new homes PLUS the “temporary” 150 units at site no 116, 120 Chigwell Road, will bring a huge demand for school places in the local area. The school expansion schemes already in place for Woodbridge and Nightingale Primary School are in place to cope with current demands and the plan has not factored in future demands with the growth proposal. The expansion at Woodbridge is unprecedented and the size of the school will hardly be able to accommodate the higher number of pupils. The school has sacrificed sports grounds to build new school blocks and they will have to have staggered break times to manage the huge crowds. It seems that Redbridge Council is taking unnecessary risks in the education of our children, in terms of having a local school to attend and making sure the children are in a safe, nurturing and decent learning environment with easy access to outdoor space and sports.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/01 and R00108/06	
R00378/04	Steven Houston	155	site 122	<p>Other infrastructure The plan does not provide any improvements to infrastructure areas such as doctor’s surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. How will South Woodford cope with the larger population when the plan does not outline any improvements in these areas over the next 15 years? The plan focuses on the infrastructure improvements at a borough level however it means that South Woodford residents are expected to travel all across the borough to get to schools, sports and leisure facilities, hospitals etc. We can travel (creating more pollution, traffic and pressure on local transport) to places with better infrastructure such as Goodmayes for swimming, the new climbing facilities in Fairlop and schools in Ilford. This is not sustainable growth. The only site which will potentially provide some leisure facility is a tiny car park (site 122) which would only be able to accommodate a small scale proposal. Hardly commensurate with the proposed population growth in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See response R00108/01	

R00378/05	Steven Houston	32	Paras 1.17.8, 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford Our business sites provide decent and affordable areas for business to operate profitably and thrive. The new plan has earmarked all the business sites in South Woodford for residential development. This is economically viable business space which is under attack from this plan. The area has already lost a huge amount of office and business space as freeholders convert to residential. This has done untold damage to local resident's ability to work locally and damaged other local businesses who rely on a mix of customers throughout the day.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.17.8 refers to poor office spaces hindering development, however, there has been no new office development in South Woodford for many years. Profitable businesses are being forced to relocate to facilitate the building of homes. Local people will have to travel further distances to get to work causing additional burdens on transport and traffic as well increasing costs such as childcare.</p>	comment, no change sought	see response to R00108/11-12	
R00378/06	Steven Houston	32	Para 3.61 / 3.6.5	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 Landmark building on the Station Estate Residents made it clear in a petition with nearly 2000 signatures that they did not want tall buildings. This paragraph for a proposal of a landmark building on Station Estate conflicts with paragraph 3.6.8 which notes that new developments must 'respect the established residential characteristics'. Why is this document, which is meant to be strategic, picking on the specific concept of a landmark building for South Woodford? As an investment and growth area, tall buildings will also be considered in other areas of South Woodford but proposals for these building will be addressed by local planning briefs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 states that the council will "seek to enhance local heritage recognising (South Woodford's) rich Victorian and Edwardian character". How do tower blocks fit next to this wonderful heritage? In conclusion the maxim of the Plan is growth in a sustainable manner (para 1.4.2) balancing: homes, job, and infrastructure (para 3.22). However, it is difficult to see how the current plan delivers this in South Woodford.</p>	comment, no change sought	See responses to R00108/14 and R00108/17	
R00378/07	Steven Houston	32	Policy LP1D	*Soundness Improvements? 1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/01.	
R00378/08	Steven Houston	154	sites 116, 117, 118, 120	2. Preserve the economic vitality and viability of South Woodford business community rather than encouraging a 'land grab' for residential development; remove a number of business sites earmarked for development i.e. Site no's 116, 117, 118 & 120	Remove sites 116,117, 118, 120	. See response R00108/11.	
R00378/09	Steven Houston	32	Para 3.6.5	3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford	comment, no change sought	. See response R00108/14.	

R00378/10	Steven Houston	32	Para 3.6.5, 3.10.1	<p>4. Earmarked development areas like Station Estate would be perfect for specialist accommodation for the elderly, as they have less need for access to the Central Line in peak periods, this is a specific observation in the plan that such accommodation is lacking see paragraph 3.10.1. With Redbridge's part ownership of this site, it would be the perfect location for this type of development combined maybe with a pocket park or a community facility.</p> <p>*Legally Compliant? Don't know *Duty to Cooperate? Don't know</p>	designate Station Estate as specialist accomodation (LP4), combine with a pocket park or community facility	See response to R108/15	
R00380/01	Sean Clark	4	Para 1.7	<p>*Soundness? No *Soundness Comments? We believe the Redbridge Local Plan is not legally compliant because: CONSULTATION ON THE PLAN AND CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES HAS BEEN EXTREMELY POOR PARAGRAPHS 1.7 In Ilford South, residents have only become aware of the draft Redbridge Local Plan in the last few months. This has meant considering a Plan in the last stage of its completion with virtually no room for change. Awareness raising was through the work of a resident's group and not the council. None of the preceding consultations were known about by the vast majority of people in Ilford South. It has simply been assumed that Ilford South will take 75% of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives to this strategy have been marked by their absence. Any debate in the last few years has been about a very small percentage of development that might be in other areas.</p>	no change sought	See response to R00166/13	
R00380/02	Sean Clark	8	Paras 1.13, 1.20, Policies LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3	<p>*Soundness Improvements? THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT LEGALLY COMPLIANT BY: HAVING A REAL CONSULTATION ABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO PUTTING 75% OF ALL HOUSING IN ILFORD SOUTH We believe the Redbridge Local Plan is not sound. It is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy because: THE PLAN DOES NOT FULFILL ITS OBJECTIVES OF INCREASING FAIRNESS AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL RESIDENTS PARAGRAPHS 1.13, 1.20; LP1A, LP1B, LP1C, LP3 There will be a huge increase in population in Ilford South, which is already the most densely populated and deprived part of the borough. There are already problems with the traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. The schools are also overcrowded and are being expanded, with loss of open space. This is making them too large and impersonal, detrimentally affecting children's wellbeing. There are huge catchments for doctors and there is already a deficiency of open space in the area. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS IN ILFORD SOUTH</p>	Better consultation regarding, and reduced housing figures for, Ilford South	See response to R00166/01	

R00380/03	Sean Clark	5	Para 1.8, Policy LP24	<p>THE EVIDENCE BASE IS POOR PARAGRAPH 1.8; LP24 Population projections and housing data have poor analyses and use insufficient and erroneous data. No population density, parking stress or pollution level surveys have been carried out in areas of high proposed development. The benefits of Crossrail to enhance train capacity are not scrutinized or quantified.</p> <p>THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: DOING DETAILED, ROBUST ANALYSES OF POPULATION, HOUSING, PARKING AND POLLUTION LEVELS IN ILFORD SOUTH AND BY SCRUTINYING THE TRUE IMPACT OF CROSSRAIL</p>	Better analysis of Ilford South and impacts of Crossrail	See response to R00166/01-02	
R00380/04	Sean Clark	46	Paras 3.11, 3.12, 7.7, Policy LP5	<p>THE DWELLING MIX WILL NOT ADDRESS LOCAL NEEDS PARAGRAPHS 3.11, 3.12, 7.7; LP5; The preponderance of 1 and 2 bedroom flats will not provide the dwelling mix required for the local area, where there is a major shortage of family housing. The council is, therefore, not addressing the specific housing needs in the borough, particularly for families, but is simply trying to meet housing unit numbers. Using council land predominantly for private, market rate housing is a strategy to generate income for the council and will not address the housing issues of the borough. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: MORE UNITS NEED TO BE FAMILY AND ELDERLY FRIENDLY.</p>	More family and elderly accommodation	See response to R00166/02	
R00380/05	Sean Clark	24	para 3.3.4, LP3	<p>COUNCIL LAND SHOULD BE USED TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR LOCAL PEOPLE THE POLICY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL NOT ADDRESS THE HUGE CRISIS OF AFFORDABILITY IN THE AREA PARAGRAPH 3.9.4; LP3 For affordable to be defined as 80% of market rate in Redbridge, which has some of the highest house prices in outer London, is simply unrealistic. A 30% affordable target is very low when there is such a need. The council is, therefore, not addressing the housing crisis in the borough but simply trying to meet housing targets and to generate income for the council. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: A HIGHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET LINKED TO AVERAGE INCOMES – WITH NO GET OUT CLAUSES</p>	Link affordable housing targets to average incomes.	See response to R00166/03	

R00380/06	Sean Clark	98	para 5.4, LP26, LP27, LP29	<p>THE TALL BUILDINGS STRATEGY IS POORLY THOUGHT THROUGH PARAGRAPHS 5.4; LP26,LP27, LP29 The encouragement of high density tall buildings, primarily residential, predominantly in Ilford South, is a very dangerous gamble on the part of Redbridge Council. These developments will be overbearing and out of character with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing and height. This strategy is likely to cause the quality of life of the residents to degenerate. The town centres need a focus on employment rather than housing. It will exacerbate the many existing problems of an already crowded environment, along with the associated problems relating to the amenities of local residents, in terms of overshadowing, overlooking, and wind tunnelling. The policy standards of LP26 have been and, we fear, will continue to be constantly flouted with no regard to the amenity of existing residents. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: JUSTIFYING THE REASON FOR A TALL BUILDING ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS – NOT SPECIFYING A PARTICULAR AREA FOR THEIR LOCATION. HAVING ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS TO ENSURE QUALITY DESIGN IS ADHERED TO. THE TIMESCALES ARE NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	Alter LP27 to remove all references to Tall Building Zones.	The purpose of specifying certain areas for tall buildings, the Tall Building Zones, is to direct their development towards the town centre locations which have the best public transport connectivity, the highest land values, and where tall buildings can be, subject to their own individual merits, an appropriate form of development.	No further change required.
R00380/07	Sean Clark	52	Policies LP9, LP10, LP11	<p>LP9, LP10, LP11 The timescales advocated within the Plan are not practicable. The plan proposes a high concentration of building sites in a number of limited areas, coming on stream at the same time. It will turn certain areas into permanent building sites for years. The phases are ill-thought, giving so much development to Ilford South in phases 1 and 2 and reserving development in other parts of the borough until phase 3. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: CHANGE THE PHASING ALLOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS</p>	Change phasing for developments (in Ilford South)	See response to R00166/03-04	
R00380/08	Sean Clark	67	Para 3.24, appendix 2	<p>IT DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE SOUND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLANNING. PARAGRAPHS 3.24; APPENDIX 2 There are no visual plans of the infrastructure. To have such a detailed plan for housing sites in Ilford South for all phases before having an equally detailed and robust plan for infrastructure for the same time scale is highly irresponsible. Funding is still being secured for much of the infrastructure. Many things have yet to be confirmed and are listed as borough wide rather than area specific. There are too many get out clauses which, we fear, will lead to infrastructure not being put in place at all, as has happened in the past. THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: GIVING MUCH GREATER DETAIL WITH INFRASTRUCTURE TIMESCALES LINKED CLOSER TO HOUSING TRAJECTORIES. DETAILED VISUAL PLANS REQUIRED.</p>	Provide detailed timescales for infrastructure delivery vis-à-vis housing delivery	See response to R00166/04	

R00380/09	Sean Clark	47	Policy LP6, LP7, LP13	<p>ALLOWING HMOs (HOUSES OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION) AND CONVERSION OF HOMES TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH WILL LEAD TO FURTHER DECREASE IN THE HOUSING STOCK AVAILABLE FOR LOCAL NEEDS LP6, LP7, LP13 Allowing the further conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing, will continue to lead to the degradation of the Ilford South area.</p> <p>THE LOCAL PLAN COULD BE CHANGED IN ORDER TO MAKE IT SOUND BY: NOT ALLOWING ANY FURTHER HMOS, BEDS IN SHEDS AND CONVERSIONS TO HOTELS IN ILFORD SOUTH</p> <p>Legally Compliant? No Duty to Cooperate? No</p>	Do not allow any further HMOs, conversions to hotels, or Beds in Sheds.	Policy LP6 introduces criteria on conversion of housing to HMO where planning permission is required. Policy LP7 reiterates that the Planning Service will work with other Council bodies to tackle the issue of beds in sheds; however general enforcement procedures fall outside the remit of this Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00381/01	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	I believe the Plan is unsound because of the proposed release of the following areas of Green Belt, as per paragraphs 6.17 to 6.19. These areas are strategically important to all of London for environmental, social and amenity reasons and to ensure the human costs of urban sprawl, including increased pollution, are avoided.		See response to R00381/03	
R00381/02	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	Proposals to release large areas of Green Belt for housing developments directly contradict both national government and London Plan policy		See response to R01082/03	
R00381/03	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	The Green Belt sites proposed for housing DO meet NPPF green belt purposes and LB Redbridge's statement at 6.1.7 that they do not is factually incorrect		Sites proposed for release do not meet any NPPF Green Belt Purposes as demonstrated through the Green Belt Review 2016 (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R00381/04	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	It cannot be said (and has not been proven by LB Redbridge) that the benefit of releasing large areas of Green Belt within the Greater London area outweigh the harm		The Council's high level of housing need, and supporting infrastructure requirements, are considered exceptional circumstances to amend the borough's green belt in accordance with NPPF requirements. All sites proposed for release do not meet any NPPF Green Belt Purposes as demonstrated through the Green Belt Assessment 2016 (LBE 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R00381/05	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	The government has said that demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing Green Belt boundaries but LB Redbridge is clearly justifying the release of Green Belt by arguing it is needed for housing		See response to R01082/05	
R00381/06	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	Green Belt should have been taken into account as a constraint when setting housing targets, but has not been		See response to R01082/06	
R00381/07	Simon Holder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	<p>The plan should be modified so that the following areas Green Belt are not allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11b and GB11c) • Claybury Hospital (parcels GB12b and GB12c) • Hainault Fields (parcel GB13b) • Fairlop Plain (parcel GB14b) • King George and Goodmayes Hospital (parcels GB16b); and • Billet Road (parcels GB14c) 		See response to R00381/04.	
R00382	Gladys Shuckard Rowe	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07

R00383	Dr Raymond Rowe	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00384	Deborah Carson	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00385	Martin Eden	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00386	Dr Hugh Jones	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00387	Susan Parker	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00388	Suzanne Stables	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00389	Hannah Macleod	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00390	Anthony Howe	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00391	Celia Jones	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00392	Cynthia Jenkins	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00393	Lucy Jacobs	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00394	Alan Simpson	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00395	Ray Haris	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00396	Maya Anaokar	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00397	Nancy Mayo	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00398	Mr Derek Far	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00399	Mrs G Far	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00400	Elizabeth Nuckowska	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00401	Keith Bilton	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00402	Sue Dyson	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00403	Judith Wood	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00404	Michael Wood	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07

R00405	Robert Flunder	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00406	Paul Kaufman	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00407	Ruth Kaufman	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00408	Allan Mayo	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00409	Elizabeth Simpson	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00410	Helen Steinlechner	122	Paragraph 6.17 to 6.19	(As comments R00381/01-07)		See Responses to R00381/01-07	See Responses to R00381/01-07
R00411/01	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Section 3/para 2.2/6.1.6/6.1.7/6.1.9/6.2.8/6.2.9	<u>Green Belt release (Ford Sports/Goodmayes Green Belt)</u> The Council are trying to justify the release of Green Belt by stating exceptional circumstances. The SHMA is used to support this approach, but the SHMA does not justify Green Belt release	No change sought	The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) (SHMA) provides evidence of the borough's actual housing need, or Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). The information provided in the SHMA states that housing need in Redbridge extends to around over 2,132 new homes per year (around 31,977 new homes for the Plan period up to 2030), which is approx. double the Mayor's housing target for the borough (1,123 new homes per year). The Mayor's target is a real challenge for the borough even if green belt land could be released for alternative uses, but the actual borough need, or OAN, which is the target that Local Authorities must aim to achieve in line with the NPPF, is a far more difficult target for the borough, and is unlikely to be achieved even with green belt release. The fact that the borough has very little brownfield land upon which it can achieve any of its housing targets creates exceptional circumstances – the Mayor's housing target cannot be achieved in a sustainable manner, and the borough housing need cannot be achieved at all, on brownfield land alone. The fact that additional land is also needed for community infrastructure to support major housing development in the borough exacerbates the situation further.	No further change required.
R00411/02	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Local Plan Policy LP1B	Green Review by Wardell and Armstrong is a flawed document. It states that the NPPF has a different approach to PPG2 on Green Belt. It does not. Also, removing land in Policy LP1B from Green Belt is contrary to NPPF; London Plan Chpt 7; Local Plan Policies LP18, LP21, LP34, LP37 and LP39	No change sought	Part of the justification for the release of Green Belt in the Wardell & Armstrong Green Belt Review (2016) is based on the five purposes of including land in Green Belt as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), whereby the land recommended for release is stated as not meeting those purposes. Although it states that PPG2 has been superseded by the NPPF, page 8 paragraph 2.3.5 of the Review also states that the NPPF is essentially not different from the planning policy approach in PPG2 with regard to the five purposes: '2.3.5. The wording of the five NPPF purposes is identical to that of PPG2 which formed the basis of the 2010 assessment. As a consequence the national interpretation of these purposes presented by the 2010 Green Belt review are still valid and there is no need to re-examine the national purposes...' The document clearly states that the purposes for including land in Green Belt have not changed between PPG2 and the NPPF, and it is essentially those purposes that are the basis for the recommendations for Green Belt release outlined in the Review, and which keep it in line with National Planning Policy.	No further change required.

R00411/03	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	32	Policy LP1B	The character of the area around the land in Policy LP1B has not changed since it was first designated as Green Belt. Why is it now suitable for release from Green Belt? Concerns over Seven Kings Park Extension	No change sought	The initial designation of Green Belt in the borough is likely to have occurred at the time of the publication of the 1944 Greater London Plan and 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, when London's Green Belt designated. The Council holds historic maps and aerial mapping records of large areas of the borough within its GIS database, going back approximately 80 years. These maps show that in the area in question, by the late 1940s almost all of the Green Belt at the now Ford Sports ground and Seven Kings Park was actually arable land enclosed for farming, and allotment land, containing very little housing development at all. The neighbouring land at Goodmayes Hospital (the West ham Mental Hospital) was much more open than it is today, particularly to the north overlooking Eastern Avenue, where King George Hospital is currently located. This created a green buffer around the existing development at that time. During the period 1947-1960, Goodmayes Hospital was the only real major development in the area north of Seven Kings, which is an older Edwardian part of the borough. Since that time major housing development has taken place in the wider area around the Goodmayes area of Green Belt, although these were still being built after 1981. It is clear from Council records that during the period when Green Belt was initially designated in the borough, the area around the Goodmayes Green Belt would have been substantially different in character than today. Since the initial Green Belt designation at Goodmayes, a substantial area of green open space has been developed, and the generally area of designated Green Belt has been eroded. There are no plans to develop Seven Kings Park, which will remain open for recreational purposes.	No further change required.
R00411/04	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	125	Figure 23	There are inconsistencies with open space categories within the Local Plan as shown on the maps within the Plan.	The Local Plan should show open space categories more clearly.	Changes were made to mapping in the Local Plan as it went through the various constitutional stages – errors were corrected and the representation of categories updated. Older versions of the plan may show inconsistencies but the Pre-Submission version is accurate	No further change required.
R00411/05	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	120	LP34	There is less and less Green Belt left in London, this is a local concern. We need to be more creative about delivering homes and infrastructure	No change sought	Comments noted	No further change required.
R00411/06	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	9	Para 1.15.5	Calculations errors for figures on the elderly, page 11 para. 1.15.5 compared to figures at 1.16.5	Update inconsistencies in calculations mentioned in comment	Noted. Amendments proposed so all references to older people are consistent with those set out in paragraph 1.16.5	Rephrase last sentence of 1.15.5 to read " The number of older people (persons aged 65 years and over) is 36,218 equating to 12% of the overall population, which is also greater than the London average of 12% The borough also has a high number of older people" and delete 3rd sentence of 3.10.2: " Currently 12% of the population are of retirement age (65 years or over), which is the 13th highest in London. "
R00411/07	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	81	Policy Lp21	Flood Risk Seven Kings Water is an important tributary and part of the Blue Ribbon Network. This is not mentioned in the Plan, and the regular flooding and related flood plain designation in the SFRA is not mentioned	Update mapping in the Local Plan to reflect the level of flood risk in the borough.	This issue has been resolved through the updating of the mapping in the Pre-submission Local Plan, clearly showing flood risk zones in Redbridge (Figure 18).	No further change required.
R00411/08	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	LP1B	Crossrail Corridor Investment & Growth Area (CCIGA) The CCIGA is an arbitrary boundary contrived to justify Green Belt release	Modify the Crossrail Corridor Investment & Growth Area (IGA) by removing areas of Green Belt	Redbridge has approximately 2000 hectares of open space and is one of the greenest boroughs in London. There are areas of open space deficiency, which the Council is seeking to address through policy commitments in the Local Plan Policy LP35. However there are many very large open spaces and parks within the borough for residents within the borough to meet and engage in recreational and social activities.	No further change required.

R00411/09	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Policy LP1B	There are inconsistencies with regard to how the land in LPB1 is measured. Site 46 has no site size; site 66 is shown as 26.8ha, whereas BNP Paribas Real Estate Local Plan Viability Assessment puts the site at 27.04ha.	No change sought	Appendix 1 has been modified to include measurements for site 46. The minor difference in measurements of site 66 between the consultants work and the Council's own GIS officers is noted. Essentially the site can be considered as approx. 27ha.	See proposed modifications to Appendix 1.
R00411/10	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Policy LP1B	If the land at LP1B was removed from the Green Belt and developed for housing, Redbridge would be in breach of its own Plan by creating more open space deficiency.	No change sought	Much of the land within LP1B targeted for development already contains existing buildings and uses. Whilst some open space will be used for development, much of the land used will be sites with existing development, and large areas of open space, such as Seven Kings Park, will remain open.	No further change required.
R00411/11	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	120	LP34	The pedestrian pathways along Seven Kings Water running through the area of Green Belt at Goodmayes should be retained.	No change sought	This can be taken into consideration should the land at Goodmayes Green Belt come forward for development. The Council could seek to retain pedestrian paths for incorporation into any future development scheme as part of a master planning exercise for the site.	No further change required.
R00411/12	David Stephens Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Policy LP1B	<u>Suggested Modifications</u> Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to the LP1B lands. • Review the rest of the Plan to remove all inconsistencies and correct/amend it to ensure it properly reflects National and GLA policy and planning guidance 	The Council believes that the release of Green Belt land Goodmayes is the most sustainable option with regard to meeting the housing targets and needs of the borough, and the Policy will not be deleted from the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R00412	Mark Kennedy Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Section 3/para 2.2/6.1.6/6.1.7/6.1.9/6.2.8/6.2.9	As comments R00411/01-12	As comments R00411/01-12	See responses to R00411/01-02	See responses to R00411/01-02
R00413	Margaret & Tom Farrissey Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Section 3/para 2.2/6.1.6/6.1.7/6.1.9/6.2.8/6.2.9	As comments R00411/01-12	As comments R00411/01-12	See responses to R00411/01-02	See responses to R00411/01-02
R00414	Prem Sagoo Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Section 3/para 2.2/6.1.6/6.1.7/6.1.9/6.2.8/6.2.9	As comments R00411/01-12	As comments R00411/01-12	See responses to R00411/01-02	See responses to R00411/01-02
R00415	Alfred Martin Seven Kings And Newbury Park Residents Association	26	Section 3/para 2.2/6.1.6/6.1.7/6.1.9/6.2.8/6.2.9	As comments R00411/01-12	As comments R00411/01-12	See responses to R00411/01-02	See responses to R00411/01-02
R00416/01	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	The Plan is not positively prepared or effective. It is totally ineffective regarding South Woodford.	No change suggested.	Comments noted. The Local Plan aims to deliver sustainable growth. Policies, LP1 and LP1A-E have been included in the Local Plan to ensure that in the context of growth the Council continues to protect the local environment whilst securing opportunities for improvement and investment. Examination by an independent Planning Inspector will assess if the plan provides a sound strategy for addressing the boroughs future development needs.	No further change required.

R00416/02	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	South Woodford has been designated as an Investment & Growth Area. More than 650 homes are planned for South Woodford, without improvements to infrastructure. The area cannot cope with demands of increased population without these improvements.	No change suggested.	<p>South Woodford has been identified as an Investment & Growth Area because it has an active, thriving district centre located around good levels of local public transport including South Woodford Underground Station, and has capacity for further development. The area also includes a key Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) at Southend Road that the Council wants to protect and direct industrial activity towards.</p> <p>The Local Plan approach of directing growth towards Investment & Growth Areas and town centres is a positive strategy to enable the delivery of successful places and a thriving economy, and provide a robust planning framework against which the aspirations of the Council can be successfully delivered. It is considered that the preferred approach in the Local Plan is on balance the most sustainable. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan, which has informed the Plan and supports the preferred strategy within it. Paragraph 3.2.1 explicitly states that each of the Plan's Investment and Growth Areas are distinctive in their own way with their own individual context and character and proposed level of growth.</p> <p>The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan, as well as the policy position. The IDP plans for the expansion of schools in the borough by looking at current provision and identifying future requirements between 2015 and 2022, and includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough. The IDP also discusses provision of infrastructure for open space, leisure, community and health facilities to support growth in the borough. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.</p>	<p>Add the following text to the beginning of para. 3.6.4 as follows:</p> <p><u>'The designation of South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Area will ensure a strategy for growth that protects and boosts local business and commercial activity through new mixed use development, strengthening it economically, as well as delivering additional homes.'</u></p> <p>Update Appendix 2 to show proposed education provision in the west of the borough.</p> <p>The Local Plan approach of directing growth towards Investment & Growth Areas and town centres is a positive strategy to enable the delivery of successful places and a thriving economy, and provide a robust planning framework against which the aspirations of the Council can be successfully delivered. It is considered that the preferred approach in the Local Plan is on balance the most sustainable. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan, which has informed the Plan and supports the preferred strategy within it. Paragraph 3.2.1 explicitly states that each of the Plan's Investment and Growth Areas are distinctive in their own way with their own individual context and character and proposed level of growth.</p> <p>The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan, as well as the policy position. The IDP plans for the expansion of schools in the borough by looking at current provision and identifying future requirements between 2015 and 2022, and includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough. The IDP also discusses provision of infrastructure for open space, leisure, community and health facilities to support growth in the borough. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.</p>
R00416/03	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	South Woodford relies on the Central Line, which is not currently coping with footfall, how can its potential be improved? Plans for further housing should be focused around Hainault Station, which is less busy.	No change suggested.	<p>Policy LP22 within the Local Plan states that the Council will resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on capacity on local and strategic road networks and public transport. As a statutory consultee Transport for London (TfL) is notified on all planning applications for new development, and will inform the Council where serious capacity issues are implied by development affecting roads or near train stations. Transport for London (TfL) have also identified ways in which capacity on public transport can be increased such as through improved signalling on the Central Line and walk through trains.</p> <p>The Council is working in partnership with strategic transport authorities such as TfL and Network Rail to deliver Crossrail and invest in renewing transport infrastructure and public realm, and improved infrastructure to support growth. Infrastructure improvements in South Woodford will include improved cycle infrastructure and improvements to the junction at Charlie Brown's roundabout, to reduce the level of traffic congestion and improve the pedestrian and cycle network.</p> <p>The Local Plan concentrates growth at other stations within the borough, at Fairlop, Barkingside, and Gants Hill Underground Stations, and in particular at Ilford Station and three Overground Stations within the Crossrail Corridor (see Policy LP1 Spatial Development Strategy i).</p>	No further change required.

R00416/04	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Charlie Brown's roundabout has high levels of traffic. How can the Council make improvements to this junction? (Sites 116, 118 & 119). The Plan has not considered road infrastructure.	No change suggested.	Charlie Browns Roundabout is on the strategic road network and is therefore under the control of TfL. The Local Plan (para 3.6.7) has committed to continuing to work with TfL to seek improvements and to address some of the issues at the roundabout, particularly in relation to air quality. TfL has recently notified the Council that it is considering a scheme to signalise the roundabout and make improvements. Consultation is expected later in 2017.	No further change required.
R00416/05	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	There are no proposals for new schools in South Woodford. The additional homes in the area will bring huge demand for school places. The Plan has not factored in this future demand. The expansion at Woodbridge School is not enough.	No change suggested.	See response to R00416/02. There is a need for school places in the borough, specifically secondary school places, The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (July 2016) identifies the infrastructure needed to deliver planned growth set out in the Local Plan sustainably. The expansion of Woodbridge School is one such improvement necessary to absorb some of this demand. This expansion has taken into account existing playing fields and it is considered by the Council that this will not compromise children's safety.	No further change required.
R00416/06	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	The Plan does not provide improvements for other infrastructure such as doctor's surgeries, community and leisure services, childcare and hospitals. Making South Woodford residents travel across the borough to access these facilities is not sustainable.	No change suggested.	See response to R00416/02. Local Plan Policy LP35 explicitly states that the Council will support new high quality outdoor sports facilities and promote sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports. The Council is currently undertaking a feasibility study associated with the delivery of a new swimming pool in the Wanstead area. Once finalised, the IDP will be updated to reflect this. Details of the location will be confirmed. The proposal of a new pool in Wanstead is considered to meet the demand in the west of the borough.	No further change required.
R00416/07	Kulwinder Kaul	155	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Site 122 is not enough to provide additional leisure facilities in South Woodford, considering the implied population growth in the area.	No change suggested.	The Wanstead and Woodford area of the borough has two major sports and leisure facilities, Wanstead Leisure Centre and Ashton Playing Fields, and a large number of sports pitches and playing fields, including Wanstead Flats, with affiliated clubs that play football, cricket and rugby. The provision of leisure facilities is part of the Council's strategy to deliver adequate levels of community facilities and is considered in the supporting text of Policy LP17 Delivering Community Infrastructure. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) also considers the current and future provision of leisure facilities, and is informed by the Redbridge Cultural and Leisure Strategy 2015-19. Investment for future provision will focus on intensification of existing use/facilities and increasing access to this provision. This will involve developing new facilities; making existing facilities open for use to the community; improving existing facilities; and bringing unused facilities back into use to meet future demand. LP35 also states that the Council will protect and enhance the quality of open space and will improve access to existing green space. The policy commits the Council to support for new high quality outdoor sports facilities and the promotion of sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports.	No further change required.

R00416/08	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Key business sites in South Woodford have been earmarked for residential development. Businesses have already been lost, and more are under attack from the Plan.	No change suggested.	<p>The importance of protecting better quality employment sites, alongside the provision of new fit for purpose employment space as part of mixed use schemes is acknowledged. On the basis of the findings of the Employment Land Study (2016), it is proposed that Woodford Trading Estate and Raven Road Industrial Estate are removed as development opportunity sites in Appendix 1; to better reflect their protection for continued employment uses. Other sites have not been designated as SIL or Local Business Areas on account of the findings of the Employment Land Study, and as such are retained as Development Opportunity Sites.</p> <p>It is recognised that policy LP14 and its accompanying text could benefit from some modification to better clarify that the Council's approach to employment land is a combination of protecting sites of better quality (as informed by the Employment Land Study), and seeking the provision of new fit for purpose employment uses as part of mixed use schemes on non-designated land.</p>	See Modifications Schedule.
R00416/08a	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	As above.	As above.	As above.	See Modifications Schedule.
R00416/09	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Para. 1.17.8 refers to poor office space in the area. There has been no new office space in South Woodford for many years. Businesses are being forced to relocate to make way for new homes, forcing local people to travel distances to get to work, affecting traffic and creating childcare costs.	No change suggested.	Paragraph 1.17.8 discusses some of the economic issues and challenges facing the borough. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deal with these issues, which includes identifying Investment and Growth Areas, and improving existing employment areas to attract investment in order to maximise employment opportunities across the borough.	No further change required.
R00416/10	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Para. 3.6.5 proposes a landmark building on Station Estate. People in South Woodford have already opposed this through a petition. The proposal conflicts with para. 3.6.8 in the Plan. Why is the Plan identifying South Woodford in particular for such a proposal?	No change suggested.	<p>While higher density development is generally considered more acceptable closer to highly accessible locations such as stations, the term 'landmark building' does not necessarily mean 'tall building', rather it relates to the Council's aspiration of bringing forward a development of high quality design that respects and contributes to the character of the existing area. Any future development of Station Estate will be subject to a planning application and consultation with the local community.</p> <p>Agree to amend paragraph 3.6.5 to make it clear the Council's aspiration for high quality developments in South Woodford.</p>	<p>Re-word para. 3.6.5. line 9 to read as follows:</p> <p>The Council will seek to create a contemporary landmark within the town-centre at Station Estate. This building should be sympathetically designed to deliver high quality developments on these Opportunity Sites that respect the local character of the surrounding area (Policies LP26, 27 and 33).</p>

R00416/11	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	How do tall buildings/towers fit in with South Woodford's local heritage and the Plan's aim to protect it?	No change suggested.	<p>The emerging Local Plan does <u>not</u> make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford. Paragraph 5.2.12 explicitly states that opportunities for tall buildings are fewer in areas like South Woodford and Barkingside because of existing character and overall scale and mass of buildings being at lower heights of 2-3 or 4 storeys. These areas are generally more sensitive to buildings of substantial height and bulk. The Tall Building designation for Station Estate, as set out in the Core Strategy (2008), has been removed from the draft Local Plan. The Station Estate site is retained as a development opportunity site for mixed use, including housing and commercial. The Council has also undertaken a Tall Buildings study of the borough, to support the policy position of the Local Plan and to ascertain areas in the borough that can accommodate this type of development. Initial findings indicate that due to a general lack of tall buildings in the area, and the local character development opportunities are limited.</p> <p>Following adoption of the Local Plan, the Planning Brief for the Station Estate at Eastwood Close will be updated to reflect the most up-to-date position in relation to development proposals for Station Estate.</p>	Amend bullet point 2 in the Implementation section of Policy LP1 as follows: 2 The Council will prepare and facilitate the production and updating of planning briefs and/or Masterplans for the key Opportunity Sites as required. In particular, master-planning frameworks will be prepared to guide the future development at Oakfield, Goodmayes and King George Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, land at Billet Road, Station Estate and Gants Hill Opportunity Sites;
R00416/12	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	In conclusion it's difficult to see how the Plan delivers a balance of homes, jobs and infrastructure (para. 3.22) in a sustainable manner (para. 1.4.2).	No change suggested.	<p>Noted. The Council consider the Plan and its policies to be fully justified, with the overall aim of supporting growth in sustainable locations. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their effect on amenity, neighbourhoods and infrastructure will be considered through the application of all policies contained within the Plan. The Plan sets out what is considered sustainable development in the context of Redbridge, and is consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is also focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge, and ensuring that the benefits of growth are captured for residents, helping to reduce inequalities in the borough.</p>	No further change required.
R00416/13	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Remove South Woodford designation as an Investment & Growth Area.	Remove South Woodford designation as an Investment & Growth Area.	See response R00416/02.	See suggested modification at R00416/02.
R00416/14	Kulwinder Kaul	154	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Remove a number of business sites (sites 116, 117, 118 & 120) earmarked for residential development from the Plan.	Remove a number of business sites (sites 116, 117, 118 & 120) earmarked for residential development from the Plan.	See response R00416/08.	See suggested modification at R00416/08.
R00416/15	Kulwinder Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Remove references to landmark buildings in South Woodford.	Remove references to landmark buildings in South Woodford.	See response R00416/10.	See suggested modification at R00416/10.
R00416/16	Kulwinder Kaul	154	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	Consider Station Estate for community uses, including specialist accommodation for the elderly.	Consider Station Estate for community uses, including specialist accommodation for the elderly.	With regard to the suggestion that Station Estate could be partly used for specialist accommodation, the Local Plan does not preclude that possibility. However any proposals for specialist accommodation on the site would need to meet the tests within Policy LP4: Specialist Accommodation.	Amend Appendix 1 of the Local Plan: To reflect the adopted Planning Brief for Station Estate, update the preferred uses column in Appendix 1 to include community uses.
R00417	Ekta Kaul	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00418	Therese Clancy	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16

R00419	Robert Bishop	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00420	Philip Stafford	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00421	Nina Stafford	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00422	Carole Ottonaro	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00423	Yu Wang	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00424	June Barber	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00425	Zulfiye Huseyin	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00426	Moris Davis	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00427	Linda Alefounder	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00428	Judy Noble	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00429	Nicola Kentisbeer	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00430	Emma Sharland	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00431	John Ryan	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00432	Louise Gilani	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00433	Jade Flitton	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00434	Lesley Wood	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16

R00435	Philip Willcocks	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00436	Chris Underhill	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00437	Thomas Abraham	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00438	Nicole Davidoff	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00439	Sal Marsh	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00440	Mark Kentisbeer	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00441	Natasha Griffith	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00442	Clare Dibble	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00443	Christopher Dibble	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00444	Anthony Bexley	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00445	Lisa Thurtle	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00446	Helena Underhill	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00447	Natasha Wells	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00448	Eva Benackova	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00449	Richard Dunkling	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00450	Shirley Reynolds	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6 .5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16

R00451	James Loton	32	Para 3.2/3.6.7/3.6.5/3.6.1	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R00452/01	William Whitton Noise	22	Policy LP1A	Residents of Ilford South have only become aware of the draft Local Plan in the last few months. None of the proceeding consultations were known about by the majority of people in Ilford South. It has simply assumed that Ilford South will take 75% of all the future housing in the borough. Consultation on alternatives strategies have been lacking.	Further consultation should be undertaken to consider alternatives to locating significant housing numbers in South Ilford.	The Council has undertaken each stage of consultation in accordance with the Statutory Regulations as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012), and Statement of Community Involvement (2006). The Council's Consultation Statement (2016) sets out how, who and when the Council has consulted during the development of the draft Local Plan.	No proposed change
R00452/02	William Whitton Noise	22	Policy LP1A	Proposals in the draft Local Plan will increase population in one of the most densely populated and deprived parts of the borough. Ilford South	Reducing the number of units proposed in Ilford South.	Ilford is designated as a Metropolitan town centre and Opportunity Area in the London Plan (2015) and is the most accessible location in the borough. Given the above, the requirement of the NPPF and London Plan (2015) to make effective use of brownfield land and to address the borough's significant housing need the Council consider the proposed levels of housing to be appropriate. The Council's evidence base, including the GLA's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2013), Retail Site Opportunities Assessment (2015), Employment Land Review (2016), Strategic Transport Assessment (2017) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017) suggest Ilford has the capacity to accommodate the proposed level of growth.	No change
R00452/03	William Whitton Noise	20	Policy LP1	There are discrepancies in evidence base documents and lack of data in relation to housing completions, parking stress air pollution and benefits of Crossrail train capacity.	Further work should be undertaken to assess: 1) population levels in the borough; 2) housing completions; 3) parking; and 4) the impact of Cross Rail.	The Council has based its strategy on the latest and most up-to-date population projections produced by the GLA. The housing completions data used in the draft Local Plan has been derived from recent monitoring. Figures contained in the draft Local Plan are borough wide. The Council's proposed parking standards are in accordance with the London Plan. Crossrail increases the overall capacity by about 70% per train. This will enable the trains to get further in to London before reaching capacity. The typical scenario therein is that trains will empty significantly at either major transport nodes (Stratford for Overground, DLR and Jubilee; and Whitechapel for Canary Wharf Crossrail branch) and centres of employment, which for Crossrail will be Liverpool Street through to Bond Street.	No change
R00452/04	William Whitton Noise	46	Policy LP5	The preponderance of 1 and 2 bedroom flats will not provide the dwelling mix for the local area, where there is a major shortage of family housing. The Council is therefore not addressing specific housing need in the borough.	The draft Local Plan should increase the requirement to provide more family (and elderly friendly) homes addressed through an amended preferred dwelling mix.	The Council's preferred housing mix and policy LP5 seeks a range of unit sizes in new development to deliver a balance of unit sizes across the borough. The proposed policy seeks to significantly increase family housing in the borough by seeking 50% of units to be 3no. bed or more, particularly in the affordable sector. The preferred dwelling mix will be applied on a site by site basis, to schemes across the borough, including those in town centres.	No change

R00452/05	William Whitton Noise	40	Policy LP3	Affordable housing defined as 80% of market rate in Redbridge is unrealistic. 30% affordable housing target is very low. The Council is therefore not addressing the housing crisis and simply trying to meet housing target.	Higher affordable housing targets linked to average incomes.	The definition of affordable rented housing is set in the NPPF. The Local Plan Viability Assessment has found that a minimum target of 20% - 40% affordable housing is viable across the borough. In light of this representation and after further discussions with the Mayor, the Council are now proposing a higher minimum target of 40%. London boroughs have previously lobbied the Mayor of London to enable local planning authorities to link affordable rents to average earnings. However, this was rejected by the Mayor. Therefore, the borough including this requirement in the draft Local Plan would mean it is not in conformity with the London Plan (2015).	Policy LP3 – Affordable housing and paragraph 3.9.5 Modify policy LP3 and paragraph 3.9.5 and supporting text as follows: The Council will seek to maximise the provision of affordable housing in the borough by setting a minimum strategic affordable housing target of 30% (a) Delivering on average, a minimum of 336 additional affordable homes per year. (d) Assessing the level of affordable housing on a site by site basis. Proposals will need to provide a viability assessment in order to justify the level of affordable provision on each site should proposals be below the 30% policy requirement. Amend last sentence of paragraph 3.9.5 as follows: In order to address the acute level of housing need in the borough, whilst also seeking to ensure that housing development remains viable the Council will adopt a strategic affordable housing target of minimum 30% and a corporate affordable housing delivery target of 336 homes per year or 5,040 units over the plan period.
R00452/06	William Whitton Noise	98	LP26, LP27, LP29	Encouraging high density housing in Ilford South is a dangerous gamble. Such development will be overbearing and out of character in terms of scale, massing and height. This approach will exacerbate many of the existing problems in Ilford such as amenity of local residents, overshadowing, overlooking and wind tunnelling.	Justifying the reason for a tall building on a case by case basis, not specifying a particular area for their location and having safeguards to ensure quality design.	Ensuring high density housing is sustainable and successful depends on a complex range of factors including location, management, occupancy and tenure of a development etc. A number of studies explore how high density schemes can provide good quality, attractive housing which benefit occupants and ensure the most efficient use of land. The Council has undertaken a tall building study to consider these concerns. This study has considered the impact the proposed level of development will have on the character of areas such as Ilford South. The study supports the Council's approach to tall buildings as set out LP27. In addition, LP27 sets out a range of criteria to safeguard and promote quality design.	No change
R00452/07	William Whitton Noise	52	LP9, LP10, LP11	The timescales advocated within the Plan are not practical with high concentrations building sites in a limited area at the same time.	Change the phasing allocations for development.	The Council has reviewed phasing in appendix 1.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R00452/08	William Whitton Noise	162	Appendix 2	The draft Local Plan does not demonstrate sound infrastructure planning. The draft Local Plan lacks a clear and detailed strategy for its implementation of infrastructure which is irresponsible. There is concern infrastructure will not be in place at the appropriate timing.	More detail on infrastructure planning and phasing linked to housing delivery. Detailed visual plans required.	The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan is an active and live document which continuously being updated. The Council has continued to engage with both health and education providers. These updates have been reflected in appendix 2.	See Appendix 2 Modifications Schedule.
R00452/09	William Whitton Noise	47	LP6, LP7, LP13.	The draft Local Plan does not address key problems in Ilford South such as conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing. This will continue to lead to the degradation of Ilford South.	The Council should resist further HMOs, Beds in Sheds and conversions to hotels in Ilford South.	The Council agree this is an issue in the borough. The draft Local Plan provides detailed policies seeking to address these issues. It should be noted that due to Government changes in 2010, changes of use from housing (C3) to HMOs (C4) do not require planning permission and are therefore not in the 'control' of the Council. Policies LP6 and LP7 specifically seek to address and manage these issues. Policy LP13 seeks to specifically address and manage the issue regarding conversion to hotel.	No further change required.
R00453	Alison Evans Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.1.2/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.2.4	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00454	Peter Musgrave Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09

R00455	Hamza Memon Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00456	Yasin Patel Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00457	Rob Sheldon & Rosa Santilli Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00458	Nimisha Dwivedi Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00459	Vivek Sharma Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00460	David Gunn Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00461	Muhammad Waqas Qureshi Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00462	Nasir Mobeen Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00463	Kathy Harington Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00464	Rajesh Sharma Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00465	Imtiaz Umer Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09

R00466	Deepika Sharma Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00467	Malcom Nieman Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00468	Meenakshi Sharma Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	The submission of a petition in response to the Local Plan which includes 1,500 names.		Noted	No further change required.
R00469	Vishal Barot Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00470	Angela Santamaria Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00471	Asif Natha Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00472	Jasdip Sagu Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00473	kuldip/Nirmal/Amrit Sagu Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00474	Sam Bali Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00475	Dominiq Ot Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00476	Noor Raja Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09

R00477	Amir Aslam raja Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00478	Abida Raja Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00479	Raja G Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00480	Isaac Maka Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00481	Kery Sullivan Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00482	Huzaiyah Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00483	Haroon Paderwala Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00484	Syed Kazmi Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00485	Joanna Cotton Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00486	Usha Hussain Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00487	Paul Wicks Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09

R00488	Aysha Khanam Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00489	Mohammed Hussain Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00490	Aneeqa Khanam Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00491	Zubaria Raja & Amir Raja Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00492	Paul Scott Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00493	Julie Morin Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00494	Sobha Biswas Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00495	Humeira Munshi Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00496	Debbie Skeete Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00497	Glenda Hope Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00498	Fahad Sheikh Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09

R00499	Diana Neslen Noise	22	Para 1.7/1.13/ 1.20/1.8/3.1 1/3.12/ 7.7/3.9.4/5.4 /3.24	As comments R00452/01-09	As comments R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09	See responses to R00452/01-09
R00500	Charles David Barwell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.75 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00501	Sandra David Horsey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.75 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00502	David Horsey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00503	Anthony Carter Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00504	Roy Hollingsworth Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00505	Simon James Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00506	Noshin Khan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00507	Martin Henry Showler Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00508	Ann Jane Showler Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00509	Daren Jones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00510	Michael Turvey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00511	Kamran Bashir Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00512	Lauren Thomas Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00513	Stuart Long Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00514	Owen Long Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00515	Milton Mcenzie Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00516	Keith Long Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00517	Marianne Long Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00518	Paul Thomas Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00519	Tristran Sargen Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00520	Richard Pearson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00521	Matthew Clarke Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00522	Martin Caroll Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00523	Matthew Darby Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00524	Karim Hammoulan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00525	Pedro Andras Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00526	Chris Baker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00527	Stuart Warner Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00528	Max Majeenathan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00529	Shirley Hooker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00530	Karen Shepherd Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00531	Rupart Slack Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00532	Matthew Slack Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00533	Charlotte Slack Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00534	Joanne Hooker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00535	Gary Lee Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00536	James Stockdale Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00537	Sean Geoghogan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00538	Graham Sheret Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00539	Alex Denham Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00540	Nick Newell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00541	Taylor Donovan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00542	Joe O'Grady Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00543	Mark Cruse Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00544	James Hodges Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00545	Charlie Brown Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00546	Ronald Holmes Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00547	Catherine Holmes Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00548	Valarie Parsell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00549	Elaine Thumwood Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00550	Conor Thumwood Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00551	Liam Brady Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00552	Tony Charles Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00553	Mitch Hahn Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00554	Henry Engecsdan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00555	Ali Ahmet Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00556	Veniamin Spyroy Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00557	Selen Mertdjan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00558	Michael Gould Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00559	David Gould Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00560	Robert Coundon Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00561	Jennifer Coundon Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00562	Natalia Runkevic Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00563	Steven Richard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00564	Gayle Norden Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00565	Sophia Spyrou Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00566	Amewa Silas Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00567	Pippa Baret Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00568	Loraine Farnham Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00569	Michael Crowe Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00570	Jane Engleman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00571	Olsa Wilson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00572	Amna Bakars Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00573	Lisa Goud Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00574	Jane Gilbert Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00575	James Bishop Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00576	Ann Jarman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00577	Maudred Gerald Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00578	Cydney Cook Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00579	Lauren Thomas Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00580	Marissa Jarard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00581	Svetla Pavlova Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00582	Jake Frank Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00583	Joe Sword Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00584	Cral Edwards Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00585	Rhea Bayliss Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00586	Graham Bayliss Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00587	Patricia M Macrae Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00588	Alison Bayliss Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00589	Sharon Brooks Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00590	Paula Webb Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00591	Kirsty Willis Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00592	Aran Huseyin Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00593	Daren Clyde Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00594	Tery King Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00595	Asdair Laidlaw- Walker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00596	Alex William Gramborn Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00597	Grant Bass Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00598	Aran Hogan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00599	Ian Sawyer Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00600	Simon Evans Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00601	Scott Gumble Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00602	Thomas Keating Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00603	Adam Gray Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00604	Thomas Jones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00605	Tom Murphy Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00606	Joe Jones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00607	Alex Grayburn Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00608	Louis Glassar Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00609	Tirath Singh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00610	Matt Wilson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00611	Jack Farley Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00612	Steven Fahey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00613	James Brewer Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00614	Tony Lee Sayers Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00615	Cameron Wallis Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00616	Matthew Wright Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00617	Patrick Bail Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00618	Brannndan Kaikitis Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00619	Ayud Nabomgo Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00620	Kyden Davis Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00621	Christopher Westwood Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00622	Cliff Louett Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00623	Antony Morgan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00624	Claire Parish Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00625	Damla Yagmur Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00626	Nigel Paul Bunce Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00627	Miss A. J Noel Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00628	Lesley- Anne Mobbs Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00629	Iain Worman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00630	Joide Southion Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00631	Simon Hicks Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00632	Rich Fahey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00633	Marills Wihalache Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00634	Dan Lupascu Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00635	Michael Wilson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00636	Faiza Shaikh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00637	Janet Risby Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00638	John Roberts Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00639	Russell Moss Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00640	Tom Purcell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00641	Daniel Longden Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00642	Terence Barlow Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00643	John Reid Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00644	Josh Cove Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00645	Dean Haris Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00646	Paul Smith Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00647	John Jones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00648	Joe Newell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00649	Luke McCarthy Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00650	Ben Connor Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00651	Daniee Kingsman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00652	William Blackwell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00653	Curtis Payne Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00654	Danny Ford Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00655	John Payne Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00656	Alex Smith Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00657	Martin Leigh Sawyer Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00658	Ian Sawyer Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00659	Josh Tyler Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00660	Richard Taylor Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00661	J Adedyire Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00662	Elaine Nolan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00663	Gianluca Conooli Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00664	Michael O'Halloran Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00665	John Ellis Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00666	Neil Lesurf Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00667	Kevin Sekyere Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00668	Joseph David Lane Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00669	Joe Conner Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00670	Archie Hammond Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00671	Andrew Wetlake Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00672	Dean Briden Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00673	Richard Kirby Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00674	Stuart Sheppard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00675	Alison Sheppard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00676	Paul Brown Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00677	Shoab Iqbal Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00678	Duncan Sheppard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00679	Michael Chiswell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00680	Dean Sheppard Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00681	Stephen Whaymand Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00682	Gary Davies Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00683	Paul Burton Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00684	David Arbukle Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00685	Aaron Mcfarlane Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00686	Joshua Holmes Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00687	Jack Mills Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00688	Christopher Bone Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00689	Jake Donovan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00690	George Nolan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00691	Bernadette Halliday Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00692	Micheal Rory Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00693	Susannah Halliday Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00694	Tate Rawson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00695	Daren Clarivette Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00696	Tommy Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00697	K Newman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00698	Tony Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00699	Eilie Kandell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00700	Youcef Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00701	Jeff Worley Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00702	Chloe Bendon Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00703	Nardjas Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00704	Mohmed Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00705	Michael Amobush Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00706	Ryan Singh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00707	Scott Morgan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00708	Drew Cole Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00709	Nick Sheehan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00710	Dina Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00711	Oliver Jones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00712	Tommu Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00713	Ryan Singh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00714	Jay Russell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00715	Phillip Cuttle Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00716	Maria Morgan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00717	Jamie Williams Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00718	Sami Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00719	Mehdi Adimi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00720	Anees Rathor Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00721	J Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00722	Alfie Scott Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00723	J Newman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00724	Nina Cole Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00725	Steven Gould Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00726	Jennifer Gould Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00727	Louise Parsall Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00728	Lee Parsall Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00729	Jeffrey Parsall Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00730	Ryan Long Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00731	Dinder Singh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00732	Michellr singh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00733	Jennifer Mitchel Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00734	Muhammad Azeem Rathor Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00735	Anusha Rasani Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00736	Zain Durand Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00737	Saima Durand Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00738	Steve Vella Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00739	Lisa Vella Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00740	Nina Riddell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00741	Michael Riddell Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00742	Tiffany Laryman Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00743	Loren Ateli Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00744	Andrew Ateli Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00745	Tery Peace Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00746	Kim Peace Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00747	Lewis Martin Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00748	Kamal Bodi Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00749	Geeta Bithal Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00750	Kanez Ravani Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00751	Charlotte Pender Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00752	Jonathan Martin Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00753	Stephen Pender Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00754	Kirsti Martin Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00755	Pritel Barcha Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00756	James Geller Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00757	John Coughlan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00758	Robert Hawkins Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00759	Aiden Garner Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00760	Carol Maccallun Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00761	Kelly Melthouse Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00762	Danny Chaplin Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00763	Lee Wilson Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00764	Katie Hamprey Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00765	Glenn Pealing Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00766	Gary Heath Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00767	Zehra Heath Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00768	Anthony Cain Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00769	Antonio Piatkowski Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00770	Anthony Leach Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00771	Deborah Hall Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00772	Janet Walker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00773	Mary-Jane Millare-Adolfo Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00774	Steven Adolfo Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00775	Maria Mcmanus Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00776	James Nolan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00777	Irene Nolan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00778	Nathan Coker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00779	Peter Doyle Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00780	Asif Malik Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00781	Thuy Nguyen Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00782	Ricahrd Morison Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00783	Umer Ashraf Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00784	Heather Barlow Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00785	David Barker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00786	Filip Baranski Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00787	Elena Quinones Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00788	Carly Leeks Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00789	Stephen Walsh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00790	Catherine Walsh Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00791	Paula Ryan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00792	Michael Ryan Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00793	Philip Walters Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00794	Anneli Mccomb Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00795	Evie Walters Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00796	Rohan Small Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00797	Paul Coker Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00798	Spencer Macdoanld Bealonians Football Club	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00799	Robert Worsfold The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00800	Olive Worsfold The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00801	Amy Schuller The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00802	Mandy Schuller The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00803	Wilhelm Schuller The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00804	Jacqueline Hurell The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00805	Rick Hurell The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00806	Harjodh Gill The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00807	L D Ring The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00808	George Leeson The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00809	Rosina B Leeson The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00810	Russell Chalk The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00811	Rosemary Chalk The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00812	Trupti Patel The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00813	Kawser Ahmed The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00814	Teresa Neale The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00815	Helen Laycock The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00816	Michelle Williamson The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00817	Maire Ryan The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00818	Alex Fisher The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00819	Trupti Shira The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00820	Muriel Masters The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00821	Stefan Schuller The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00822	Daniel Macdonald The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00823	Claire Mackenzie The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00824	Sheila Moth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00825	Parmeet Sarpal The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00826	Manuj Sarpal The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00827	Lesley Schiffman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00828	Alan Schiffman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00829	Dave & Lousie Norington The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00830	Alan Schiffman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00831	June Mick The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00832	Susan Hastings The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00833	Ivor Michael Preuiner The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00834	Steven Heard The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00835	Tracy Brown The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00836	Micky Blake Jnr The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00837	Alan Wagstaff The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00838	Vassodo Neeladoo The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00839	Asher Khan The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00840	Sukla Debb The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00841	Dr Nripendra krishan Deb The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00842	Sidney E Brewster The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00843	Carol Heard The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00844	Dorothy M Brewster The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00845	Sarah Marie Micallef The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00846	Alfred Micallef The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00847	Margaret Kathleen Micallef The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00848	Laura Rose Micallef The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00849	Stuart Harper-Horn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00850	Thomas Varnes The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00851	Margaret Varnes The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00852	Bryony Daley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00853	Jacqueline Wendy Kavanagh The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00854	B.A Westcott The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00855	Mr J Patience The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00856	Sheila Leake The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00857	Stephen Romaniuk The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00858	Yolanda Thompson The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00859	Norman & Eileen Hagger The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00860	David Wise The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00861	Gillian McGregor The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00862	Patricia Edna Winn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00863	Janice Ann Jones The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00864	David Jones The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00865	David Winn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00866	Keith Varnes The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00867	Samuel Varnes The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00868	Colin & Christine Ward The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00869	J A Lodge The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00870	Sean Cotton The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00871	Sam Rank The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00872	Luke Scott The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00873	Daniel Bean The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00874	Luke Higgins The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00875	Hermes Solomonides The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00876	Joner Foley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00877	James Ross The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00878	Josh Gordon The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00879	Steven Williams- Barow The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00880	Amarpal Khattrra The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00881	Seyon Kurumoorthy The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00882	Tim Parker The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00883	Erand Jonozi The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00884	Leslie Frank Adler The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00885	Lee Goldfarb The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00886	Robert Meluica The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00887	Charlie Penny The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00888	Bill Davey The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00889	Jason Wright The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00890	Hary Barfoot The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00891	Kieran O'Brien The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00892	Cain Barrett The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00893	Matthew Swan The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00894	Gavin Dye The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00895	Nathan Macoly The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00896	Ola Lunle The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00897	Gurmir Bhadia The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00898	James Ernest White The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00899	Robin Flaxman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00900	Cristopher Beament The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00901	L Ahearn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00902	Michelle Waldron The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00903	Paul Urbanski The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00904	Kevin Dearing The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00905	Jo Parker The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00906	James Pownceby The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00907	M Taylor The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00908	Alan Bauouquett The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00909	Eddie Bow The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00910	Duncan Singh The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00911	Patrick Moore The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00912	Lucky Tennison The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00913	Andrew More The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00914	Lionel Faull The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00915	Angela Bow The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00916	Stephen J Russll The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00917	Alex Fisher The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00918	Scott Duke The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00919	D Kate The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00920	Edward lee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00921	Edward M Newman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00922	Colin J Meriman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00923	Peter Orsborn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00924	Graham Muray The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00925	Richard Fearncey The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00926	Mark Venner The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00927	Russel West The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00928	Steve Porter The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00929	Kimberley Moore The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00930	G Deykin	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00931	Michael Davies The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00932	Simon Manaci The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00933	Angela Dooley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00934	Duljit Singh The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00935	Adam Brook The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00936	Steven Carter The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00937	Robert William Wheeler The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00938	Sheibie Arthur The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00939	Lisa Fields The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00940	Lisa Park The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00941	G J Dixon The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00942	Graham Belchamber The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00943	Howard Pearce The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00944	Anthony Drane The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00945	John V Lambert The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00946	Trevour Nicholls The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00947	Clive Last The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00948	Stuart Knaoman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00949	Graham Jones The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00950	Alison Moore The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00951	Tina Freeman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00952	Sachin Fing The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00953	Bhavik Trivedi The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00954	George M Christian The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00955	Subash Patel The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00956	Peter R Rowe The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00957	Matthew Porter The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00958	Stephen Reddish The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00959	Sian Karby The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00960	Graham Aindow The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00961	Anthony J Money The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00962	David J Wheatley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00963	Sriram Srapaneni The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00964	Jack Marquis The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00965	Danny Latham The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00966	Andy Warin The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00967	Sylvia Hunt The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00968	Stuart Forster The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00969	Maureen P Ashley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00970	Patrick Anthony The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00971	Janet Anthony The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00972	David Lyon The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00973	George Hunt The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00974	Paresh Kalley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00975	Ayush Desai The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00976	Navinder Kalley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00977	Jaydeep Dhuria The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00978	Amanda McCarthy The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00979	Adam McCarthy The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00980	Daren Ivory The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00981	Anna Alves The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00982	Lee Bacon The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00983	Rashmin Patel The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00984	Bryn Evans The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00985	Angela Ivory The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00986	Abhay M Thorat The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00987	Gillian Cawser The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00988	Paul Scott The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00989	John Walden The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00990	Daniel Lawrence The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00991	Jamie Porter The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00992	Michael Barnes The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00993	Alan Medley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00994	Jonathan Medley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R00995	Jonathan Balakumar The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00996	Crystina Barington The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00997	Ozgur Dsmirabala The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00998	Peggy Barington The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R00999	Amar Desai The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01000	Adoie Butt The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01001	Nat Kuradia The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01002	Kirtika Shah The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01003	Stephen Millward The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01004	David Flynn The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01005	Kavita Pungliya The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01006	Dlip Pungliya The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01007	Kumar san Karan & Krithika Venkatraman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01008	Valentina Trozzi The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01009	S Salasappan The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01010	Nasir Baig The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01011	Dean Phillips The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01012	Waren Litkin The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01013	Stephen H Selby The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01014	Hazel M Selby The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01015	Shirley R Selby The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01016	Georgia Prokopi The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01017	Sarah Prokopi The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01018	Teresa M Hill The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01019	Zosia M Hill The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01020	Patrika Sharman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01021	Clr Brian Lambert The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01022	Maureen Lambert The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01023	D Rodrigues The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01024	M Ryan The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01025	Ronald David Thomas The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01026	Joan C Thomas The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01027	Elearor Day The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01028	Iris Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01029	Jotin N Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01030	Leon Wicken The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01031	Michelle Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01032	Mark Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01033	Mason Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01034	Daniel Hildreth The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01035	Edward Housden The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01036	Malik Miah The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01037	Sham Malik The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01038	Jacqueline Knubley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01039	S Andrew The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01040	Berke Ash The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01041	Adrienne Tobias The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01042	J L Knubley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01043	J F Knubley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01044	David Stuart Martin The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01044	David Stuart Martin The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Oakfield Site is of some archaeological interest and would need to be investigated		See response to R01162/01	See response to R01162/01
R01045	Balvinder Diocee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01046	Himmat S Diocee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01047	Michael P Blake The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01048	Peter C Jeffery The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01049	Sheila F Nutt The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01050	Jennifer F Middleton The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01051	Pamela J Jeffery The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01052	Carol Pemberton The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01053	Teerath S Diocee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01054	Manjit Kaur Diocee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01055	Randeep Kaur Diocee The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01056	D Bradley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01057	James A Doree The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01058	Eric Madgwick The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01059	Brenda Tarman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01060	Alan Tarman The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01061	Roy Moseley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01062	David Edward Kingston The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01063	Marian Moseley The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01064	Gillian Bouquet The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01065	Shanley I Bouquet The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01066	Peter Bouquet The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01067	John Baxter The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01068	Claire Mackenzie The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01069	Charlie Briggs The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01070	Priya Vijaykumar Shinde The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01071	Juee Manyesh Thorat The Save Oakfield Society	22	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01072/01	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Vision and Objectives	Support for the Council's commitment to promote regeneration in the borough, meet its development needs and maximise the opportunities presented by Crossrail.		Support Noted	No proposed change.
R01072/02	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Vision and Objectives	Support for the Overall Vision and Strategic Objections identified in table 2 of the Local Plan.		Support Noted	No proposed change.
R01072/03	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Policy LP1	Support for policy LP1, particularly the identification of Crossrail as an Investment and Growth Area which the site is located.		Support Noted	No proposed change.
R01072/04	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Policy LP2	Support for policy LP2 in that it promotes development with Crossrail Corridor which contributes to sustainable forms of transport.		Support Noted	No proposed change.

R01072/05	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Policy LP10	Support for the ambitious proposals for the Crossrail Corridor and for allocation of the site for housing led mixed use. However, 882 High Road could be promoted for more efficient and effective uses, particularly given the improved connectivity resulting from the introduction of Crossrail. The London Plan SRQ density Matrix does not reflect the significant enhancements that are to be delivered by Crossrail. Higher density development on the site could make an increase contribution to meeting housing need in the borough.		Noted – The Council has reviewed the site’s proposed use and capacity estimate.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R01072/06	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Policy LP10	Policy LP10 should be amended to allow for more flexibility in relation to the loss of retail floorspace, particularly where a site have been allocated for future redevelopment.		Noted – The Council will amend policy to include additional flexibility in relation to demonstrating regeneration benefits.	See response to R01101/02
R01072/07	James Cogan GL Hearn Limited (Tesco Stores Ltd)	22	Policy LP27	Support for policy LP27 and the role tall buildings can perform in ensuring the most efficient and effective use of previously developed land, particularly at 822 High Road.		Support noted	No proposed change.
R01073/01	Sally Arnold Planning Potential (Power Lesuire Bookmakers Ltd)	22	Policy LP10 – Part 1	There is no explanation or evidence to demonstrate why the A1 threshold figures have been set at 70% and 50%. The policy is therefore not justified and based on robust evidence.		The Council has produced a Quantitative Retail Capacity Assessment 2015, which informs the thresholds in Plocy LP10.	No further change required.
R01073/02	Sally Arnold Planning Potential (Power Lesuire Bookmakers Ltd)	22	Policy LP10 - Part 2 (a) and (b)	The Council should be clearer about how they expect applicants to interpret these parts of the policy and how they are assessed. The policy is therefore not effective.		The aim of part 2 of LP10 is to ensure that areas of the borough that are isolated from the key retail areas within the borough can continue to have access to convenience retail. Parts 2 (a) and (b) clearly state that local areas should not be left underserved (no other convenience retail within 400m of an affected shop/site is underserved), and efforts should be made to maintain shops that could remain viable. With regard to point (b) the onus is on the developer to demonstrate that a particular shop is no longer viable and there is no real prospect of future viability, in oredr to gain consent for a change of use.	No further change required.
R01073/03	Sally Arnold Planning Potential (Power Lesuire Bookmakers Ltd)	22	Paras 3.18.1, 3.18.2	There is no evidence presented to support the statements made in paragraphs 3.18.1 and 3.18.2.		The text at paragraphs 3.18.1 and 3.18.2 is based on discussions the Council has had with local residents and community and engagement groups in relation to work undertaken on the Council's regeneration projects (Area Action Plans for key borough town centres in the Planning Service), and the physical evidence encountered by the Council through site surveys as part of the work mentioned above, and as part of the surveys undertaken during town centre health checks. The issues outlined the paragraphs 3.18.1 and 3.18.2 are real concerns of local people, and real issues that need to be considered, assessed and tackled as part of the Council's work in the regeneration of parts of the borough.	No further change required.
R01073/04	Sally Arnold Planning Potential (Power Lesuire Bookmakers Ltd)	22	Policy LP11	Part (a) of policy LP11 should make sure the definition of ‘town centre’ is made clear in the policy. Part (b) is not a planning matter, it relates to licencing and is not applicable. Part (c) should not consider betting shop uses alongside money lenders as they are separate uses.	Council to provide clearer guidance on the definition of ‘town centre’. Part (b) of the policy should be deleted. Betting shops should be removed from part (c) of the policy.	There is a definition for town centres in Appendix 9 (page 182), which covers metropolitan, major, district and local town centres. The health and wellbeing of borough residents is a planning issue which is considered in Local Plan Policy LP18: Health and Wellbeing. Betting shops and payday money lenders are actually not part of a use class as such, but are both categorised as Sui Generis. However they are land uses that the Council aim to firmly control, and this is the aim of Policy Lp11.	No further change required.
R01074/01	Laura Webster CBRE Ltd (Equator Corpoaration Ltd)	22	Appendix 1	Site at 713 Eastern Avenue (Holiday Inn Express, Newbury Park) to be included as a Development Opportunity site suitable for high density housing and hotel development with commercial at ground floor.	Allocation site 713 Eastern Avenue as an opportunity site	Agree – Site at 713 Eastern Avenue to be allocated as an Opportunity Site for housing, hotel and commercial development	Amend appendix 1 to include Site at 713 Eastern Avenue. Proposals include housing, hotel and commercial development. Proposed for phase 2.

R01074/02	Laura Webster CBRE Ltd (Equator Corpoaration Ltd)	22	Appendix 1	The site should be included in phase 2 of the Local Plan.		Noted.	See response to R01074/01.
R01075/01	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	154	Site 116	We do not consider that the Local Plan currently meets the soundness tests in relation to the Station Estate South Woodford, because it does not maximise development in the South Woodford Investment and Growth Area (IGA), in line with London Plan Policy 3.4 <i>Optimising Housing Potential</i> , and does not make efficient use of brownfield land as expressed in the NPPF.	No change suggested	The housing numbers shown in Appendix 1: <i>Development Opportunity Sites</i> , show the projected numbers of new homes for all allocated sites in the borough. These numbers are indicative and calculated at a mid-range density, not at the upper end of the London Plan density matrix. This is in order to reflect a more sustainable approach towards development in the borough, taking into account the character of the local area of sites, provision of local infrastructure, and other sensitivities within the local area of sites. Because the numbers are indicative, it should be considered that sites may come forward for development at higher numbers than those shown in Appendix 1. The number of units given to sites should not be considered as a cap or a figure that will decide planning applications.	No further change required.
R01075/02	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	154	Site 116	The indicative capacity for Station Estate in Appendix 1 is well below what is suggested in the London Plan density matrix. There are significantly higher densities on some sites in other parts of the borough in Appendix 1, well above the London Plan density matrix. The approach for density levels across IGAs is inconsistent, and does not provide certainty necessary for required growth. The Council is not taking advantage of the opportunity that the redevelopment of sustainable brownfield land could offer in meeting housing need and future growth targets.	Increase indicative numbers in Appendix 1.	See response to R01075/01 above. As stated numbers of new homes on sites in Appendix 1 are indicative, and also based on local PTAL and other local sensitivities, accounting for differences in indicative housing estimates. In response to representations the Council has reviewed the housing capacity of Development Opportunity Sites in Appendix 1, most of which are on brownfield land. It is important however that the Council reaches the right balance between achieving the full development potential of land and ensuring development is sustainable. As well as targets the Council must consider other important elements of growth, including the development of key infrastructure to support growth.	See modifications to Appendix 1.
R01075/03	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	101	Policy LP27	Station Estate is located within an Investment and Growth Area and as such may be appropriate for tall building development, in accordance with LP27. However the supporting text of the policy states that opportunities for tall buildings in South Woodford will be few. This is contradictory.	Change supporting text of LP27.	The Council recognises that tall and large buildings are likely to have a key role in growth and therefore proposals for tall buildings should be <i>considered</i> in Investment and Growth Areas (IGA). However the Council believes that growth and intensification can be accommodated through a variety of building typologies, and development does not necessarily have to be in the form of tall buildings in order for growth to be achieved. Like Barkingside, South Woodford is an IGA where there are good opportunities for growth, but it is not implicit that growth must take the form of tall buildings. The Council believes that whilst it is correct that proposals for tall buildings can be considered in IGAs, it is not given that there are many opportunities for such development within all IGAs. The majority of opportunities for such development will be in the Metropolitan Centre of Ilford and the Crossrail Corridor IGA. Further away from these more central, urbanised areas opportunities will decrease drastically. The overall scale and mass of buildings in South Woodford and Barkingside is low, with heights at 2-3, and perhaps 4 storeys, and contains sensitive designated areas of special character. The policy approach and the supporting text at 5.2.12 are not considered to be contradictory, rather both part of a balanced and sensitive approach that the Council has taken towards tall building development.	No further change required.

R01075/04	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	154	Site 116	The Station Estate site should be designated as a tall buildings zone.	Designate the site at Station Estate as a Tall Buildings Zone.	As part of the development of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan, the Council has undertaken a tall buildings study for the borough. The study indicates where the development of tall buildings may be appropriate and which parts of the borough are more sensitive to such development. The findings of the study indicate that South Woodford is an area sensitive to the development of tall buildings, and that no area or land within the South Woodford IGA warrants the designation of a tall building zone.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R01075/05	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	120	Policy LP34	The full capacity of brownfield sites needs to be properly considered before the Council's approach to Green Belt release can be considered complete.	No change suggested	The Council considers it has exceptional circumstances to justify releasing land from the Green Belt to meet its development needs. The Council has reviewed the housing capacity of all identified Development Opportunity Sites, most of which are covered by policies LP1B-E (on brownfield land) as set out in Appendix 1. This has been undertaken in accordance with the SHLAA 2013 methodology and the London Plan Density Matrix (2016). Although capacity testing at a higher density in line with policy 3.7 of the London Plan would result in the Council being able to meet and exceed the London Plan minimum target of 1,123 units without having to intrude into the Green Belt, the impact of building at such densities would have a negative effect on the townscape, character and sustainability as well as the inability of the Council to deliver much needed supporting health and education infrastructure.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R01075/06	Phoebe Juggins CBRE Ltd (Anderson Group)	154	Site 116	Proposed Modifications: • The capacity of Station Estate should be increased to reflect London Plan and NPPF policy supporting brownfield development and increasing density in town centre locations. • Increase density on the site to 260 dwellings per hectare	Amend Appendix 1 to give a higher housing capacity for the Station Estate, Site 117, to approx. 198 units.	As stated at response R01075/02, Appendix 1 has been modified in response to representations received during the consultation for the Pre-submission Local Plan.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R01076/01	Helen Harris Cushman & Wakefield (Royal Mail Group)	-	-	The potential growth in housing numbers in the borough will have major capacity implications for those existing delivery offices at Ilford, Woodford Green and Woodford Green Vehicle Park. It is confirmed that there are currently no plans to relocate operations from any of these sites in the foreseeable future. Given the proposed level of growth these existing site will need to be expanded or additional sites identified.		Noted	No further change required.
R01076/02	Helen Harris Cushman & Wakefield (Royal Mail Group)	-	-	The existing sites in the borough are constrained and may not be able to accommodate the proposed level of growth.		The Council has re-assessed all the sites within Local Plan Appendix 1, accounting for infrastructure requirements, and the planned growth in the Plan can be accommodated by the sites that have been allocated.	No further change required.
R01076/03	Helen Harris Cushman & Wakefield (Royal Mail Group)	-	-	Royal Mail's operations need to be duly considered throughout the forthcoming stages of the draft Local Plan. The Royal Mail must be kept up-to-date and informed about strategic locations, planned expansions and growth area to allow for appropriate and timely business development and planning.		Noted. The Royal Mail will be consulted when the Local Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, which is the next stage of the Local Plan review process.	No further change required.

R01076/04	Helen Harris Cushman & Wakefield (Royal Mail Group)	61	Policy LP14	The nature of business operations of Royal mail sites take place during sensitive hours which could have significant amenity issues for neighbouring sensitive uses (such as housing). General support for LP14 and protection of strategic industrial land (SIL). However, additional policy wording should be introduced to safeguard Royal Mail properties and other employment uses which are located outside SIL for residential development or uses not supportive of existing business operations.	Additional policy wording should be introduced to safeguard Royal Mail properties and other employment uses which are located outside SIL.	Noted –LP14 part (d) clearly sets some protection for the non designated employment sites.	No further change required.
R01077/01	Barry Cansfield Pegasus Group (Ilford High Road Ltd)	10	Site 10	The site area of site 10 should be increased to encompass all land owned by Ilford High Road Ltd. The site area as currently proposed does not reflect the sites potential or housing capacity.	Amend site boundary to reflect land ownership of Ilford High Road Ltd and assess housing capacity on this basis.	Agreed - Site 10 boundary to be amended to reflect the ownership of Ilford High Road Ltd.	Amend site boundary 10 – See Policies Map Extract.
R01078/01	Mark Pender PPM Planning (Al-Noor Foundation)	156	Site 139	Proposals to establish a 4 form entry school at Newton Industrial Estate (as part of a mixed use housing scheme). Proposals would help alleviate increasing pressure on school places for Redbridge.	Inclusion of school use as part of the proposed mix of uses.	Noted – LP14 on the basis of the findings of the employment land study, the Council seeks to protect the boroughs better quality employment land. Therefore, the western part of the site will be retained as a ‘Local Business Area’ whilst the eastern part is an allocated as an ‘Opportunity Site’. The Council would support the principle of a school and housing on the part of the site allocated as an ‘Opportunity Site’.	Amend site 139 on policies map to reflect employment land study recommendations and indicate ‘protection’ of site as Local business Area and rest of site as an Opportunity Site. Amend proposed use to state: Housing/ <u>Education</u>
R01078/02	Mark Pender PPM Planning (Al-Noor Foundation)	156	Site 139	Support for de-designation of site from its Business Area allocation.		Noted – The western part of the site is proposed to be protected as a Local Business Area, as set out in policy LP14 on the basis of the findings of the employment land study.	See response to R01078/01.
R01078/03	Mark Pender PPM Planning (Al-Noor Foundation)	156	Site 139	Recent redevelopment strategy for the site has been undertaken which estimates that the site can accommodate a school and 60 units.		Noted	No further change required.
R01079/01	Hannah Blunstone CBRE Ltd (Bancroft School)	124	Policy LP35	Propose the ‘release’ of the land at West Grove Sports Ground from the green belt.	Release West Grove Sports Ground from the green belt and allocate as an ‘Opportunity Site’ for a housing scheme.	Noted – The site (part of GB08 in the Green Belt Review) is physically contiguous with the remainder of GB08. The site connects to ‘countryside’ and its retention within the Green Belt therefore fulfils the NPPF Green Belt purpose of “To assist in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.	No further change required.
R01079/02	Hannah Blunstone CBRE Ltd (Bancroft School)	20	Policy LP1	The site is required to contribute to the borough’s housing need and challenging housing target.		Noted – The Council are proposing to release parcels of Green Belt that do not meet NPPF purposes. As demonstrated in the Green Belt Review Bancroft’s school ‘assist in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.	No further change required.
R01079/03	Hannah Blunstone CBRE Ltd (Bancroft School)	124	Policy LP35	The site fails to meet Green Belt criteria (as set out in the NPPF) 1, 2, 3 and 4.		Noted – The site (part of GB08 in the Green Belt Review) is physically contiguous with the remainder of GB08. The site connects to ‘countryside’ and its retention within the Green Belt therefore fulfils the NPPF Green Belt purpose of “To assist in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.	No further change required.
R01079/04	Hannah Blunstone CBRE Ltd (Bancroft School)	-	-	The capital generated from the sale would be reinvested back into Bancroft’s School for its ongoing upkeep, improvements and future expansion of facilities.		Noted	No further change required.
R01079/05	Hannah Blunstone CBRE Ltd (Bancroft School)	124	Policy LP35	The proposed allocation would not result in a net loss of playing fields or facilities as these will be redistributed within the schools other land holdings and the development would not undermine the community open space deficiency.		Noted	No further change required.
R01080/01	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mother Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	150	Site 66	Support for the allocation of the site for a housing led mixed use scheme at circa 850 homes. However, the site area appears to include Seven Kings Park. Confirmation that Ford Sports Ground Allocation only includes land owned by Fords.	Confirmation that Ford Sports Ground Allocation only includes land owned by Fords.	Noted – Confirm that Seven Kings Park does not form part of the Opportunity Site.	No further change required.

R01080/02	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	20	Policy LP1 (ii)	Support for the overall development strategy as set out in LP1 in order to meet the Council's wider objectives of the Local Plan and housing requirements. However, further discussion with the Council with regards to the preparation of a planning brief/masterplan is welcomed.		Noted – Further discussion are welcomed	No further change required.
R01080/03	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	26	LP1B	Support for the release of Ford Sports Ground from the Green Belt as it is considered that the site no longer performs the purposes of the Green Belt as defined by the NPPF. Support for the wider review of the Green Belt to support objectively assessed housing need.		Noted	No further change required.
R01080/04	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	121	Policy 6.1.4, 6.1.6	The case of Calverton Parish Council vs. Greater Nottingham Councils (2015) show the factors for consideration in establishing 'exceptional circumstances'. Given the Council's insufficient brownfield land available to meet Objectively Assessed Housing Need, it is considered the Council are taking appropriate steps to meet these needs and avoid the significant negative social and economic effect that would result for failing to meet this need.		Noted	No further change required.
R01080/05	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	26	Policy LP1B and figure 8	Again general support for the allocation of the site for a mixed use housing led scheme. Support for overall capacity being identified for around 850 new homes. However, the following words should be added, "the exact number of dwellings the site can deliver will be dependent on appropriate masterplanning and feasibility work which is reflective of the current market conditions, relevant site constraints and policy requirements" as it would not be justifiable to identify anything other than an illustrative capacity for the site at this stage.	Include the following text in LP1B: "the exact number of dwellings the site can deliver will be dependent on appropriate masterplanning and feasibility work which is reflective of the current market conditions, relevant site constraints and policy requirements"	Noted – The draft Local Plan sets overall development parameters and indicative capacity figures. The indicative Concept Masterplan for the site indicates that these are achievable on this site.	No further change required.
R01080/06	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	26	Policy LP1B and figure 8	The proposed education provision is questioned as there is no justification for this. This should only be considered through detailed masterplanning or feasibility work on the site.		Noted – The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017) (LBR 2.21) clearly sets out the Council's existing and future education needs, particularly for the Crossrail Corridor.	No further change required.
R01080/07	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	26	Policy LP1B	Further clarity is also provided regarding the reference to "reprovision of existing pitches". There is little explanation as to how this will be facilitated and by whom. The facilities have been in decline in the use of the sports facilities at the site over a number of years. Demand for sports pitches has also declined. Given this it is contended that the current provision needs to be reprovided in quantum and quality. Some onsite reprovision would be an adequate response to balance all development needs. The word prior should be removed from the policy LP1B.	Remove the word 'before' from policy LP1B.	Noted. The Council has undertaken further feasibility work on alternatives undertaken by the Institute of Groundsmanship which sets out how alternative sites could provide 'like for like' replacement. The existing playing pitches will be re-provided as part of the development, in accordance with policy LP35 of the Local Plan. The Council's Playing Pitch Feasibility Study (2017) demonstrates that there is scope to relocate pitches and facilities at Fords Sport Ground to Goodmayes Park Extension.	No further change required.
R01080/08	Jayme McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	37	Policy LP2 para 1	Given the shortfall in Objectively Assessed Housing Need and the minimum London Plan target, the Council is asked to consider greater densities across allocated sites in order to maximise densities.		Noted – The Council seek to ensure that any reprovision of pitches occurs before any development to ensure minimum disruption to existing users of existing facilities.	No further change required.

R01080/09	Jayne McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	46	Policy LP5, table 5	Reference to the need for residential mix to be considered on a site by site basis.		Agreed – Amend policy to specify dwelling mix will be considered on a site by site basis.	Modify policy LP5 as follows: The Council will seek a range of dwelling sizes and tenures particularly focussing on the provision of larger family sized homes (three bed plus) in line with the preferred housing mix, as set out in table 4. Dwelling mix will be considered on a site by site basis.
R01080/10	Jayne McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	41	Policy LP3 (d)	Retain wording in clause D relating to affordable housing being assessed on a site by site basis. However, clarification sought on ‘viability driven approach’ in relation to NPPF paragraph 173.		Noted	No further change required.
R01080/11	Jayne McArthur ICENi (Ford Mothor Company & Ford Sports Social Trust)	41	Policy LP3 (g)	Clause G of policy LP3 regarding self-build or custom build needs to be reworded to state such housing will only be required should demand be demonstrable.		Noted –The approach in part G accords with this approach.	No further change required.
R01081/01	Angie Fenton Quod (Travis Perkins Site)	155	Site 120	No immediate intention to vacate the site and concern is raised that use as a builders merchants will not be acceptable in any future redevelopment of the site. Existing builders merchant provides a valuable town centre use. Aim to protection of the existing ‘sui generis’ (builders merchants) use on the site. Potential long term development for a mixed use scheme which includes the existing sui generis use.	Include the words “Employment generation sui generis uses” in the site proposal	Agree – The Council recognise the important role Travis Perkins play in South Woodford area and support proposals for potential a mixed use development including the existing use.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule. Insert the following text into site proposals 120 Residential/Commercial/ Employment (sui generis)
R01081/02	Angie Fenton Quod (Travis Perkins Site)	155	Site 120	The site has the potential to be redeveloped in the first phase of the Local Plan.	Amend the phasing period of the site to: 2017 – 2025.	Agree – Land owner has provided clarification on timing of site deliverability.	Change phasing period of site 120: 2021-2025 to 2015 - 2020
R01082/01	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	All green belt sites proposed for release meet green belt purposes; they form parts of larger green belt sites, are open, hold back towns from merging, and contain sprawl. Oakfield in particular prevents urban sprawl and separates Barkingside from Hainault.	The plan should be modified so that the following areas of Green Belt are not allocated for housing development or any other inappropriate development and instead remain open, protected Green Belt for the duration of the plan. • Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area • Claybury Hospital • Hainnault Fields • Fairlop Plain • King George and Goodmayes Hospital • Billet Road	Sites proposed for green belt release are based on the findings of successive assessments of their performance against NPPF criteria. Specific to Oakfield, see response to R01088/01.	No further change required.
R01082/02	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Sites proposed for release from green belt hold sports, environmental, health, amenity, and social value.		The value of existing sports pitches and facilities is recognised, and as such the Local Plan sets out that their re-provision is a prerequisite of development. Furthermore, the Local Plan also sets out requirements for the provision of new open space as part of a masterplanned approach to the development of released sites.	No further change required.
R01082/03	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Green belt release contradicts London Plan policy.		All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Assessment (2016) and the Green Belt Addendum (2017).	No further change required.
R01082/04	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Use by existing sports clubs of Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground, are of strategic importance to the region.		The value of existing sports pitches is recognised, and as such the Local Plan sets out that their re-provision is a prerequisite of development.	No further change required.

R01082/05	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Government statements indicate demand for housing cannot form the exceptional circumstances needed to justify changing green belt boundaries.		Government statements refer to “demand for housing alone” not justifying exceptional circumstances. In addition to housing need, green belt release is also required in Redbridge to provide for supporting infrastructure and support a sustainable pattern of development. Furthermore, parcels proposed for release have been demonstrated through successive assessments to not meet green belt purposes, and as sustainable development options through the Sustainability Appraisal.	No further change required.
R01082/06	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Green belt constraints should have been taken into account when housing targets were set.		The Council’s minimum housing targets are set by the Mayor of London through the London Plan using a consistent methodology across the region. The presence of functional green belt has been taken into account through the Local Plan’s approach of seeking to meet and exceed minimum London Plan targets, but recognising that meeting its full objectively assessed housing need is not possible.	No further change required.
R01082/07	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	There has been a failure to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to find brownfield sites.		See response to R01082/09 below	See response to R01082/09
R01082/08	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	The Playing Pitch Strategy does not take account of growth in youth population in Redbridge and East London, or changes to Sport England policy arising from new government sports policy published in Dec 2015.		See response to R01085/07	See response to R01085/07
R01082/09	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	It is unnecessary to release green belt for housing when East London has extensive brownfield land.		The London Plan sets targets for individual boroughs to meet as a minimum. Targets for Redbridge cannot be achieved without releasing some poorer performing green belt parcels, and as set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement, the Council cannot rely on neighbouring boroughs to absorb its housing need.	No further change required.
R01082/10	Alice Roberts CPRE London	122	Para 6.1.7-6.1.9 Policy LP1B/LP1E/LP2/LP34	Consultation has been misleading in terms of green belt release.		Proposed green belt release, and the Council’s justification has been explicit throughout consultation. Figure 22 shows areas of proposed green belt release, whilst paragraphs 6.1.6 - 6.1.10 set out justification for including making clear where they are identified as opportunity sites. Appendix 1 acknowledges the existing use of all opportunity sites.	No further change required.
R01083/01	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	122	6.1.7/6.1.8 policy 34	The plan ignores the opportunity to develop the former landfill site for housing and open space improvements to form approximately 1ha of accessibly green infrastructure		Site is designated as green belt, where housing is an inappropriate use. Green belt boundary revisions have been considered through green belt reviews; which found the site to meet the NPPF green belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. In addition the site also forms part of the Roding Valley Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, on account of the presence of several species that require these buffer type lands adjacent to the river corridor as part of their lifecycle. On the basis of a recent review of SINC’s, the GLA are considering upgrading the existing designation from borough to metropolitan level of importance on account of the rich habitat diversity that extends beyond the river.	No further change required.

R01083/02	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	120	6.1.7/6.1.8 policy 34	<p>Green belt assessment has been wrongly applied to the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An inconsistent approach to western boundary embankment and vegetation has been applied; despite the importance of the river corridor as a visual and physical link to the wider retained parcel to the west, the presence of similar characteristics are not used to retain land to the north</i> • <i>Steep embankment provides a clear physical barrier</i> • <i>Vegetation to the west of the site provides physical enclosure from wider retained GB9 parcel</i> • <i>No strong visual connection to GB09 exists</i> • <i>Local amenity space value does not warrant green belt protection</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the north removed from green belt on account of the presence of non-green belt compatible buildings meaning that unlike the proposed site, it does not represent countryside • Roding Lane South provides a clear physical boundary to the green belt designation and corresponds with SINC boundary. It provides a more permanent and defined boundary than the river embankment. • Land on both sides of the embankment proposed as an alternative boundary would both be very similar in character; both representing countryside • Green belt designation has been retained on the basis of an assessment of the sites performance against green belt criteria. Local amenity space value alone is not used to justify the green belt designation 	No further change required.
R01083/03	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	122	6.1.7/6.1.8 policy 34	<p>Insufficient recreational support from sports and leisure consultees to Oakfield proposals indicates Local Plan does not follow the most appropriate strategy.</p>		<p>Proposals for Oakfield include provision for relocation of existing pitches and facilities. Plan is supported by a Sustainability Appraisal that demonstrates it as the most appropriate strategy when assessed against reasonable alternatives. Proposed site does not provide a realistic alternative to Oakfield on account of it meeting green belt objectives, being designated as SINC, being a less sustainable location in terms of town centre and public transport accessibility, and it not being of sufficient size to accommodate similar levels of housing and infrastructure development.</p>	No further change required.
R01083/04	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	122	Paras 6.1.7, 6.1.8; Policy 34	<p>There is an urgent need for new housing on available sites. Allocating land without known replacement of playing fields does not offer certainty of housing delivery.</p>		<p>Oakfield is phased later in the plan period in recognition of works needed to facilitate the relocation of existing playing fields. Feasibility works supports the plan to demonstrate pitches and facilities can be relocated within the borough.</p>	No further change required.
R01083/05	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	122	6.1.7/6.1.8 policy 34	<p>Roding Lane South serves none of the purposes outlined in NPPF paragraph 80. Its inclusion in the green belt is unjustified under paragraph 85 criteria since:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It risks the plan failing to meet identified requirements for sustainable development • It is not needed to be kept permanently open (and on site open space can be provided) • It means the green belt will not have a clear defined boundary using features likely to be permanent and ignores the obvious boundary formed by the eastern bank to the River Roding. <p>It also means the plan is contrary to one of the core planning principles in paragraph 17 of the NPPF; that planning “not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives”.</p>		<p>As set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1), the site assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Regarding paragraph 85 of the NPPF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan identifies sites to meet minimum London Plan housing targets and the boroughs infrastructure needs in a sustainable manner, and is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal; • It should be kept permanently open on the basis it safeguards the countryside from encroachment • Roding Lane South provides a more readily recognisable feature likely to be permanent as the green belt boundary <p>Core planning principles as defined in paragraph 17 of the NPPF include protecting green belts, recognising the character and beauty of the countryside, conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and reusing previously developed land that is not of high environmental value.</p>	No change required

R01083/06	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	122	6.1.7/6.1.8 policy 34	The retention of the Roding Lane South within the Green Belt will result in it remaining vacant, private, and with poor ground conditions. Identifying the site as an opportunity site would enable development to come forward that is compatible with the aims of Policies LP2, LP35, LP37, and LP39.	Amend first bullet point of paragraph 6.1.7 to read: "Roding Hospital and Surrounding Area (parcels GB11a , GB11b and GB11c);" Delete final bullet point of paragraph 6.1.8: "Land remaining within Roding Hospital (GB11) be amalgamated with Roding Valley Park (GB09)" Figures 22 and 23 and the Policies Map to be amended to conform with above revisions. Additional site added to Appendix 1: "Site address: Land south of Roding Hospital Size: 2.8ha Ward: Clayhall Current use: Vacant Proposed Use: Housing with public open space Indicative Development Capacity: 60 dwellings Phasing Period: 2015-2020 Planning Status: No current planning application or new permission "	Whilst development of the site could realise some benefits such as increased housing delivery and publically accessible open space, proposals are contrary to the Green Belt policy, and would harm its nature conservation role that is acknowledged through the SINC designation also covering the site.	No further change required.
R01084/01	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	167	SO1	Strategic objective 1 supported		Support noted.	No further change required.
R01084/02	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	-	-	More recent indicators of housing need since the Further Alterations to the London Plan suggest housing need in Redbridge in excess of the London Plan target. To comply with the NPPF, the borough should therefore pro-actively seek opportunities to significantly boost housing supply.		Noted. Based on the findings of the Outer North East London SHMA (LBR 2.01), the Local Plan acknowledges higher levels of housing need than the London Plan target. Subsequently, it aims to exceed the London Plan target to help close the gap on levels of housing need, where this can be achieved in a sustainable manner in accordance with the NPPF.	No further change required.
R01084/03	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	120	LP34	Proposed Green Belt boundary revisions do not go sufficiently far enough to meet development needs. Land at Tomswood Hill should be released on the basis that parcels either side are proposed for release, and its performance against NPPF green belt tests. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not check unrestricted sprawl as it is surrounded by development on three sides, is disjointed, and does not restrict urban sprawl; • It does not prevent neighbouring towns merging; • It does not safeguard the countryside as the site itself is not open countryside or important open space in the overall context of Claybury Park; • It does not preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; • It does not assist in urban regeneration as land beyond urban brownfield land is needed to meet identified housing needs. 		Parcels either side of land at Tomswood Hill have already been developed, which detracts from their openness and performance against NPPF Green Belt tests, as set out in the Green Belt Assessment (LBR 2.41). This also sets out that the proposed site performs a strong role is safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, as it is open, undeveloped and contiguous with the wider Green Belt parcel GB12. Furthermore, Tomswood Hill Road creates a strong physical boundary.	No further change required.

R01084/04	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	-	-	<p>Indicative Sustainability Appraisal of site provided indicating the development of the site would have a neutral impact in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering community facilities; and • Delivering accessible development and sustainable transport; <p>Also determined to have a positive impact on several criteria including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping address housing need; • Retaining some open space on site; • Protecting character of residential areas and heritage assets; • Positively addressing climate change due to its accessibility by public transport and proximity to town centre amenities; • Its deliverability 		<p>Positive performance against preserving open space, when proposal is to develop on open space, is questionable. The Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Submission Plan sets out that the Green Belt sites proposed for release and development through the plan are the most sustainable.</p>	No further change required.
R01084/05	Andrew Blackwell Bidwells(Todcharm Ltd)	125	Figure 23	<p>Figure 23 does not clearly distinguish between Green Belt and Open Space designations, and the Draft Open Spaces Study highlights Tomswood Hill as part of an open space designation</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.1.7, figure 22 and figure 23 should all be amended so that land at Tomswood Hill is not designated as Green Belt or Open Space, and the site identified in Appendix 1 as a Development Opportunity Site for the first phase of the plan.</p>	<p>Different shades of green are shown in figure 23 to denote the difference between open space designations and retained green belt. Designations are also available to view on the Policies Map. Both of these make clear the site is designated as green belt, but not open space in the Submission Plan. Figure 1.1 of the Draft Open Spaces Study identifies the site as part of the boroughs existing network of open spaces, which includes all land designated as green belt (prior to any releases proposed through the Local Plan).</p>	No further change required
R01085/01	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>Oakfield should not be identified as an opportunity site due to its amenity, recreation, and community value, and its designation as green belt and as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Oakfield from the list of opportunity sites • Remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5 in the Local Plan • Retain LP34 (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Land) but add to implementation <i>"The Council will seek to enhance the accessibility and opportunities on Hainault Plain, in particular at Oakfield"</i> • In LP35 (Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces) remove Oakfield from paragraph (g) which is inconsistent with and indeed reverses the policies in the previous paragraphs (a) to (f). 	<p>Policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing facilities as a pre-requisite of development in recognition of their value. See response to R01085/03 below regarding green belt status of the site.</p>	<p>Policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing facilities as a pre-requisite of development in recognition of their value. See response to R01085/03 below regarding green belt status of the site.</p>
R01085/02	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	<p>Designating Oakfield as an opportunity site does not comply with NPPF paragraphs 6-10, 17, 69-70, 73-75, and 79-89, or London Plan Policies 2.18, 3.16, 3.19, 7.1C, 7.3, and 7.4A.</p>		<p>The Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF and the London Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal sets out how the plan complies with the concept of sustainable development in accordance with paragraphs 6-10 of the NPPF. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out a variety of competing planning principles, which include that <i>"every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet housing, business and other development needs"</i>, and to <i>"focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable"</i>. Designating Oakfield as an opportunity site complies with these principles. Policy LP18 (Health and Well-being) of the Local Plan recognises the importance of promoting healthy communities. Policy also requires re-provision of existing facilities before any development, and therefore <i>"guards against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services"</i> in line with paragraphs 69-70 of the NPPF, that <i>"green infrastructure needs are planned and managed"</i> in accordance with London Plan Policy 2.18, and that social infrastructure and sports facilities are not lost in accordance with London Plan Policies 3.16 and 3.19.</p>	No further change required.

R01085/02a	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As above	As above	The Local Plan is supported by assessments of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities, and as clarified in response to R00325/09 sets out that whilst existing facilities are not surplus to requirements, they will be replaced with equivalent or better provision, in accordance with paragraphs 73-75 of the NPPF. The identification of Oakfield as an opportunity site is based on the existence of exceptional circumstances (i.e. levels of housing and other development needs), and supported by assessments of how the site performs against green belt purposes, in accordance with paragraphs 79-89 of the NPPF. London Plan Policy 7.1C on Lifetime Neighbourhoods, 7.3 on Designing out Crime, and 7.4A on Local Character all set out factors that development proposals should respond to at the detailed design stage. Section 5 of the Local Plan on "Achieving Quality Design" conforms with these policies.	As above
R01085/03	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Oakfield meets two green belt tests as shown in the 2010 Green Belt Review - it prevents urban sprawl, and separates Barkingside from Hainault. It is also important open local green space.		The 2010 Green Belt Assessment found that the wider parcel of Hainault Fields met green belt tests. When the site is sub-divided, it does not form functional green belt as set out in successive Green Belt Assessments. Policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing pitches and facilities in recognition of their value.	No further change required.
R01085/04	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Exceptional circumstances that outweigh the benefits of the current use of Oakfield do not exist.		The borough's high level of housing need, and supporting infrastructure requirements, are considered exceptional circumstances to amend the borough's green belt. In recognition of their value, policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing facilities as a pre-requisite of development, and identifies potential alternative sites.	No further change required.
R01085/05	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Identifying Oakfield as an opportunity site will divert investment away from brownfield sites.		Housing need in the borough is such that it cannot be entirely met on brownfield land. The majority of sites identified in the plan are brownfield, including many that will benefit from enhanced accessibility from investment in Crossrail, and direct intervention through Ilford Housing Zone. Green belt sites are phased later in the plan period.	No further change required.
R01085/06	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Developing Oakfield will have negative health implications in that it will increase traffic congestion, exacerbate poor air quality and reduce participation in sport and exercise.		See response to R01088/04 regarding air quality. Policy in the Local Plan requires the re-provision of existing sports facilities as a pre-requisite of development.	No further change required.
R01085/07	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	The Playing Pitch Strategy does not take account of growth in youth population in Redbridge and East London, or changes to Sport England policy arising from new government sports policy published in Dec 2015.		The Playing Pitch Strategy uses Sub National Population Projections, and has been prepared in accordance with Sport England's Playing Pitch Strategy Guidance (Oct 2013), which has not altered in response to the government's publication of Sporting Future (Dec 2015).	No further change required.
R01085/08	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	The Alternative Playing Pitch Sites Assessment has been manipulated and does not take account of facilities needed in top amateur cricket and football, nor the status of proposed pitch relocation sites in the Minerals Plan.		Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (2017) (LBR 2.44.1) demonstrates how with appropriate investment and maintenance, high quality pitches can be achieved on proposed relocation sites. See response to R01088/02 regarding status of relocation sites in the Minerals Plan.	No further change required.
R01085/09	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	There has not been meaningful cooperation with other boroughs to meet housing need on brownfield sites.		The Duty to Cooperate Statement that accompanies the plan sets out how the Council have sought other boroughs assistance in meeting housing need.	No further change required.

R01085/10	Howard Berlin (SOS)	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	There is no need for a school and medical centre in the area due to existing levels of provision.		Provision for education and healthcare facilities is supported by key delivery partners such as the Education Funding Authority, and Redbridge CCG.	No further change required.
R01086/01	Adam Gostling Lambert Smith Hampton	124	Appendix 1 LP35	Land at 2 Woodville Gardens, Barkingside, has not been used for over 4 years and should therefore be removed from the LP35 designation and identified as an opportunity site to help meet housing need.		Proposals do not conform with requirements of NPPF paragraph 74 that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or • the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or • the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. 	No further change required.
R01087/01	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	122	Para 6.1.7, Policy LP34	Support the release of land identified as King George Hospital and Goodmayes Hospital from Green Belt, and identification as a Development Opportunity Site		Noted	No further change required
R01087/02	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	122	Para 6.1.7, Policy LP34	Capacity studies demonstrate that the site can provide significantly more than 500 dwellings identified in the Local Plan, so policy should express this figure as a minimum		Calculation of capacity significantly above 500 dwellings has not accounted for on-site provision of infrastructure as set out in Policy LP1B, and other requirements such as dwelling mix, and operational parking requirements of retained hospital buildings	No further change required
R01087/03	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	120	6.1.7 LP34	Policy should recognise that King George and Goodmayes Hospitals can come forward separately in a phased manner; to reflect separate ownerships and likely separate accesses		A masterplanned approach to development is sought in the interests of securing a comprehensive development that secures benefits including improved pedestrian and cycle links through the site, a suitable dwelling mix, and provision of on-site infrastructure such as a school. Nevertheless, the likelihood of development coming forward in a phased manner is acknowledged.	Amend final bullet point of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals box under LP1B to read: <i>"The phased development of land in separate ownership Development of this site should be considered in the context of a Planning Brief/ Masterplan for the site as a whole"</i> .
R01087/04	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	122	Para 6.1.7, Policy LP34	Masterplanning should be high level and conceptual rather than detailed to avoid compromising delivery in the early phases of the plan		Noted. Conceptual Masterplans have been produced as evidence base to support the Local Plan. As set out in response to R01087/03 above, terminology amended to be consistent with requirements for other Green Belt sites.	No further change required.
R01087/05	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	122	Para 6.1.7, Policy LP34	It should be clarified in Policy LP1B if Masterplanning relates to just the King George and Goodmayes Hospital site, or the wider Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area		See response to R01087/03. Policy box for King George and Goodmayes Hospital makes clear a Planning Brief/ Masterplan is required for the site as a whole (i.e. parcels in separate land ownership) to enable comprehensive development, rather than as a Masterplan for the entire Crossrail Corridor.	No further change required.
R01087/06	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	Clarification is required regarding school requirements. Policy LP1B seeks three new 8FE secondary schools in the Crossrail Corridor, specific guidance on the hospitals site requires on site provision of a primary and secondary school, whilst the specific guidance on Ford Sports Ground doesn't specify on site school provision; contrary to figure 8 and the IDP.		Anomalies noted. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates 1 new secondary school is required on each of the strategic sites in the Crossrail Corridor.	Amend 3rd bullet point of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals policy box to read: <i>"On site provision of a new primary and secondary school"</i> Also insert additional bullet point to The Ford Sports Ground policy box to read: <i>"On site provision of a new secondary school"</i> And Land at Billet Road policy box to read: <i>"On site provision of a new secondary school"</i>
R01087/07	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	68	LP17	Greater clarity on school requirements is necessary in terms of size, preferred location, and delivery mechanism if this requires land not in local education authority ownership		See response to R01087/06. As set out in the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, requirements for the site are for an 8FE secondary school. The Planning Brief/ Masterplan that accompanies the submission Local Plan identifies a preferred location, and anticipated site size, based on EFA guidance. On site delivery will require partnership working with the Education Funding Agency.	No further change required.

R01087/08	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	Policy LP1B should recognise the viability implications of on-site school provision		All parts of the plan should be read in conjunction. Paragraph 7.2.15 makes clear that the economic viability, and the full range of benefits of development, will be taken into account when determining planning obligations. The level of development envisaged on site will contribute to demand for new school places in the borough.	No further change required.
R01087/09	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	Lack of availability of a masterplan calls site deliverability into question, so Council should work with landowners to develop further evidence to demonstrate deliverability of the site		See response to R01087/04 above	No further change required
R01087/10	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	As above.	Rephrase LP1B on King George and Goodmayes Hospitals to read: <i>"The Council expects a comprehensive-coordinated housing-led mixed-use developments to come forward at King George and Goodmayes Hospitals in accordance with the following criteria:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Land in and around King George and Goodmayes Hospitals will be developed to provide around at least 500 high quality new homes (including affordable in accordance with Policy LP3: Affordable Housing) ;</i> • <i>Maximising densities compatible with local context, sustainable design principles and public transport capacity, in line with the Density Matrix of the London Plan;</i> • <i>On site provision for a new primary and secondary school;</i> • <i>Ap P ermeable design – a walkable neighbourhoods with routes and spaces defined by buildings and landscape;</i> • <i>Improved east-west pedestrian and cycle routes to link the new neighbourhoods together;</i> 	Provision for decentralised energy can help achieve carbon reduction targets. As set out in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan, King George and Goodmayes Hospital has been identified as a decentralised energy opportunity area in the GLAs DeMAP programme, and further analysis through the Decentralised Energy Masterplanning Study (2012) has identified it as one of the most suitable areas of the borough for such network. It is acknowledged that wording in policy LP1B should be updated to refer to viability rather than feasibility.	Amend 8th bullet point of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals policy box to read: <i>"The provision for decentralised energy networks, subject to feasibility-viability. Any provision that is secured on this site must comply with policy LP29 in order to limit impacts on residential amenity."</i>
R01087/10a	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Development to be of the highest quality design, respecting the nature and character of the area;</i> • <i>At Goodmayes development should maximise the opportunity to create a centrepiece for the new neighbourhood with opportunities to enhance the setting of the former mental health asylum;</i> • <i>The provision for decentralised energy networks, subject to feasibility. Any provision that is secured on this site must comply with policy LP29 in order to limit impacts on residential amenity;</i> 	See response to R01087/1-10 above	See response to R01087/1-10.

R01087/10b	Iain Hill Ingleton Wood (NELFT)	26	Policy LP1B	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site should also comply with all other relevant policy requirements of this plan; and • Development of this site should be considered in the context of a Masterplan for the site as a whole . A Planning Brief/ Concept Masterplan will be prepared in consultation with the owners of the sites to ensure that a coordinated approach is taken to the development of the sites and the provision of infrastructure." 	See response to R01087/1-10 above	See response to R01087/1-10 above
R01088/01	Dr C Nutt Save Oakfeid Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34 & LP35	<p>Oakfield should be protected as green belt on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is largely open undeveloped land; • it prevents the merging of Fullwell Cross, Barkingside and New North Road; • it prevents the merging of Barkingside and Hainault; • it was dissected from Hainault Fields by the railway line when it was first designated as green belt; • the Council can meet its London Plan minimum housing target without releasing the site; • it meets other important aims such as the provision of high quality sports facilities and social amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Oakfield from the list of opportunity sites • Remove Oakfield from para 3.7.5 in the Local Plan • Retain LP34 (Managing and Protecting the Borough's Green Belt and Metropolitan Land) but add to implementation "The Council will seek to enhance the accessibility and opportunities on Hainault Plain, in particular at Oakfield" • In LP35 (Protecting and Enhancing Open Spaces) remove Oakfield from paragraph (g) which is inconsistent with and indeed reverses the policies in the previous paragraphs (a) to (f). 	<p>As set out in the Green Belt Assessment (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1), the site does not meet any of the 5 green belt purposes as set out in the NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant proportion of the site comprises of Redbridge Sports Centre, car parking, and pavilions • It is surrounded by development to the north, west and south, so does not prevent the merging of Fullwell Cross, Barkingside and New North Road • The railway line and remaining green belt parcels to the east prevent the merging of Barkingside and Hainault • Population growth means the boroughs development needs have increased significantly since the site was first designated as green belt • London Plan minimum targets (which the Council should seek to exceed given high levels of objectively assessed housing need) cannot be met without Green Belt release. The Green Belt Assessment demonstrates that the site does not meet NPPF green belt tests, whilst the Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates it is a sustainable site to help meet the boroughs development needs, which also includes infrastructure requirements. • Whilst the benefits of the current use of the site are recognised (and policy therefore requires re-provision of existing facilities), such benefits do not form part of the assessment of if land should continue to be protected as green belt. 	No further change required.

R01088/02	Dr C Nutt Save Oakfeid Society	36	3.7.5 LP34 & LP35	<p>Identified potential replacement facilities at Forest Road Recreation Ground and Hainault Recreation Ground do not meet NPPF and Sport England requirements that playing fields should only be built on if they are surplus to requirements, or they are replaced by equivalent or better quality and quantity provision in a suitable location, since:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identified sites are already in use, which indicative layouts do not take account of; • drains/ manholes and flood risk limit scope for new pitches; • significant improvements to site levels is necessary; • Hainault Recreation Ground is an area safeguarded for extraction in the Minerals Local Plan meaning land may not be suitable post extraction; • proposed sites are in a less sustainable location than the existing site, meaning they will be of less community benefit. 		<p>The Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (LBR 2.44.1) (2016) demonstrate that suitable pitch and facility re-provision is feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Playing Pitch Strategy (LBR 2.43) identified significant underuse at proposed sites (15 senior football pitches unused across both sites, and significant scope for increased cricket use at Forest Road). • Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (2017) (LBR 2.44.1) Updated demonstrates how provision of existing facilities can be provided for alongside continued existing use • Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (2017) (LBR 2.44.1) demonstrates how existing site constraints such as drains/ manholes and site levels can be overcome with investment • The Minerals Local Plan (LBR 3.09) identifies a number of potential minerals extraction sites to meet the boroughs minerals apportionment. This includes “Preferred Land of Extraction” sites with proven mineral resources, and other “Minerals Search Areas”, such as Hainault Recreation Ground, that have not been bore-hole tested but are estimated to have aggregate reserves. Any extraction proposals for safeguarded sites will need to meet Policy M4 of the Minerals Local Plan; which includes some scope for safeguarded sites to come forward for other uses prior to extraction where policy tests have been met – i.e. it is demonstrated that the site does not contain a commercially viable minerals resource, or there is an overriding community need for the proposal that outweighs the need for the minerals resource. • Proposed relocation sites are in a sustainable location a short walk from Fairlop tube station and various bus routes. 	No further change required.
R01088/03	Dr C Nutt Save Oakfeid Society	36	Para 3.7.5 LP34 & LP35	Crown covenants preclude development of Oakfield for residential purposes.		Land is owned by London Borough of Redbridge. As such, the Council has statutory powers to appropriate for planning purposes and therefore render any restrictive covenants void. The Council will consider extinguishing these as appropriate after the Local Plan is adopted.	No further change required.
R01088/04	Dr C Nutt Save Oakfeid Society	120	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34 & LP35	Additional residential development at Oakfield will exacerbate poor air quality that already exists as a result of traffic at Fullwell Cross roundabout.		Any development proposals for the site will be required to meet Policy LP24 (Pollution) requirements for an air quality assessment and appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the site is in a sustainable location close to Barkingside town centre and Fairlop Station; which will limit its impact in terms of increases in road traffic.	No further change required.
R01088/05	Dr C Nutt Save Oakfeid Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34 & LP35	There is no evidence that the Council has sought neighbouring boroughs assistance in meeting its housing need.		The Council’s Duty to Co-operate statement sets out in section 5.5 that it has sought neighbouring borough assistance to meet its housing need.	No further change required.
R01089/01	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Policy LP21 is too generic and should be tailored to the local area using evidence from the SFRA and Thames River Basin Management Plan.	The plan should demonstrate how the sequential test has been applied for strategic sites and allocations; based on the findings of the SFRA	Agreed. The Council has produced a Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency, please see document LBR 4.01 The Council’s proposed modifications set out in response to comments R01089/01-27 have all been agreed with the Environment Agency and there are no outstanding matters where the Council and Environment Agency are in disagreement.	Insert to end of paragraph 4.4.2: “Using the findings of the SFRA, a Sequential and Exception Test has been prepared to accompany the Local Plan. This demonstrates that both the strategic sites in Policy LP1, and the proposed opportunity sites listed in Appendix 1 pass these tests where necessary.” Appendix 1 updated (see LBR 1.01) to take account of SFRA and sequential test findings and direct vulnerable uses away from areas of higher flood risk.
R01089/02	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	The plan fails to acknowledge flood risk from tidal sources.		Paragraph 4.5.1 acknowledges that the River Roding (Lower) is affected by the tide from Ilford.	No further change required.
R01089/03	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Greater emphasis to protecting existing communities at risk of flooding should be provided.		Agreed	Amend final sentence of paragraph 4.4.3 to read: “The probability of such events recurring is likely to increase as a result of climate change, making it important to ensure new development minimises risk of flooding; both to occupiers of new buildings, but also to communities already at risk of flooding.”

R01089/04	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Policy should ensure new development is not to the detriment of flood defence		Agreed	Insert new point (h) to LP21 to read: “Resisting developments that would compromise the function of flood defence infrastructure identified in the SFRA.”
R01089/05	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	A commitment should be made in the Local Plan to safeguarding Flood Zone 3b.		Agreed	Insert new point (a) to read: “Safeguarding the functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3b) as land where water can flow to or be stored in times of a flood from development other than water compatible uses or essential infrastructure” And renumber rest of policy accordingly.
R01089/06	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	A stronger policy commitment to reducing flood risk and improving water courses should be made.	Rephrase LP21 opening sentence to read: <i>“The Council will seek to ensure that development does not increase flood risk and implements opportunities to reduce the risk of flooding where possible overall.</i> LP21(a) should be preceded by a statement that development in areas of high flood risk will be avoided. Rephrase LP21(b)(iv) to read <i>“Land identified within the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as being subject to surface water flooding.”</i> Further detail of appropriate flood resilient measures should be provided in LP21(c). LP21(d) should be rephrased to read: <i>“Utilising Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in line with the drainage hierarchy, unless inappropriate, to achieve a greenfield run-off rate where feasible” and further supplemented to acknowledge the benefits of SuDS beyond flood mitigation.”</i> First sentence of LP21(g) should be rephrased to read: <i>“Resisting D evelopment that poses unacceptable risk to the quality of the water catchment, ground water or surface water. will not be permitted.”</i>	Agreed, although regarding proposals for LP21(g), policy seeks to be positively worded.	Rephrase LP21 opening sentence to read: <i>“The Council will seek to ensure that development does not increase flood risk and implements opportunities to reduces the risk of flooding where possible overall.</i> Rephrase first sentence of LP21(a) to read: “Directing vulnerable land uses away from areas of high flood risk. Requiring D evelopment on land that is at risk of flooding as identified in the Council’s SFRA must to comply with the Sequential Test and (where appropriate) the Exceptions Test, as set out in the NPPF and accompany Technical Guidance.” Rephrase LP21(b)(iv) to read <i>“Land identified within the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as being subject to surface water flooding.”</i> Rephrase 21(c) to read: “Requiring incorporating flood resistant and flood resilient measures to be incorporated into the design of new buildings in areas prone to flooding in accordance with the recommendations of the SFRA. Measures used should be informed by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, but could include raising floor levels and power sockets, and the provision of safe access and egress points in the event of a flood.” Rephrase LP21(d) to read: <i>“Utilising Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in line with the drainage hierarchy, unless inappropriate, to achieve a greenfield run-off rate where feasible. Where possible, SuDS should also be designed to deliver other benefits, such as improved water quality, and enhancing biodiversity.”</i> No change to policy LP21(g)
R01089/07	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Support desire to de-culvert rivers where possible, but policy could also encourage financial contributions when unviable on site.	LP21(f) should be rephrased to read: “Opposing Resisting the further culverting of watercourses and building over culverts. All developments on sites with existing culverts should seek opportunities to de-culvert these streams to reduce flood risk and provide conservation benefits; and Where enhancements or deculverting are financially viable but not feasible the Council will seek a financial contribution toward other relevant projects for the enhancement or deculverting of other sections of the waterway.”	Agreed – with further clarification of when financial contributions are likely to be preferable to on-site works added.	Rephrase LP21(f) to read: <i>“Resisting the further culverting of watercourses and building over culverts. All developments on sites with existing culverts should seek opportunities to de-culvert these streams to reduce flood risk and provide conservation benefits; and Where deculverting is financially viable but is impractical, or would be of little environmental value, the Council will seek a financial contribution toward other relevant projects for the enhancement or deculverting of other sections of the waterway;”</i>
R01089/08	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Policy should address water efficiency in addition to focussing on the impacts of flooding.		Water efficiency addressed through modifications to Policy LP32 – see response to R01089/24	No further change required.

R01089/09	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Policy LP21 should use the recommendations in the Thames River Basin Management Plan, and set out how the Council will aid the Environment Agency in completing Water Framework Directive actions.		The implementation of both the River Basin Management Plan and the Water Framework Directive requires actions from multiple partners and stretches beyond the remit of the determination of planning applications; which the Local Plan focusses on. A more explicit reference to partnership wording can however be included in the implementation section of the policy.	Amend first sentence of implementation to read: <i>"The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies to meet the requirements of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and Water Framework Directive, in order to address current and future flooding and water quality issues and minimise risks."</i>
R01089/10	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	It is important to mitigate the impacts of climate change on water supply		Agreed. See response to R01089/24	No further change required
R01089/11	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Paragraph 4.5.1 should be reworded for clarity.	Rephrase paragraph 4.5.1 to read: <i>"The largest river to flow through the borough is the River Roding. and the other main river includes its tributaries and the largely culverted Cran Brook and Seven Kings Water/ Loxford Water. The River Roding (Lower) is affected by the tide from Ilford."</i>	Agreed	Rephrase paragraph 4.5.1 to read: <i>"The largest river to flow through the borough is the River Roding. and the other main rivers includes its tributaries and the largely culverted Cran Brook and Seven Kings Water/ Loxford Water. The River Roding (Lower) is affected by the tide from Ilford."</i>
R01089/12	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	It is unclear what 'events' paragraph 4.5.2 refers to.		Agreed	Rephrase first sentence of paragraph 4.5.2 to read: <i>"Both the NPPF and the London Plan (2015) require the planning process to actively manage development to minimise the likelihood of flooding such events being repeated."</i>
R01089/13	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	A stronger commitment to protecting areas of natural flood storage or providing compensatory storage is needed.	Amend paragraph 4.6.1 to read: <i>"Developing in areas at risk of flooding can increase the risk on and off site. In addition to the increased footprint, being at risk of flooding, buildings and other forms of development can contribute towards flooding in the first place. They can do this by replacing naturally vegetated land with hard, impermeable surfaces can increase the burden on surface watercourses, culverts and drainage systems which can increase flood risk. Developments should aim to maximise floodplain storage through use of green infrastructure and sustainable drainage measures. There should be no net loss in floodplain storage, or in exceptional circumstances, providing adequate off site compensatory storage on a level for level basis. Overland flow routes should not be obstructed. that increase the rate of runoff and by altering the pattern of drainage. Forcing natural water courses into artificial channels and culverts frequently adds to these problems."</i>	Agreed	Amend paragraph 4.6.1 to read: <i>"Developing in areas at risk of flooding can increase the risk on and off site. In addition to the increased footprint, being at risk of flooding, buildings and other forms of development can contribute towards flooding in the first place. They can do this by replacing naturally vegetated land with hard, impermeable surfaces can increase the burden on surface watercourses, culverts and drainage systems which can increase flood risk. Developments should aim to maximise floodplain storage through use of green infrastructure and sustainable drainage measures. There should be no net loss in floodplain storage, or in exceptional circumstances, providing adequate off site compensatory storage on a level for level basis. Overland flow routes should not be obstructed. that increase the rate of runoff and by altering the pattern of drainage. Forcing natural water courses into artificial channels and culverts frequently adds to these problems."</i>
R01089/14	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	81	Policy LP21	Paragraph 4.6.2 should make clear that the use of SuDS is encouraged through the Local Plan.		Agreed	Rephrase first sentence of paragraph 4.6.2 to read <i>"To help combat this, The incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are now being employed: into new developments is an effective way of mitigating flood risk, and as such is encouraged in policy LP21."</i>
R01089/15	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	Plan should list proposals on how to mitigate against current known issues with sewage and drainage infrastructure and how improvements will be made		The capacity of sewerage and drainage network is the responsibility of Thames Water, who have been consulted at all stages of plan production. The Plan seeks to reduce stress on the drainage network by supporting the increased use of SuDS, deculverting of existing water courses, and working with partners to meet the objective of the Water Framework Directive. Nevertheless, a reference to ensuring that sufficient capacity exists to support proposed developments would be beneficial.	Insert additional point (m) to read: <i>"(m) Requiring that major new developments demonstrate through liaison with Thames Water that sufficient capacity exists within the sewerage and drainage network to serve the proposed development, and where necessary, that capacity upgrades will be secured."</i>

R01089/16	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	Policy LP24 and supporting text should consider the impact of diffuse urban pollution on the water catchment in line with the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan		Policy points (e) and (f) together seek to resist developments that will harm the natural environment and impact on the water catchment. Further commitment to meeting the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan could be made in supporting text.	Insert new paragraph 14.17.5 to read: “Water pollution can come from multiple sources, harms the natural environment, and requires a multi-agency approach to tackle. It goes beyond the design of new developments, and matters such as plumbing misconnection of new appliances can have a major impact. The Council will work with the Environment Agency to ensure their technical advice is considered where new development proposals pose a risk to water quality, and the objectives of the Water Framework Directive and Thames River Basin Management Plan are met.”
R01089/17	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	Local Plan should consider the full enclosure of waste operations to improve air quality and safeguard against waste fires	Add to LP24: “All waste storage and treatment activities may only be carried out inside a covered building, enclosed on all sides with access and egress points covered by fast acting doors which default close.”	Proposals for waste storage and treatment activities will need to meet the comprehensive set of criteria included in policy W5 of the East London Waste Plan (2012). Agreed that some further text could be added to Policy LP24.	Insert new policy point (l) to read: “(l) Requiring proposals for waste facilities to adequately mitigate their impact on amenity, air quality, noise and other relevant environmental considerations by fully enclosing the facility.” Insert new paragraph 4.17.5 to read: “In addition to meeting the requirements of the East London Waste Plan (Joint Waste Development Plan 2012), it is important that new waste facilities give full consideration to their potential impact on the local environment. To mitigate against potential adverse impacts, including to safeguard against pollution from waste fires, the Council will seek that waste storage and treatment facilities are fully enclosed.”
R01089/18	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	LP24 (e) and (f) should be expanded to include the issue of misconnections, and wording should be strengthened.	Rephrase LP24(e) to read: “Resisting Development which that poses an unacceptable risk to the quality of the water catchment, groundwater or surface water will be refused.”	Building control, rather than planning, considered better placed to control issues of plumbing misconnections. Wording provided in the local plan seeks to be positively worded.	No further change required.
R01089/19	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	LP24(f) should clarify how runoff pollution will be reduced.	Rephrase LP24(f) to read: “reducing the runoff of particulates and other forms of biological and chemical pollution to waterways through sustainable drainage and pollution prevention methods”	Agreed –with further explanation of potential pollution prevention measures.	Rephrase LP24(f) to read: “reducing the runoff of particulates and other forms of biological and chemical pollution to waterways through sustainable drainage and pollution prevention methods such as incorporation of oil interceptors.”
R01089/20	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	LP24(g) supported		Noted	No further change required.
R01089/21	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	93	Policy LP24	LP24(j) and paragraph 4.17.1 should address the impact of light pollution on water courses	Rephrase LP24(j) to read: “Resisting development involving floodlights or other external forms of lighting (including flashing lights) that would unacceptably impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers at unsocial hours, or be likely to distract drivers on the public highway or be likely to disrupt the ecology of watercourses.”	Agreed, although 4.17.1 and 4.17.3 already refers to impact on wildlife.	Rephrase LP24(j) to read: “Resisting development involving floodlights or other external forms of lighting (including flashing lights) that would unacceptably impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers at unsocial hours, biodiversity, including protected species and the ecology of watercourses, or be likely to distract drivers on the public highway.”
R01089/22	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	101	Policy LP27	The potential adverse impact of tall buildings on the ecology and amenity of a watercourse should be acknowledged	Rephrase LP271(d) to read: “the overshadowing effect the building has on other buildings, public spaces and open spaces and watercourses.”	Agreed	Rephrase LP27 (d) to read: “the overshadowing effect the building has on other buildings, public spaces and open spaces and watercourses.”
R01089/23	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	112	Policy LP32	Support use of property development to reduce demands on natural resources		Noted	No further change required.
R01089/24	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	112	Policy LP32	Commitment to water efficiency should be provided in such a highly stressed area.		The London Plan forms part of the Development Plan and sets out requirements to incorporate water saving measures and designing development to minimise water consumption. A cross reference to the relevant policy could aid clarity.	Insert new policy point 3(d) to read: “minimising water consumption in accordance with the London Plan by incorporating water saving measures and equipment into new developments, and designing residential development so that mains water consumption does not exceed 105 litres per head per day” And renumber rest of policy accordingly

R01089/25	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	112	Policy LP32	Use of BREEAM criteria should be strengthened and clarified, including that BREEAM excellent ratings specifically for water efficiency should be sought		Agreed	<p>Delete LP32 (4) (a) and replace with:</p> <p><i>“Seeking that where viable, domestic refurbishment works requiring planning permission meet BREEAM ‘Excellent’ Domestic Refurbishment Scheme Ratings, including specifically within the water efficiency category.”</i></p> <p>Delete existing LP32 (4) (b) and replace with:</p> <p><i>“Seeking the achievement of BREEAM ‘Excellent’ ratings, including specifically within the water efficiency category, where viable on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the refurbishment of non- domestic buildings</i> • <i>new non-domestic buildings over 1000m2 in size</i> • <i>extensions to non-domestic buildings where the proposed extension is equal to or greater than 50% of the existing building floorspace.”</i>
R01089/26	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	130	Policy LP37	Broad principles of LP37 supported, but specific reference should be included to the findings of the Thames River Basin Management Plan.	<p>Rephrase LP37(c) to read:</p> <p><i>“Protecting and enhancing the borough’s Blue Ribbon network, particularly supporting projects which improve water quality and biodiversity and restore parts- if the River Roding and other watercourses, in accordance with the Thames River Basin Management Plan”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.6 should be supplemented as follows:</p> <p><i>“The River Roding is currently classified as having poor ecological potential and Seven Kings Water is classified as ‘moderate.’ Both watercourses need to achieve good ecological potential by 2027 under the Water Framework Directive. The watercourses are heavily modified by concrete channels and banks (culverting in places) and domestic plumbing misconnections, urban runoff and non-native species all contribute to poor water quality and ecology. It is important developments in the borough do not cause further deterioration and they make a positive contribution to improve and restore the watercourses. In addition, The Council will promote the improvement of water quality in the Blue Ribbon Network in accordance with the Thames River Basin Management Plan, by working in partnership with the Environment Agency and other partners such as the Roding, Beam and Ingrebourne Catchment Partnership.”</i></p>	Agreed.	<p>Rephrase LP37(c) to read:</p> <p><i>“Protecting and enhancing the borough’s Blue Ribbon network, particularly supporting projects which improve water quality and biodiversity and restore parts- if the River Roding and other watercourses, in accordance with the Thames River Basin Management Plan”</i></p> <p>Replace final 2 sentences of paragraph 6.4.6 with new paragraph 6.4.7 to read:</p> <p><i>“The River Roding is currently classified as having poor ecological potential and Seven Kings Water is classified as ‘moderate.’ Both watercourses need to achieve good ecological potential by 2027 under the Water Framework Directive. The watercourses are heavily modified by concrete channels and banks (culverting in places) and domestic plumbing misconnections, urban runoff and non-native species all contribute to poor water quality and ecology. It is important developments in the borough do not cause further deterioration and they make a positive contribution to improve and restore the watercourses. In addition, The Council will promote the improvement of water quality in the Blue Ribbon Network in accordance with the Thames River Basin Management Plan, by working in partnership with the Environment Agency and other partners such as the Roding, Beam and Ingrebourne Catchment Partnership. The London Rivers Action Plan (LRAP) aims to promote river restoration across London through the enhancement of riverside parks and green spaces.”</i></p>
R01089/27	Andy Goymer Environment Agency	133	Policy LP39	Policy LP39 deemed sound		Noted	No further change required.
R01090/01	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	14	Para 1.22.2	References to wildlife, greenspaces and corridors could be strengthened by highlighting nationally and regionally important habitats		Noted	Amend last sentence of paragraph 1.22.2 to read: <i>“Epping Forest is designated as a Natura 2000 site, whilst Hainault Forest Country Park is of regional importance in supporting breeding populations of a range of priority species.”</i>
R01090/02	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	132	Policy LP38	Reference should be made to Nature Conservation SPD and Trees and Landscaping SPD		Noted	<p>Under implementation section of Policy LP38 insert additional point 4 to read:</p> <p><i>“4. Further guidance on protecting trees and enhancing the landscape is provided in the Trees and Landscaping SPD.”</i></p> <p>And additional implementation point 2 under Policy LP39 to read:</p> <p><i>“2. Further guidance on protecting and enhancing the natural environment is provided in the Nature Conservation SPD.”</i></p>

R01090/03	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	LBR 1.11	SA	Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal underplays the biodiversity value of Fairlop Plain, its conclusions that the Plan's policies will have an overall 'positive effect' on the boroughs natural heritage are questioned, and it downplays the cumulative effect of new development on biodiversity.		Noted. Draft Sustainability Appraisal updated to accompany the Submission version of the Local Plan.	No further change (to Local Plan) required.
R01090/04	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	-	-	Open Space Study makes no reference to the boroughs network of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation		All Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation were marked on site audit forms that fall outside the main body of the report, and contributed to overall scores attributed to sites. Final report updated to include a reference to these designations.	No further change required.
R01090/05	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	18	Objectives	Fairlop Plain should be cited alongside Epping Forest and Hainault Forest Country Park as highly valued open spaces in the Vision and Objectives		The Vision and Objectives does not provide an exhaustive list of valued open spaces, as outlines by the use of the words 'such as.'	No further change required.
R01090/06	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	17	Figure 6	Key diagram gives the impression growth overrides protection of open spaces in terms of plan priorities		Key diagram is conceptual and indicates broad areas of strategic growth as it is required to do under the NPPF	No further change required.
R01090/07	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	18	Table 2	Table 2 (Strategic Objectives) should be amended to fully reflect which objectives and policies link to biodiversity		Plan objectives are cross-cutting and several policies will link to multiple objectives. Table 2 aims to provide a broad breakdown showing where policies principally link to key objectives, which correspond with how the remainder of the document is split into sections.	No further change required.
R01090/08	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	26	Policies LP1B, LP1D, LP1E	Area specific policies for the Crossrail Corridor, Barkingside, and South Woodford, should make reference to the need to protect biodiversity constraints, in accordance with Sustainability Appraisal recommendations.		Sustainability Appraisal makes such recommendations specifically to King George and Goodmayes Hospitals and the Ford Sports Ground, on account of the presence of an important ecological corridor on site. Identified opportunity sites in Barkingside and South Woodford do not have such constraints.	Insert new 5th bullet point to King George and Goodmayes Hospital box (page 28) to read: <i>"Enhanced open space provision, including the protection and enhancement of land designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation."</i> And amend 3rd bullet point of Ford Sports Ground box (page 28) to read: <i>"Ensure the appropriate levels of open space provision, including the protection and enhancement of land designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation"</i>
R01090/09	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	20	Policy LP1	LP1 could introduce an overarching commitment to enhanced green infrastructure in Investment and Growth Areas	Insert additional policy point to LP1 to read: <i>"Development proposals for the Investment and Growth Areas should set out how they will contribute to enhanced green infrastructure, in line with Policy LP37, in order to minimise adverse impacts on the natural environment and secure gains for climate resilience and other benefits."</i>	Not considered necessary. Policy LP37 will be applied in relevant cases. Proposed modification gives the impression it would only apply to development in Investment and Growth Areas.	No further change required.
R01090/10	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	49	Policy LP7	References to biodiversity in the supporting text to Policy LP7 are welcomed, although a short rationale of the importance of back gardens would be beneficial.		Paragraphs 3.13.1, 3.13.3, and 3.13.4 all provide rationale of importance of back gardens to biodiversity, local character, and climate change.	No further change required.
R01090/11	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	50	Policy LP8	Policy LP8 supported		Noted.	No further change required.
R01090/12	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	60	Para 3.19.4	Paragraph 3.19.4 could refer to potential impacts of night time uses on habitats and features that support nocturnal species		Night time economy will be focussed in key town centres in urban areas that have limited impact on habitats	No further change required.
R01090/13	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	72	Policy LP18	Policy LP18 supported in principle, although a stronger reference to the role of greenspace and the natural environment would be welcome		Use of term 'high quality environment' is inclusive of the natural environment, and paragraph 3.29.1 specifically recognises the importance of access to open space and nature as part of a high quality environment that enhances residents health and wellbeing.	No further change required.
R01090/14	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	78	Para 4.1.1	Paragraph 4.1.1 should recognise the role of the natural environment in adapting to the impacts of climate change		The reference in paragraph 4.1.1 to environmental protection recognises the importance of the natural environment in addressing climate change.	No further change required.
R01090/15	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	78	Policy LP19	Policy LP19 supported in principle		Noted	No further change required.

R01090/16	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	79	Para 4.3.8	Paragraph 4.3.8 should make clear that trees and green infrastructure play more of a climate change adaptation, rather than mitigation role.		Noted	Rephrase paragraph 4.3.8 to read: "Trees are a prominent feature in the borough and significantly contribute not only to local character but also in terms of climate change adaptation . mitigating against the effects of climate change. In accordance with LP38 new development should seek to incorporate new trees and other vegetation as part of their development to further contribute to the 'greening' and help adapt to of the borough and mitigate against the impacts of climate change. "
R01090/17	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	80	Policy LP21	Policy LP21 supported in principle, but reference could be made to the biodiversity benefits of some measures, and point (f) should refer to 'nature conservation' benefits		Noted. See response to R01089/06	See response to R01089/06 Amend 2nd sentence of point (f) to read: "All new developments on sites with existing culverts should seek opportunities to de-culvert these streams to reduce flood risk and provide nature conservation benefits; and "
R01090/18	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	84	Para 4.6.2	Paragraph 4.6.2 could make specific reference to biodiversity and the objectives of the Water Framework Directive		Noted	Amend final sentence of paragraph 4.6.2 to read: "An added benefit of SuDs is that they can improve the water quality of rivers, lakes and streams (in accordance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive) by removing many pollutants and much of the particulate matters from storm water before it leaves the development site. They can also be multifunctional and provide biodiversity benefits"
R01090/19	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	85	Figure 19	Figure 19 colouration of rivers is feint.		Chosen colours have been picked to avoid any confusion with rail lines or main road network.	No further change required.
R01090/20	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	86	Policy LP22	Policy LP22 supported in principle, although paragraph 4.10.8 should clarify that new cycle networks should not damage biodiversity habitats or disturb sensitive species.		Noted. Policy LP39 set out how biodiversity will be considered through all forms of development.	No further change required.
R01090/21	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	93	Policy LP24	Policy LP24 supported in principle. Part (j) could refer to impact on biodiversity, whilst paragraph 4.17.1 could be more specific about wildlife impacts.		Noted.	Amend 3rd sentence of 4.17.1 to read: "Other adverse impacts include use of unnecessary amounts of energy and in some detrimental effects on road safety or on wildlife such as through disturbance to the ecosystems of nocturnal species"
R01090/22	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	107	Para 5.4.4	Paragraph 5.4.4 supported		Noted	No further change required.
R01090/23	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	112	Policy LP32	Policy LP32 supported in principle, but a stronger reference to biodiversity could be added		Policy includes requirements for new developments to incorporate new green infrastructure and protect existing open space, which will help support biodiversity. Furthermore, policies in the plan should be read in conjunction – Policy LP39 seeks the inclusion of measures to improve biodiversity in new developments	No further change required.
R01090/24	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	115	Policy LP33	Policy LP33 supported in principle, although some reference to natural heritage is recommended, whilst paragraph 5.7.5 could note that a number of heritage assets are also have environmental significance.		Policy seeks to protect designated assets including Conservation Areas such as Claybury Park, Historic Parks and Gardens such as Wanstead Park, and Listed and Locally Buildings and their settings including those at Hainault Forest. Open spaces are also given strong protection through other policies in the plan.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 5.7.5 to read: "These heritage assets are irreplaceable resources that have broad social, cultural, environmental and economic significance, and which are important to this and future generations."
R01090/25	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	120	Policy LP34	Reference to green belt and MOLs importance for biodiversity welcomed, and Policy LP34 supported in principle, although part 2(b) would benefit from reference to nature conservation		Noted	Rephrase point 2(b) to read: "Supporting development which improves access to Green Belt areas for beneficial uses such as outdoor sport and recreation where there is no conflict with protecting the openness and nature conservation value of such land."
R01090/26	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	125	Figure 23	Object to the de-designation of Green Belt sites – housing requirements do not justify exceptional circumstances, and proposed new designations do not compensate for the loss.		Sites proposed for green belt release are based on the findings of successive assessments of their performance against NPPF criteria. Similarly, proposals for new designations relates to how they meet green belt criteria, rather than a quantitative replacement as compensation for de-designated sites.	No further change required.
R01090/27	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	123	Figure 22	Site G11B as shown on figure 22 is a Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation and forms part of the All London Green Grid.		Noted. Site is proposed for green belt release based on the findings of successive assessments of its performance against NPPF criteria. It retains its designation as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, as shown on the Policies Map.	No further change required.
R01090/28	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	124	Policy LP35	Broad thrust of Policy LP35 supported, but it should also include specific references to biodiversity and green infrastructure.		Policies should not be read in isolation. Paragraph 6.2.2 makes clear that open spaces provide multiple roles and benefits.	No further change required.
R01090/29	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	124	Paras 6.2.2 - 6.2.5	Paragraph 6.2.2 could include stronger references to biodiversity, whilst paragraphs 6.2.3-6.2.5 are recreation focussed.		Paragraph 6.2.2 makes clear that open spaces provide multiple roles and benefits that it is not considered necessary to reiterate through subsequent paragraphs. Paragraph could benefit from some re-wording and improved cross referencing.	Rephrase penultimate sentence of paragraph 6.2.2 to read: "The borough's open spaces include provide habitats and areas of biodiversity value (see LP39), and helping to control and manage flood risk and mitigate the risk of climate change."

R01090/30	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	125	Figure 23	Figure 23 does not show any Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.		Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation are shown on Policies Map.	No further change required.
R01090/31	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	129	Policy LP36	Policy LP36 supported, though it would benefit from biodiversity references and noting that some productive land in the green belt is proposed to be lost.		Proposed green belt release sites do not include any allotments. Policy wording sets out how planning applications will be judged – supporting text provides justification; including recognition of contribution towards biodiversity.	No further change required.
R01090/32	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	133	Policy LP39	Last line of paragraph 6.3.1 should also refer to Policy LP39		Agreed	Amend last sentence of paragraph 6.3.1 to read: “Such spaces also contribute to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity (See LP37 - and LP389)”
R01090/33	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	130	Policy LP37	Policy LP37 supported in principle, but recommend this be the overarching policy from which others in the chapter follow, and further subdivision of policies on green infrastructure and the blue ribbon network recommended.		Policies in the plan cover several cross-cutting themes and should be read in conjunction. All link to the overall vision and objectives for the borough as set out in section 2 of the document; which specifically includes protecting and enhancing assets.	No further change required.
R01090/34	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	130	Para 6.4.1	Paragraph 6.4.1 could better align with London Plan definition of green infrastructure by including reference to wildlife habitats. Green belt, SuDs etc.		Noted.	Amend paragraph 6.4.1 to read: “The green infrastructure network is a multi-functional resource that includes a range of types number of open spaces including the green belt and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, parks, paths, walkways, SuDS features, and other environmental features such as the Blue Ribbon Network. It The green infrastructure network links places both within and beyond the borough and encourages walking, cycling and access to nature whilst also providing biodiversity benefits. Green infrastructure therefore plays a vital role in improving people’s quality of life.”
R01090/35	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	131	Para 6.4.6	Paragraph 6.4.6 doesn’t reference the Water Framework Directive.		References within the paragraph to flood and surface water management functions, and improvements to water quality, are consistent with the aims of the Water Framework Directive.	No change required.
R01090/36	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	132	Policy LP38	Policy LP38 supported in principle, but could benefit from references to broader benefits such as climate change adaptation, biodiversity etc. Also the cross reference to LP38 in paragraph 6.5.1 is inaccurate.		Policy should be read alongside supporting text. Paragraph 6.5.1 specifically refers to benefits such as promoting biodiversity and mitigating climate change.	Amend last sentence of paragraph 6.5.1 to read: “The Council recognises the role that trees play as part role of the borough’s green infrastructure (see LP36), providing scenic amenity, local environmental quality, provide local character, promoting biodiversity (see LP389) and mitigating climate change and air pollution (see LP18).”
R01090/37	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	133	Policy LP39	Policy LP39 supported in principle, but has incorrectly categorised some sites, and fails to clearly define ‘biodiversity sites’	Replace point (a) and (b) of policy as follows, and renumber subsequent points accordingly: “On Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation development proposals should: a) give the highest protection to sites with existing or proposed international designations (e.g. Epping Forest SAC) and national designations (SSSIs, e.g. parts of Epping Forest, Wanstead Flats and Hainault Forest) in line with the relevant EU and UK guidance and regulations b) give strong protection to sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMIs, e.g. Epping Forest, Hainault Forest and Country Park). These are sites jointly identified by the Mayor and boroughs as having strategic nature conservation importance. c) Give sites of Borough and Local Importance for Nature Conservation (e.g. Seven Kings Water) the level of protection commensurate with their importance.”	Incorrect categorisation of some sites, and lack of clarity of meaning of “biodiversity sites” noted. However, proposed wording includes the omission of text supported by the Habitats Regulation Assessment regarding Epping Forest SAC, and also appears to seek a high level of protection for undesignated sites through the use of the term “existing or proposed”.	Amend policy point 1b to read: “b) Protecting designated international, national and local sites of nature conservation importance including Sites of Special Scientific Interest covering parts of Epping Forest, Wanstead Flats and Hainault Forest and all Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation as identified on the Policies Map Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMIs) covering the River Roding and Seven Kings Water Corridors;” Amend policy point 1c to read: “c) Promoting the qualitative enhancement of all sites of biodiversity value sites, (including the Blue Ribbon Network, designated SSSIs, SACs, SINCs, and other sites with protected and priority species), by supporting proposals that improve access, connectivity and the creation of new habitats throughout the borough. Measures include - by maintaining trees, native vegetation, and improving and restoring ation of open spaces and green infrastructure providing new areas of such vegetation for the benefit of wildlife; and”
R01090/38	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	133	Policy LP39	Policy LP39 should reference protected species, the Biodiversity Action Plan, priority species and habitats, and the boroughs Nature Conservation SPD.		Noted. See response to R01090/37 regarding reference to protected and priority species and R01090/02 regarding reference to Nature Conservation SPD.	Under Policy LP39 amend point 1d to read: “Working with partners and local conservation groups to improve conditions for biodiversity in the borough in accordance with the Biodiversity Action Plan.”

R01090/39	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	129	Para 6.6.3	Paragraph 6.6.3 welcomed, but should reference the complete hierarchy of SINC sites, and Seven Kings Water should be referred to as a Site of Borough Importance rather than Metropolitan Importance.		Noted.	Amend first two sentences of paragraph 6.6.3 to read: <i>"Other important sites include Sites of Special Scientific Interest covering parts of Epping Forest, Wanstead Flats and Hainault Forest. Sites of Importance for Metropolitan Nature Conservation include several sub categories that reflects their value and how they were identified. In total there are 35 SINC sites in the borough, which are shown on the Policies Map and listed in Appendix 5. - include the River Roding and Seven Kings Water."</i> Insert new Appendix 5 to read as follows, and renumber subsequent appendices accordingly: "Appendix 5 – Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation <u>Sites of Metropolitan Importance</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Epping Forest • Hainault Forest • Epping Forest South • River Roding north of the Liverpool Street to Southend Railway • Claybury Wood <u>Sites of Borough Importance (Grade 1)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claybury Park Grassland • Fairlop Plain and Fairlop Water • Hainault Forest Country Park and Golf Course • Roding Valley Park • Hainault Lodge Local Nature Reserve • Hargreaves Scout Camp, Seven Kings Water and Goodmayes Hospital • River Roding South of Liverpool Street to Southend Railway
R01090/39a	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	129	Para 6.6.3	As above		As above	<u>Sites of Borough Importance (Grade 2)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Park • Valentines Park • Woodford Bridge Green Pond • Central Line Railsides • Goodmayes Park • Ilford to Chadwell Heath rail sides • Alders Brook at Ilford Golf Course • Woodford Green and Ponds • The Exchange Lands • Wanstead War Memorial (Tarzy Wood) • Whiskers Island • Trinity High School Pond • Loxford Water <u>Sites of Local Importance</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ilford Cemetery and St. Mary's Churchyard • Clayhall Park • Cocked Hat Plantation (Hurstleigh Gardens Open Space) • Loxford Park • The Glade, Woodford Bridge • Newbury Park War Memorial Garden • West Wood Recreation Ground • Well Brook at Navestock Crescent Recreation Ground • Gardens of Peace • Redbridge Recreation Ground"
R01090/40	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	135	Para 6.6.4	Commitment to resisting inappropriate development should extend to all SINC sites, and make clear how this will be commensurate with their biodiversity value. A full list/ maps of all SINC sites should be provided, and a commitment made to regular reviews of the network. The different role of LNRs should also be clarified.		Noted. As worded in paragraph 6.6.4 any development harmful to all SINC sub categories will be resisted. All SINC sites are shown on the Policies Map and it is proposed to insert an additional appendix listing them. Timing of reviews of the network will be resource dependent.	Amend paragraph 6.6.4 to read: <i>"The Council will resist any inappropriate and harmful development on SINC sites and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site. In such circumstances, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken and where practicable and reasonable, additional nature conservation space must be provided. There is only one LNR in the borough (Hainault Lodge), which is also designated as a SINC."</i>
R01090/41	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	135	Para 6.6.6	Paragraph 6.6.6 supported.		Noted.	No change required.
R01090/42	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	131	Para 6.4.5	Areas of deficiency in access to nature are not identified.		Noted.	Amend 6.4.5 insert: "This will be particularly important given that some parts of the borough are currently deficient in access to open space and nature (see figures 24 and 25)." Insert new figure 25: Areas of Deficiency for Nature (and renumber subsequent figures accordingly)

R01090/43	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	135	Policy LP40	Policy LP40 supported, though no reference included to biodiversity, and the cross reference in paragraph 6.7.1 should be to Policy LP39		Policy should be read alongside supporting text; paragraph 6.7.1 recognises the biodiversity benefits of such spaces	Amend last sentence of paragraph 6.7.1 to read: <i>"They also contribute to and promote biodiversity (LP3 6 9)."</i>
R01090/44	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	138	Policy LP41	Policy LP41 supported, though paragraphs 7.2 could reference biodiversity offsetting		Policy part (as) sets out in generic terms that planning contributions will be sought to mitigate impacts of development, whilst paragraph 7.2.4 sets out broad areas that CIL can be collected for, including open space.	No further change required.
R01090/45	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	141	Para 7.9	Under paragraph 7.9, it is recommended that the Nature Conservation SPD is reviewed and updated.		Noted. Paragraph 7.9.1 refers to the future preparation of SPDs, which could include refreshing existing such documents, dependent on priorities and resources.	No further change required.
R01090/46	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	144	Para 7.10.1	Under paragraph 7.10.1, reference to the review of the SINC network is recommended		Paragraph 7.10.1 refers to the monitoring of the effectiveness of policies in the plan and sets out a commitment to ensuring key evidence, which includes those related to environmental designations, are still relevant.	No further change required.
R01090/47	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	-	-	There is no map that show designations such as SINC, SAC and SSSIs		SINC and SSSI designations are included on the Policies Map. SAC designations to be added.	Update Policies Map to show SAC designation.
R01090/48	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	178	Appendix 9 - Glossary	Definitions of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and Green Infrastructure should be added to the glossary	Add to the glossary: <i>"Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) are areas designated for their importance for wildlife to help inform planning decisions and management. In London there are three grades of SINC:</i> • <i>Sites of Metropolitan Importance – important at a London-wide scale, sites which contain the best examples of London's habitats, have particularly rare species or have particular significance in heavily built up areas</i> • <i>Sites of Borough Importance – important on a borough perspective, divided into two grades on the basis of their quality</i>	Agreed, although with some further editing of SINC definition.	Additional terms to the glossary to read as follows: <i>"Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) are areas designated for their importance for wildlife to help inform planning decisions and management. In London SINCs are designated as one of a hierarchy of types: Sites of Metropolitan Importance, Sites of Borough Importances (grade 1 and 2), and Sites of Local Importance." Green Infrastructure – A network of green spaces – and features such as street trees and green roofs – that is planned, designed and managed to provide a range of benefits, including: recreation and amenity, healthy living, reducing flooding, improving air quality, cooling the urban environment, encouraging walking and cycling, and enhancing biodiversity and ecological resilience."</i>
R01090/48a	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	178	Appendix 9 - Glossary	As above	• <i>Sites of Local Importance – of particular value to people nearby, such as residents or schools</i> <i>Green Infrastructure – A network of green spaces – and features such as street trees and green roofs – that is planned, designed and managed to provide a range of benefits, including: recreation and amenity, healthy living, reducing flooding, improving air quality, cooling the urban environment, encouraging walking and cycling, and enhancing biodiversity and ecological resilience."</i>	As above	As above
R01090/49	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	-	-	Object to proposal for King George and Goodmayes Hospital and the Ford Sports Ground on the basis that they fail to reference biodiversity and SINC designations		See response to R01090/08 above	No further change required.
R01090/50	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	153	Site 99	Billet Road (opportunity site 99) meets green belt criteria and should be retained		The Green Belt Assessments (2016 and 2017) found the site to perform poorly against NPPF green belt criteria and thus recommended its release.	No further change required.
R01090/51	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	36	Para 3.6.5	Object to proposals for Oakfield, which forms green belt and is identified as part of the All London Green Grid.		See response to R01088/01 regarding removal of green belt designation. As set out in Oakfield box of Policy LP1B, enhanced open space provision on site will be sought through a Masterplanned approach.	No further change required.

R01090/52	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	-	-	Object to land at Aldborough Hatch being identified for extraction.		Aldborough Hatch already designated as such in the Adopted Minerals Plan. Policy in that document includes requirements for comprehensive nature conservation appraisals and strategy as part of any proposal (Minerals Plan Policy E7)	No further change required.
R01090/53	Mathew Frith London Wildlife Trust	map	Policies Map	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation should be shown on the Policies Map, plus an additional map showing them could be added to the document.		Policies Map does identify Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, and it is proposed to include a list of these designations as an additional Appendix.	No further change required.
R01091/01	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	123	Figure 22	Fully support proposed removal of King George Hospital from the Green Belt and its proposed allocation for housing led development		Support noted	No further change required.
R01091/02	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	46	Policy LP5	Conceptual Masterplanning Study, taking into account constraints including the SINC designation, indicates a development capacity of circa 190 dwellings on land surplus to health requirements		Identified capacity does not appear to have fully accounted for the need for a dwelling mix compliant with Policy LP5, or operational parking requirements of the hospital	No further change required.
R01091/03	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	26	Policy LP1B	Vision for Crossrail Corridor Investment Area fully supported		Support noted	No further change required.
R01091/04	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	LBR 2.41	Green Belt Review	Conclusions of 2016 Green Belt Assessment regarding the site fully supported		Noted	No further change required.
R01091/05	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	26	LP1B	Site is in a sustainable location close to existing services, employment, schools, and public transport connections, and sustainability will be enhanced with the arrival of Crossrail		Noted	No further change required.
R01091/06	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	20	Policy LP1	Policy LP1 should not place an artificial cap of 500 dwellings on the capacity of the site, when it cannot meet its OAN, and capacity work indicates King George site can provide 190 dwellings and Goodmayes a further 500		See response to R01087/02	No further change required.
R01091/07	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	26	LP1B	As Goodmayes Hospital is owned by a separate NHS Trust, provision should be made for the sites to come forward for development independent of one another, providing a coordinated approach is taken to their development. A single detailed masterplan that makes the development of one site reliant on the other is not supported, and could delay delivery		See response to R01087/04	No further change required.
R01091/08	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	26	Policy LP1B	Requirements in Policy LP1B for a new primary and secondary school on site are inconsistent with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which suggests only a secondary school is needed. Further consideration of funding requirements, delivery mechanisms, and viability implications of education provision is also required		See responses to R01087/06 and R01087/07 above	No further change required.
R01091/09	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (University Hospitals))	26	Policy LP1B	It is unclear why Policy LP1B requires a decentralised energy network when this is not being imposed on other sites in the Crossrail Corridor, when other sites in the plan offer larger scale development on less constrained sites in single ownership.		See response to R01087/10 above	No further change required.

R01091/10	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (university Hospitals)	26	Policy LP1B	As above.	<p>Rephrase LP1B on King George and Goodmayes Hospitals to read: <i>"The Council expects a comprehensive coordinated housing-led mixed-use developments to come forward at King George and Goodmayes Hospitals in accordance with the following criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in and around King George and Goodmayes Hospitals will be developed to provide around at least 500 high quality new homes (including affordable); • Maximising densities compatible with local context, sustainable design principles and public transport capacity, in line with the Density Matrix of the London Plan; • On site provision for a new primary and secondary school; • A permeable design – a walkable permeable design – a walkable neighbourhoods with routes and spaces defined by buildings and landscape; • Improved east-west pedestrian and cycle routes to link the new neighbourhoods together; • Development to be of the highest quality design, respecting the nature and character of the area; 	See response to R01091/1-10 above	No further change required.
R01091/10a	Sam Metson Bidwells (Barking, Havering & Redbridge (university Hospitals)	26	Policy LP1B	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Goodmayes development should maximise the opportunity to create a centrepiece for the new neighbourhood with opportunities to enhance the setting of the former mental health asylum; • The provision for decentralised energy networks, subject to feasibility. Any provision that is secured on this site must comply with policy LP29 in order to limit impacts on residential amenity; • Development of this site should also comply with all other relevant policy requirements of this plan; and • Development of this site should be considered in the context of a Masterplan for the site as a whole . A Planning Brief will be prepared in consultation with the owners of the two sites to ensure that a coordinated approach is taken to their development and the provision of education and other infrastructure." 	As above	As above
R01092/01	Andy MacRae Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5	Council have a poor track record of maintaining and improving sports facilities – the high quality of existing pitches at Oakfield is due to volunteer's efforts.	Oakfield should be removed as an opportunity site and development directed to brownfield land.	Sufficient brownfield land does not exist in the borough to meet its identified housing and infrastructure needs. The Hainault Recreation and Forest Road Feasibility Study (2016) demonstrate that suitable pitch and facility re-provision is feasible, and sets out ongoing maintenance requirements.	No further change required.

R01093/01	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	37	Policy LP2	Policy LP2 should be amended to set out a commitment to meeting OAHN as set out in the NE London SHMA	Meeting the Objectively Assessed Housing Need identified in the North East London SHMA cannot be achieved whilst meeting the NPPFs requirements for sustainable development. The Council therefore proposes to exceed the minimum London Plan housing targets to help close the gap on housing need, without compromising the purpose of the green belt, by only releasing for development green belt sites that do not meet NPPF tests.	No further change required.
R01093/02	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	37	LP2	Plan fails to conclusively demonstrate that London Plan minimum housing targets can be met – past delivery has been poor, infrastructure and land ownership issues are likely to continue to slow down delivery, and it is unclear what past delivery of windfall sites has been.	Appendix 1 of the plan lists opportunity sites offering capacity to exceed London Plan minimum housing targets, whilst accompanying Masterplans for strategic sites also demonstrates their deliverability taken into account site constraints. The introduction of Crossrail is anticipated to increase the attractiveness of the borough to developers, whilst Ilford's Housing Zone status will also see targeted measures to increase housing delivery.	No further change required.
R01093/03	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	-	-	Time period for the plan should be extended to 20yrs	Paragraph 157 of the NPPF sets out a preference for plans with a 15 year time horizon	No further change required.
R01093/04	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	120	LP34	Development of the site will have negligible impact on the 5 purposes of the Green Belt on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it relates more to the urban area than the countryside • the current weak arbitrary boundary can be strengthened through development that will help prevent sprawl and encroachment to the countryside to the south • the site does not prevent neighbouring towns merging as it does not lie between two principle settlements • there is no strong relationship between the site and nearby conservation areas • land will become redundant when the facility is closed in the near future and removal of Green Belt designation will enable comprehensive redevelopment 	As set out in the Green Belt Assessment, the site has a strong physical link to land in parcel GB12, and therefore assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Assessment has confirmed the existing boundary does not relate well to physically defined features, and as such should be redrawn to access the development footprint of existing buildings.	Amend green belt boundary on Policies Map and figures 22 and 23 to align with recommendations of Green Belt Assessment.
R01093/05	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	120	LP34	The site forms part of the urban area, has no environmental and heritage constraints, is in single ownership, and the Green Belt boundary currently has a poorly defined edge.	See response to R01093/04 above	See response to R01093/04 above.
R01093/06	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	157	Sites 156, 209, 216	Opportunity sites 156, 209, and 216 are all in less sustainable locations but proposed for removal from the Green Belt	None of these sites are proposed for removal from the Green Belt, as shown by Figure 22.	No further change required.
R01093/07	Helen Donnelly DNS - Planning (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)	86	LP22	Site is in a sustainable location close to a range of services and well served by main bus routes	The site is retained as green belt in the plan on account of its performance against NPPF green belt tests.	No further change required.
R01094/01	Gami Rajesh TFL	174	Appendix 7	Appendix 7 residential parking standards is unclear in that it does not specify standards for PTALs 2-5	To bring the Local Plan policy in line with the Minor Alterations of the London Plan (2016). The Council will apply London Plan standards for residential development unless the site falls within PTAL 0-1 and PTAL 6. Appendix 7 to be amended accordingly.	See response to R01213/26
R01094/02	Gami Rajesh TFL	91	Para 4.13.3	Justification should be provided for any minimum parking standards, with reference to the London Plan and the flexibility it offers for outer London boroughs as introduced by the MALP	Noted	Insert at end of paragraph 4.13.3: <u>"This is consistent with the flexibility offered in the London Plan for Outer London Boroughs to provide minimum standards in low PTAL areas to avoid generating unacceptable pressure for on-street parking."</u>
R01095/01	Edward Lennard Old Parkonians Association	36	Para 3.7.5	The quality of pitches at Oakfield are unparalleled by anything else in the borough, and there are therefore concerns that there are any sites in the borough that would provide suitable replacement.	Noted. Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (2017) (LBR 2.44.1) demonstrate that suitable pitch and facility re-provision is feasible, and sets out ongoing maintenance requirements.	No further change required.

R01095/02	Edward Lennard Old Parkonians Association	36	Para 3.7.5	Whilst identified potential replacement sites at Hainault Recreation Ground and Forest Road have adequate space to provide like for like replacement, there are significant concerns about the quality of the pitches and money required for upgrading facilities to match current quality.		Seen response to R01095/02 above.	See response to R01095/02 above
R01095/03	Edward Lennard Old Parkonians Association	-	-	Even if Old Parkonians Association is relocated the Council's view that Oakfield no longer serves green belt purposes and should be redeveloped is not necessarily supported.		Noted.	No further change required
R01095/04	Edward Lennard Old Parkonians Association	-	-	The Local Plan can neither be supported nor denounced until firm relocation options of the clubs facilities are proposed.		Noted.	No further change required
R01096	Mike Condon London Wildlife Trust	-	-	See comments R01090/01-53	See comments R01090/01-53	See responses to R01090/01-53	See responses to R01090/01-53
R01097/01	Victoria Kirkham Natural England	-	-	The Local Plan does not pose any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose		Noted	No further change required
R01098/01	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	37	Policy LP2	The Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been put forward as justification for exceptional circumstances for removing green belt designations including at land south of Billet Road. However, section 2 of the plan refers to the delivery of 18,500 new homes, and policy LP2 to 16,845; rather than the 31,977 identified from the SHMA. Furthermore, the EU referendum results causes uncertainty regarding actual housing need.		The Council has a minimum London Plan target of 16,845 new homes over the plan period, which cannot be met in a sustainable manner without green belt release. The Outer North East London SHMA (LBR 2.01) identifies a significantly higher objectively assessed housing need for the borough, and as such the Local Plan seeks to exceed the London Plan minimum target to close the gap on objectively assessed need. There is no clear evidence to suggest that EU referendum results will substantially reduce levels of housing need in the borough.	No further change required.
R01098/02	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	LBR 2.41	Green Belt Review	The January 2016 Draft Green Belt Review is flawed in suggesting the NPPF is different in its approach to Green Belt than PPG2.		Addendum to the Draft Green Belt Study has been produced in support of the Local Plan; which focusses on assessment of parcels against the 5 green belt purposes carried over from PPG2.	No further change required.
R01098/03	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	LBR 2.41	Green Belt Review	Findings in the January 2016 Green Belt Review conflict with earlier reviews. Aerial photos show clear connectivity with Fairlop Plain, and the character of the area has remained unchanged since it was first designated as Green Belt.		Further analysis of the Green Belts performance against NPPF tests has been carried out in support of the Submission version of the Local Plan. This identifies that Hainault House Stables and Red House Farm reduce the connection to Fairlop Plain, whilst development along the majority of Billet Road further isolates the site.	No further change required.
R01098/04	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	86	Policy LP22	The High Level Transport Assessment that supports the proposed allocation of Billet Road appears to have not taken into account actual peak flow rates into the road system (which is believed to be operating at near capacity), or the impact of potential developments of King George and Goodmayes Hospital. Public transport accessibility to Billet Road is poor, and local roads are considered unsafe for cycling.		The Local Plan is also supported by a borough wide transport study (LBR 2.51) that takes into account the cumulative impact of all planned growth on the highway network and has been informed by traffic counts of key junctions and link roads. More detailed scheme specific analysis and mitigation measures will be required through the planning application process through the application of Policy LP22. As set out in section 2.3.1 of the High Level Transport Study (LBR 2.51), the site is served by a variety of cycle routes, including 'Quieter Routes' as recommended by other cyclists as part of TfL's Cycle Route Map.	No further change required.
R01098/05	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	93	Policy LP24	The Billet Road High Level Transport Study Air Quality Report is based totally on modelling and includes no actual air quality readings in the vicinity of Billet Road, Hainault Road and the A12 junction		Air quality monitoring has used data from available monitoring stations as set out in section 3.2 of The Billet Road High Level Transport Air Quality Report (LBR 2.63), and supplemented with background data from DEFRA. As set out in the recommendation, more detailed assessment will be required as part of any planning application for the site to reflect detailed layouts. Policy LP24 of the Local Plan sets out requirements for Air Quality Assessments in appropriate cases.	No further change required.

R01098/06	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	26	Policy LP1B	Land south of Billet Road, whilst not designated as a SINC, is listed as one of the boroughs "green corridors" and part of the "All London Green Grid". It is of biodiversity value given the presence birdlife and protected species.		Green corridors designation from the Local Development Framework has not been carried forward into the Local Plan, which uses a single "open space" designation for multiple open space typologies such as green corridors, playing fields, parks etc. See response to R01098/7 regarding All London Green Grid. In terms of biodiversity value, any proposals will need to meet the requirements of Policy LP39, which includes provision for protected species as set out through modification in response to R01090/37.	No further change required.
R01098/07	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	120	Policies LP34, LP36c, LP37, LP39	Removing land at GB14c from its Green Belt designation will be contrary to NPPF, London Plan, and plan policies LP34, LP36c, LP37, and LP39		The Council's high level of housing need, and supporting infrastructure requirements, are considered exceptional circumstances to amend the borough's green belt in accordance with NPPF requirements (which the London Plan signposts to). Policy LP34 applies to land designated as Green Belt or MOL in the Local Plan, which the site is not. It is acknowledged that LP36 requires clarification in terms of the protection of agricultural land. Policy LP37 seeks to enhance the green infrastructure network, including areas of regional significance such as Fairlop Waters Country Park and Hainault Country Park. Any development of Billet Road will be required to secure enhanced open space provision on site, in accordance with the recommendations of the Open Space Study. It is recognised that the Policy Box for Billet Road in LP1 should be updated to make this clear. Any development of the site would be required to meet requirements of Policy LP38, which as proposed for modifying in response to R01090/37, would include provision for biodiversity interests on site.	Amend LP36(c) to read: "Protecting agricultural land in the borough, unless there are overriding community benefits to the proposal" Insert additional 3rd bullet point to Land at Billet Road Policy Box (LP1) to read: "Enhanced open space provision"
R01098/08	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	-	-	Inclusion of 'other green belt sites' in the Sustainability Appraisal appears to be to improve the score of the plan's proposed development sites. A high score against biodiversity criteria of developing extra green belt (likely to be designated as SINC) is questionable, whilst traffic and transport scoring does not make sense.		Noted. An updated Sustainability Appraisal accompanies the submission version of the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R01098/09	Chris Gannaway Aldborough Hatch Defence Association	26	Policy LP1B	Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to land south of Billet Road	Delete Policy LP1B and remove all references in the Plan to land south of Billet Road	The NPPF requires that "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area". The Crossrail Corridor, including land south of Billet Road, has been identified as an area with significant potential to help meet the borough's development needs (including housing and infrastructure needs), capitalising on the opportunity offered by Crossrail. Land South of Billet Road has been determined for perform poorly against NPPF Green Belt tests through the latest Green Belt Assessment, and performs well through the supporting Sustainability Appraisal.	No further change required.
R01099/01	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	12	Paras 1.18.2, 1.19.2	Support references in paragraph 1.18.2 to delivery of appropriate social and community infrastructure being a major priority, and in 1.19.2 to increasing pressure on school places		Support noted	No further change required
R01099/02	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	68	LP17	Support the principle of safeguarding land for provision of new schools and for the siting of schools within the allocated sites in locations which promote sustainable travel.		Support noted	No further change required

R01099/03	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	20	Policy LP1	Welcome support in the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan for schools as necessary infrastructure required for sustainable growth, and provision of indicative locations for new schools on the key diagram and within Policies LP1-LP1E. It is recommended that mechanisms for identifying and securing sites, particularly outside of comprehensive mixed use schemes, should be set out in the Local Plan.		Support noted. LP1 sets out requirements for new schools on strategic sites, with preferred areas identified within conceptual masterplans for these sites. Policies LP1 and LP17 both refer to the use of CIL and developer contributions towards new infrastructure, whilst proposed amendments to LP17 set out in R01099/05 below specifically refer to partnership working with the Education Funding Authority. Further modifications to Appendices 1 and 2 as set out in (LBR 1.01.1 and LBR 1.01.2) identify additional sites to meet future education need, whilst further modifications to LP17 suggested to enhance cross-referencing.	Amend LP17 part (e) to read: <i>“Supporting and facilitating the expansion of existing schools and health facilities where a clear need can be demonstrated, in addition to the provision of new and expanded facilities on sites identified in Appendix 2 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan;”</i>
R01099/04	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	68	Policy LP17, Para 1.8	The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides comprehensive and useful background information on borough school requirements, and Policy LP17 of the Local Plan is supported.		Noted.	No further change required.
R01099/05	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	68	Policy LP17, Para 1.8	A reference to the EFA should be included in the implementation section of Policy LP17, and within the list of stakeholders in paragraph 1.8 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		Agreed.	Rephrase final sentence point 2 of implementation under Policy LP17 to read: <i>“External agencies include (but are not limited to) the NHS, Education Funding Authority, TfL, Metropolitan Police, Thames Water, National Grid, and Highways Agency, and Redbridge Clinical Commissioning Group”</i> Infrastructure Delivery Plan updated accordingly
R01099/06	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	20	Policy LP1	All proposals for education provision on Policy LP1 supported. In particular welcome the opportunity to work closely with LB Redbridge to investigate the feasibility of opening a free school at land in/ around King George and Goodmayes Hospital.		Support noted.	No further change required.
R01099/07	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	162	Appendix 2	Request the following sites are identified in the Local Plan as being suitable for education use: • Land at Roding Lane South • Port of London Authority Sports Ground • Former Harris Gibson Department Store, 193-207 High Road, Ilford		Identified sites discounted on the following basis: • Land at Roding Lane South, in addition to fulfilling green belt purposes, is designated as SINC, and falls within flood zone 3a; • Existing sports clubs within the borough have recently been relocated to the Port of London Authority Sports Ground; • New proposals for the redevelopment of the Harrison Gibson Department store for a mixed use scheme, excluding a school, have already reached an advanced stage.	No further change required.
R01099/08	Samantha Powell Education Funding Agency	86	Policy LP22	Policy LP22 supported in terms of helping encourage a reduction in the number of car journeys to and from new schools		Noted	No further change required.
R01100/01	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	-	-	Residents, community groups and organisations in Ilford South have not been sufficiently consulted and engaged on the development of the draft Local Plan until the latter stages in 2016. The consultations undertaken in 2011, 2013 and 2014 were inadequate - poorly publicised and unclear making responding difficult. They were not undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. The 2014 consultation did not properly consider alternatives to intensification of Ilford South, and has assumed it to be a ‘preferred’ option for locating significant numbers of new housing in the borough. The draft Local Plan gives a lack of consideration to the views of residents in Ilford South.	Further consultation should be undertaken to consider the impact of locating significant housing numbers in South Ilford.	The Council has undertaken each stage of consultation in accordance with the Statutory Regulations as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012), and Statement of Community Involvement (2006). The Council’s Consultation Statement (2016) sets out how, who and when the Council has consulted during the development of the draft Local Plan.	No further change required.

R01100/02	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	22	LP1A	<p>The vision as set out in the draft Local Plan is not 'clear', 'bland' and 'vague'. It prioritises housing delivery over other key considerations and ignores many other issues facing the borough and Ilford South.</p> <p>The vision and objectives should ensure affordable housing is linked to average incomes of local residents.</p> <p>The vision and objectives do not consider the impact of population density. There is a strong correlation between high population density and high levels of deprivation. Further population growth will further exacerbate the problems of high deprivation which already exist in the borough and Ilford South.</p> <p>The vision does not address the issues of the proliferation of illegal conversions and HMOs in Ilford South due to inward migration.</p> <p>The vision does not address the problems of 'homelessness' in the borough.</p> <p>The vision is contradictory by stating that Investment and Growth Areas are locations with the capacity to deliver a range of homes, jobs and infrastructure. Ilford South cannot accommodate the proposed level of development.</p> <p>Utilising empty properties to meet housing need. Expanding purchase and repair proprieties scheme.</p>	<p>Reducing the number of units proposed in Ilford South. Consider alternative locations of new homes and seeking neighbouring authorities to assisting in meeting housing need.</p> <p>Using Council owned land to build truly affordable housing in the borough.</p> <p>Increase the number of houses built in the borough over the number of flats.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan sets out ambitious proposals for the growth and regeneration of the borough. The draft Local Plan addresses a wide range of issues as can be seen from the 41 other individual planning policies. A significant housing need has been identified in the borough which the draft Local Plan seeks to urgently address.</p> <p>Ilford is designated as a Metropolitan town centre and Opportunity Area in the London Plan (2015) and is the most accessible location in the borough. Given the above, the requirement of the NPPF and London Plan (2015) to make effective use of brownfield land and to address the borough's significant housing need the Council consider the proposed levels of housing to be appropriate.</p> <p>London boroughs have previously lobbied the Mayor of London to enable local planning authorities to enshrine this principle in the London Plan (2015). However, this was rejected by the Mayor.</p> <p>Therefore, the borough including this requirement in the draft Local Plan would mean it is not in conformity with the London Plan (2015).</p> <p>Ensuring high density housing is sustainable and successful depends on a complex range of factors including location, management, occupancy and tenure of a development etc. A number of studies explore how high density schemes can provide good quality, attractive housing which benefit occupants and ensure the most efficient use of land.</p> <p>Due to Government changes in 2010, changes of use from housing (C3) to HMOs (C4) do not require planning permission and therefore have no 'control' over such applications. Policy LP6 was specifically included in the draft Local Plan to seek to manage such changes of use where planning permission is required. Note modification in relation to strategic objective 1, bullet point 3 above.</p> <p>Agree – Include in strategic objective</p>	<p>Proposed amendment to recognise the importance of the need to address homelessness in the borough: Modify Strategic Objective 1, bullet point 3, to read: <u>Protection of the existing family housing stock whilst ensuring Ensure diversity of in type, size and tenure of new housing, including affordable housing to meet local needs, tackle homelessness and to deliver the annual minimum housing target of 1,123 new homes;</u></p> <p>Include new paragraph after 3.9.10 to state: <u>"The Council will also continue to implement its Purchase and Repair Scheme to deliver new affordable housing in the borough."</u></p> <p>Include additional paragraph after 3.9.6 as follows: <u>"All schemes are expected to maximise the delivery of affordable housing and make the most efficient use of available resources to achieve this objective in accordance with the London Plan (2016) and the policies of this Plan. In accordance with the Mayor's Draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2016), the Council will ensure affordable housing delivery is maximised from all sources, by considering a variety of funding and design solutions such as use of grant, RP's own funding and innovative funding models to increase the overall number of affordable homes"</u>.</p>
R01100/03	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	37	LP2	<p>Population projections do not take into account the effect of Britain leaving the European Union, particularly important given high international migration in South Ilford.</p> <p>There are discrepancies in evidence base documents and lack of data in relation to: 1) housing completions in South Ilford; 2) the number of illegal conversions/HMOs and 'Beds in Sheds'; 3) homelessness; 4) pollution monitoring e.g. no air quality modelling has been done for Ilford South; and 5) analysis of the impact Crossrail will have of on capacity;</p> <p>In addition, an Open Space Assessment (2016) has not been completed in time to inform the draft Local Plan and the affordable housing assessment is 'flawed'.</p>	<p>Further work should be undertaken to assess: 1) population levels in the borough; 2) housing completions; 3) parking; and 4) the impact of Cross Rail.</p>	<p>The Council has based its strategy on the latest and most up-to-date population projections produced by the GLA. The impact of the UK leaving the European Union on population projections is unknown at this stage.</p> <p>The housing completions data used in the draft Local Plan has been derived from recent 'starts and completions' monitoring. Figures contained in the draft Local Plan are borough wide.</p> <p>Due to Government changes in 2010, changes of use from housing (C3) to HMOs (C4) do not require planning permission and therefore have no 'control' over such applications. The Council do not collect planning data on these types of applications. The introduction of an Article Four Direction removing the permitted development rights for such a change of use are include in the implementation section of LP6.</p> <p>Where an illegal conversion or 'Bed in Shed' are planning contravention. Where they occur they should be reported to the Council's Planning Enforcement team and dealt with accordingly.</p> <p>Crossrail increases the overall capacity by about 70% per train. This will enable the trains to get further in to London before reaching capacity. The typical scenario therein is that trains will empty significantly at either major transport nodes (Stratford for Overground, DLR and Jubilee; and Whitechapel for Canary Wharf Crossrail branch) and centres of employment, which for Crossrail will be Liverpool Street through to Bond Street.</p> <p>An open space assessment has been undertaken which is included in the Council's evidence base.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>

R01100/04	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	46	Policy LP5	<p>The draft Local Plan will not address local needs in relation to providing the appropriate numbers of 'larger' homes. The SHMA demonstrates that there is a high level of need for family housing in the borough. This level of need is not reflected in in LP5 'preferred dwelling mix'. The dwelling mix should be more reflective of housing need and be amended to increase the numbers of family homes sought in new development in the borough.</p> <p>In addition, focusing the majority of new homes in town centre locations will further undermine delivery of family housing given such locations are generally more conducive to small unit sizes.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan should increase the requirement to provide more family (and elderly friendly) homes addressed through an amended preferred dwelling mix.</p>	<p>The Council's preferred housing mix and policy LP5 seeks a range of unit sizes in new development to deliver a balance of units sizes across the borough. The proposed policy seeks to significantly increase family housing in the borough by seeking 50% of units to be 3no. bed or more, particularly in the affordable sector. The preferred dwelling mix will be applied on a site by site basis, to schemes across the borough, including those in town centres.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>
R01100/05	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	22	LP1A	<p>The draft Local Plan does not demonstrate sound infrastructure planning.</p> <p>Iford South already experiences problems with traffic congestion on roads, parking and overcrowding on public transport. Local schools are also overcrowded and health facilities are over stretched.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan is not clear on how it is going to deliver the required infrastructure, particularly education provision, to support the proposed developments strategy. The draft Local Plan lacks a clear and detailed strategy for its implementation.</p> <p>There is concern in relation to phasing of infrastructure. Much of the proposed infrastructure is phased to be delivered at the end of the plan period whilst housing delivery, particularly in Iford South, is proposed in the first phase of the draft Local Plan. It is considered that Infrastructure provision should be in place before new housing is delivered.</p> <p>Clarity is sought in relation to the role CIL in future infrastructure delivery.</p>	<p>Providing housing in locations which have the existing capacity/infrastructure to accommodate growth.</p> <p>More detail in relation to provision for new infrastructure which should correlate to the delivery of housing, particularly in the first phase.</p>	<p>The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan is an active and live document which continuously being updated. The Council has continued to engage with both health and education providers. Note comment above in relation to Policy LP1A, LP17 and Appendix 2. CIL will be used to deliver new social infrastructure in the borough.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan seeks to implement the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's transport 'Local Implementation Plan'. Detailed proposals and funding information can be found in these documents.</p> <p>Parking standards will be modified to accord with the London Plan.</p> <p>The Council recognise that the Iford South is in areas of open space deficiency. Where schemes come forward in such locations, in accordance with policy 35 (b), the Council will require open space provision to be provided on site or where not feasible, seek contributions to the improvement of existing open spaces.</p> <p>There are proposals to improve Iford Station to accommodate increased demand. Also see response in relation to Crossrail capacity issues above.</p>	<p>Proposed modification in relation to Parking Standards (See TFL response R01094/01-02)</p>

R01100/05a	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	68	LP17	<p>There is concern in regards to funding for additional health provision given government cuts. There is doubt that new health can be provided in mixed use development as this has not been delivered in previous scheme is Ilford South. Greater health provision should be phased in the first part of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Provision for transport infrastructure and transport improvements is 'vague'. The draft Local Plan lacks of detail in regards to transport proposals and how they will be funded.</p> <p>Parking standards are insufficient as they do not provide for current car ownership levels and assume new residents will adopt a modal shift to other forms of transport. This approach, particularly in the short term, will therefore result in further parking problems in Ilford South. In addition reducing car parking in the town centre will have an adverse impact on trade and business.</p> <p>There is concern that large numbers of housing are proposed in areas already deficient in open space. It is noted that there is limited capacity within the existing sewers and there will be a need for network upgrades in order to service the planned developments in the Borough.</p> <p>There is concern that the already busy Ilford station will not be able to deal with the increase capacity which will result from the arrival of Crossrail and the proposed number of new homes.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan should propose a higher affordable housing target, linked to average incomes. No flexibility should be provided. The Council should engage with the Mayor's Homes for Londoners Proposals'. Council Land should be used to build affordable housing and not private market housing.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Viability Assessment has found that a minimum target of 20% - 40% affordable housing is viable across the borough. In light of this representation and after further discussions with the Mayor, the Council are now proposing to insert the word "minimum" into the policy to demonstrate its intention in seeking to provide as much affordable housing as possible. This will enable development to be viable whilst also seeking to maximise the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The Local Plan is clear that in line with the London Plan (2015) of the affordable housing provided in new development 60% will be for either Social Rented or Affordable Rented housing. The level of either tenure of housing will be determined on a site by site basis. Definitions of different types of affordable housing are provided in the glossary.</p>	<p>See response to R01100/06 below.</p>
R01100/06	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	40	Policy LP3	<p>The Council's affordable housing policy will not deliver genuinely affordable homes. The overall target of 30% is lower than that set out in the London Plan. In addition, it will not deliver them in the priority area which is larger family sized housing.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan lacks clarity in relation to the delivery of Social Rented Housing.</p> <p>The methodology and conclusions of the Local Plan Viability Assessment (2015) are challenged as they are 'inaccurate'.</p>	<p>The draft Local Plan should propose a higher affordable housing target, linked to average incomes. No flexibility should be provided. The Council should engage with the Mayor's Homes for Londoners Proposals'. Council Land should be used to build affordable housing and not private market housing.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Viability Assessment has found that a minimum target of 20% - 40% affordable housing is viable across the borough. In light of this representation and after further discussions with the Mayor, the Council are now proposing a higher minimum target of 40%. The proposed new target is set to enable development to be viable whilst also seeking to maximise the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The Local Plan is clear that in line with the London Plan (2015) of the affordable housing provided in new development 60% will be for either Social Rented or Affordable Rented housing. The level of either tenure of housing will be determined on a site by site basis. Definitions of different types of affordable housing are provided in the glossary.</p>	<p>Policy LP3 – Affordable housing and paragraph 3.9.5 Modify policy LP3 and paragraph 3.9.5 and supporting text to increase the borough wide affordable housing target as follows: The Council will seek to maximise the provision of affordable housing in the borough by setting a minimum strategic affordable housing target of 30% (a) Delivering on average, a minimum of 336 additional affordable homes per year. (d) Assessing the level of affordable housing on a site by site basis. Proposals will need to provide a viability assessment in order to justify the level of affordable provision on each site should proposals be below the 30% policy requirement.</p> <p>Amend last sentence of paragraph 3.9.5 as follows: In order to address the acute level of housing need in the borough, whilst also seeking to ensure that housing development remains viable the Council will adopt a strategic affordable housing target of 30% and a corporate affordable housing delivery target of 336 homes per year or 5,040 units over the plan period.</p>
R01100/07	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	48	Policies LP6, LP7	<p>The draft Local Plan does not address key problems in Ilford South such as conversion of houses to HMOs and hotels and allowing the use of buildings in gardens for housing.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan focusses on delivery of new housing through new builds. It does not consider other ways which may achieve a better outcome such as empty properties and purchase and repair of properties.</p>	<p>The Council should resist further HMOs, Beds in Sheds and conversions to hotels in Ilford South.</p> <p>Other sources of providing housing such as bringing empty properties back into use and the purchase and repair scheme should be included.</p>	<p>The Council agree this is an issue in the borough. The draft Local Plan provides detailed policies seeking to address these issues. It should be noted that due to Government changes in 2010, changes of use from housing (C3) to HMOs (C4) do not require planning permission and are therefore not in the 'control' of the Council. Policies LP6 and LP7 specifically seek to address these issues.</p> <p>In policy LP2, it clearly states that bringing empty properties back into use is a key strategy for the Council to increase the number of homes in the borough. The Council also has an adopted Empty Properties Strategy which the draft Local Plan seeks to facilitate.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

R01100/08	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	101	LP27	Tall buildings in Ilford will be 'overbearing' and out of character out of character with the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, massing and height. The approach to building height in Ilford will exacerbate the many existing problems of an already crowded environment, and other issues such as overshadowing, overlooking, and wind tunnelling. The proposed Ilford Town Centre framework should be in place before the draft Local Plan, so it can inform the approach in the town centre.	The draft Local Plan should assess the case for tall buildings on a case by case basis not specifying areas for their location. Design policies should be strengthened to ensure quality safeguards are in place in terms of building design.	The Council has undertaken a tall building study to consider these concerns. This study has considered the impact the proposed level of development will have on the character of areas such as Ilford South. Proposed modifications to appendix 1 has sought to respond to the recommendations of this study	See modifications proposed in Appendix 1.
R01100/09	Meenakshi Sharma NOISE	146	Appendix 1	Phasing of development should be amended to be consistent. Infrastructure should be phased so that it is in place before new homes are built.	Amend phasing of allocated sites to include sites without permission in phase later phases to ensure appropriate levels of infrastructure are in place to support new homes. The draft Local Plan should include measureable monitoring targets.	Noted – Updates to Appendix 1 and Appendix 2	See modifications in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.
R01101/01	Matthew Sobic Savills (Exchange Centre)	146	Site 2	The Exchange Shopping Centre is at the 'heart' of the town centre and underpins its vitality and viability. In order to respond to changing customer habits and digital technology and provide a wider offer and increase attraction it is proposed that the proposed uses on the site are widened to include leisure, restaurants and hotels.	Add the following uses to the propose use in appendix 1 – 'Retail' and 'Leisure including restaurant, beverage and café uses and hotel uses'.	Agree – The Council support greater flexibility of uses at the Ilford Exchange.	See Appendix 1 Modifications Schedule.
R01101/02	Matthew Sobic Savills (Exchange Centre)	56	Policy LP 10	As drafted LP10 has the potential to provide an uncompetitive town centre that does not provide customer choice or diversity and harm the future of the Exchange shopping centre. The 'restrictions' placed on the primary shopping areas by LP10 should not be applied to the Exchange shopping centre to recognise the importance of Exchange centre and ensure it can 'adapt and grow' to reflect the retail, leisure commercial and housing needs of the town centre.	Include the following text in LP10 ' except within the Exchange Centre where a flexible policy approach will be adopted to recognise the importance of the Centre to Ilford town centre and the role that it can play in meeting all future development needs set out in appendix 1 '	The Council seek to ensure that the retail function of the borough's town centres are maintained. However, the Council note the potential for non retail uses to improve a town centres vitality and viability. The Council therefore propose the following modification.	Propose that the following is added to LP10 after point (c) as follows: d) Additionally, in making decisions, the Council will consider the following factors; 1) the extent to which the proposed use is capable of attracting a significant number of shoppers/visitors to the centre; 2) the extent to which the proposed use contributes to the Council's aspirations and priorities, in particular, the regeneration objectives for the local area; and 3) the contribution the proposed use will make to the vitality and viability of the proposed frontage and the centre generally and will contribute to shoppers' experience.
R01102/01	Rebecca Sladen TFL Property Response	20	Policy LP1	Support for the principle objectives of the Local Plan in respect of promoting growth in sustainable locations in accordance with the NPPF and London Plan.		Support Noted	No further change required.
R01102/02	Rebecca Sladen TFL Property Response	151	Sites 75, 120, 134, 194 and 196	Support the allocation of sites 75, 120, 134, 194 and 196. However, propose that they are phased in the first five years of the plan.	Change phasing of sites 75, 120, 134, 194 and 196 to phase 1 (2015 – 2020).	Agree - Land owner has provided clarification on timing of site deliverability.	Change phasing of sites 75, 120, 134, 194 and 196 as follows: 2021 – 2025 2015 – 2020
R01102/03	Rebecca Sladen TFL Property Response	146	Appendix 1	Support the allocation of the following sites to deliver residential led schemes: Hainault Station Car Park; Land adjacent to Hainault Station; Wanstead Station Car Park; Snaresbrook Station Car Park; Newbury Station Car Park – West; and Access road adjacent to western Newbury Park Station Car Park. This site should be included in the first phase of the draft Local Plan.	Include the following sites in as opportunity sites.	Agree – Council to include site in appendix 1	Include the following sites in appendix 1 – See Amended appendix 1. Hainault Station Car Park; Land adjacent to Hainault Station; Wanstead Station Car Park; Snaresbrook Station Car Park; Newbury Station Car Park – West; and Access road adjacent to western Newbury Park Station Car Park.
R01103/01	Christopher Wheeler The Tooley & Foster Partnership (K&C trading Ltd)	153	Site 99	Support the release of land from the green belt to deliver new housing.		Support noted	No further change required.

R01103/02	Christopher Wheeler The Tooley & Foster Partnership (K&C trading Ltd)	153	Site 99	Proposal for a sensitively designed scheme which optimises the potential of the site and contributes to the built environment.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/01	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	16	Policy LP1, Vision	Support for the objectives of the draft Local Plan which is considered to be a 'sound' document. Support for the 'release' from the green belt in order to meet its development needs, particularly for housing given the lack of available brownfield land to meet the Mayor's minimum housing target.		Support Noted	No further change required.
R01104/02	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	153	Site 99, Policy LP1B	The draft Local Plan states three different housing capacity figures for the Billet Road site. The Local Plan should states a single capacity figure.	Consistent indicative housing figure throughout the draft Local Plan.	Agree – Amend site 99 proposal in line with policy L1B to state same indicative housing figure of 1,100. The figure in table 3 included other sites in phase 3 (sites 97 and 98) so the figure reflects the capacity of all three sites.	Amend site 99 indicative figure to: 1109 800
R01104/03	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	153	Site 99	Recognition that Billet Road has the capacity to provide a range of family dwellings, open space and allotments and a primary school and allotments.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/04	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	20	Policy LP1 - Implementat ion point 2	Support for preparing a Council led masterplan for the Billet Road site.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/05	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	26	Policy LP1B	Support for linking new development with Marks Gate and joint working with Barking and Dagenham to regenerate the wider area.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/06	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	153	Site 99 - Figure 12	The phasing of development at Billet Road should be moved from phase 3 (2025 – 2030) to phase 2 (2020 – 2025).	Move the phasing of Billet Road into the second phase (2021 -2025) of the draft Local Plan.	Agree - Land owner has provided clarification on timing of site deliverability.	Change phasing of site 99 as follows: 2026 – 2030 2021 - 2025
R01104/07	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	26	Policy LP1B	Recommended that further work is undertaken in order to further understand the transport impact of development at Billet Road.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/08	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	153	Site 99	Strong support for the conclusions of the draft Green Belt Review. However, there is concern that the study is 'misleading' in places. Assert that the Billet Road site fails to meet Green Belt criteria (as set out in the NPPF) 1, 2, 3 and 4 and partially criterion 5.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/09	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	-	-	Notes Savills letter in relation to minerals meaning minerals safeguarding policy should not delay or inhibit potential redevelopment.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/10	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	93	Policy LP24	Note the need to provide an air quality assessment with any future planning application.		Noted	No further change required.
R01104/11	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	26	LP1B	Support for the proposed inclusion of education use to meet increased demand for school places.		Support noted	No further change required.
R01104/12	Jesse Honey Aecom (on behalf of East Thames)	153	Site 99	The proposed level of development on the site is unrealistically high. Indicative capacity work assesses that a has been undertaken which suggests that the site has the capacity to provide approximately 805 units (including land take for other uses).	Reassess the site capacity.	Agreed – The Council has produced a 'indicative masterplan' for the Billet Road site. Capacity estimates through this work demonstrate that the site has the potential for 800 units.	Amend the indicative capacity figures to 800
R01105	Helen Harris, Cushman & Wakefield (Royal Mail Group)	-	-	See comments R01076/01-04	See comments R01076/01-04	See responses R01076/01-04	See responses R01076/01-04
R01106/01	Ellie Taylor Labour Party	20	LP1	The Redbridge Labour Party has submitted a petition in support of the Local Plan, specifically in relation to building on brownfield land and on land which is suitable for release from the Green Belt, where enough infrastructure is planned or in place		Support noted.	No change required.

R01107/01	Lewis Marshall	-	-	The Local Plan is unsound and not positively prepared.	No change suggested.	Comments noted. The Local Plan aims to deliver sustainable growth. Policies have been included to ensure that in the context of growth the Council continues to protect the local environment whilst securing opportunities for improvement and investment. Examination by an independent Planning Inspector will assess if the plan provides a sound strategy for addressing the boroughs future development needs.	No change required.
R01107/02	Lewis Marshall	154	Site 116	A landmark/tall building on Station Estate, containing 120 homes is likely to be 10-12 storeys or more in height, and is therefore inconsistent with the stated aims of the South Woodford section of the Council's own Characterisation Study (2014). (Excerpt from the Redbridge Characterisation Study (2014) provided).	No change suggested.	The Local Plan does not make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford, and the term 'landmark building' does not necessarily mean a 'tall building', rather it relates to the Council's aspiration of bringing forward a development of high quality design that respects and contributes to the character of the existing area. However in response to representations made during Pre-submission consultation for the Local Plan, it is agreed that paragraph 3.6.5 is amended to make clear the Council's aspiration for high quality development in South Woodford. Any future development of Station Estate will be subject to a planning application and consultation with the local community.	See response to R00416/10
R01107/02a	Lewis Marshall	101	LP27	As above	As above	The Characterisation study does state that newer buildings in the centre are out of scale and character, but this does not imply that new buildings in the future cannot sympathise with the character of the centre. Also these newer buildings are on George Lane, and for the most part directly opposite the conservation area, Station Estate is not. Many of the points regarding character in the text provided from the Characterisation Study is accurate but relate to George Lane, its key characteristics, and important views onto it. However Station Estate is not on George Lane but behind it. Indeed the extract provided also states that 'There are a number of Big Box developments within the centre in the form of Sainsbury's and Waitrose supermarkets, and the Odeon Cinema, but these are situated behind the existing form of the street enclosure represented by the older buildings overlooking the street [George Lane], and are therefore not a major intrusion on the character of the core.' This shows that development off George Lane, i.e. behind it as in the case of Station Estate, can have a neutral effect on its character, even though it is of a greater scale. Also see response R00108/17.	As above
R01108/01	Steve Alderman	68	LP17	Infrastructure is at breaking point and existing high population should not be added to		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01108/02	Steve Alderman	93	Policy LP24	Increased population increases pollution levels		Policy LP24 sets out the Councils approach to pollution issues, whilst Policy LP22 encourages sustainable transport	No further change required.
R01108/03	Steve Alderman	72	Policy LP18	Increased participation in sport should be a priority due to its health benefits		Policy LP18 sets out an integrated approach to Health and Wellbeing. Proposals for Oakfield require the re-provision of existing pitches and facilities as a pre-requisite of development, as set out in Policies LP1 and LP35.	No further change required.
R01108/04	Steve Alderman	81	Policy LP21	Increased development will result water and drainage issues		The Local Plan is supported by a Flood Risk Sequential Test (LBR 2.60). Furthermore, Policy LP21 sets out requirements for Site Specific Flood Risk Assessments in relevant cases	No further change required.

R01108/05	Steve Alderman	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Duplication of R01085/01-10		See response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01109	Paula Creasey Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01110	Loraine Creasey	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01111	Allan Smith	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01112	David John Ekers	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01113	Mark Lee Ekers	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01114	Sylvie Creasey	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	duplication of R01085/01-10		see response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01115/01	John Painter	-	-	Support London Wildlife Trust comments		See response to R01090/01-53	See response to R01090/01-53
R01115/02	John Painter	123	Figure 22	Areas for release in GB11B includes some land that merits protection as green space		Noted. Areas that merit protection as open space are designated as such on the Policies Map.	No further change required.
R01115/03	John Painter	123	Figure 22	Paragraph 6.1.7 refers to Green Belt release at parcel GB11C but this is not shown in Figure 22		Mapping error – Figure 22 requires updating. Precise boundaries can be viewed on the Proposals Map.	Figure 22 will be updated.
R01115/04	John Painter	68	LP17	Inadequate infrastructure serves the Roding Valley area		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R01115/05	John Painter	-	-	Permitted schemes should fully achieve their original requirements		The implementation of existing schemes with planning permission falls beyond the remit of the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R01116/01	Rebecca Smith	120	LP34	All alternative options to building on green land should be considered before green belt		See response to R01213/01	See response to R01213/01

R01117/01	Rugina Monnan	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Redevelopment of Oakfield should not be considered when the boroughs obesity levels are higher than the national average		Policy LP18 sets out an integrated approach to Health and Wellbeing. Proposals for Oakfield require the re-provision of existing pitches and facilities as a pre-requisite of development, as set out in Policies LP1 and LP35.	No further change required.
R01118/01	Donald Leggatt	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	Proposed relocation sites for Oakfield playing pitches is subject to flooding		See response to R01088/02	See response to R01088/02
R01118/02	Donald Leggatt	81	Policy LP21	Existing open land helps absorb heavy rainfall and minimise flood risk to properties		Local Plan is supported by a Flood Risk Sequential Test (LBR 2.60). Policy LP21 sets out the Council's approach to minimising flood risk, which includes the incorporation of SuDS into new developments.	No further change required.
R01118/03	Donald Leggatt	68	LP17	Existing infrastructure is overstretched		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01118/04	Donald Leggatt	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplication of R01085/01-10		See response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01119/01	Ilona Biswas King	101	Policy LP27	Tall Buildings policy proposes too many contradictory assessments, high density development does not equate a need for tall buildings, 5.2.1, this is out-of-character.		The Council is aware that intensification and growth can be accommodated at higher densities without the need for development to be built as tall buildings. LP27 makes this clear at the end of paragraph 5.2.1.	No change required.
R01119/02	Ilona Biswas King	101	Policy LP27	Decision to build up are cost - effective only when an undisclosed optimum height is achieved, often increased on re - submission. The example promoted, Pioneer Point is upheld as a positive example 5.2.7, However Pioneer Point fails to deliver socio - economic growth on the scale envisaged, nor has this shortcoming been addressed or that of poor quality construction management and under - occupation. This is also a textbook case study of impact on local amenity, wind - tunnelling, mars the road beneath and commercial promises to re-locate historic Pioneer Market on the ground floor did not materialise, so it remains a shell/undeveloped.		The Council has carried out a tall buildings study of the borough, and Local Plan Policy LP27 is part of an overall strategic approach to controlling proposals for the development of tall buildings in Redbridge.	No change required.
R01119/03	Ilona Biswas King	101	Policy LP27	Planning has given precedent to piecemeal tall buildings development ahead of the Local Plan strategy to consolidate Plan-led zones as defined by PTAL. This justification is hugely problematic in terms of high population growth, infrastructure demand and local residents amenity.		As stated above at R01119/02 response the Council's approach to Tall Buildings development is strategic with the aim of controlling it and directing it to appropriate locations.	No change required.
R01120	Diana Holmebaeck	32	Policy LP1D	As comments R00416/01 to R00416/16	As comments R00416/01 to R00416/16	See responses R00416/01 to R00416/16	See responses R00416/01 to R00416/16
R01121	Mrs P Ilett	32	Policies LP1D, LP24	Pollution has increased at Charlie Brown's roundabout and is four times worse than at Oxford Street, has the Council undertaken air quality monitoring at this location?	Clarify pollution monitoring around Charlie Brown's		See also response to R00416/04.

R01122/01	Steve Tully	22	LP1A	The draft plan proposes 75% of all future housing in the borough in Ilford South. Such proposals will only exacerbate the inequality that exists within the borough and degrade quality of life. Ilford South will become a continuous building site for the foreseeable future.		Noted – The Mayor of London actively encourages local authorities to develop intensively on brownfield land. The South of Redbridge borough has the largest area of available brownfield land.	No further change required.
R01122/02	Steve Tully	22	LP1A	Questions if the quality of the environment in the south of the borough is of less importance than that of the wealthier parts.		Noted.	No further change required.
R01122/03	Steve Tully	22	Policy LP1A	Questions why the proposed area of Ilford Investment and Growth Area includes large areas of long established and historically significant residential housing areas.		Noted – Investment and Growth Area boundary is indicative.	No further change required.
R01122/04	Steve Tully	47	Policy LP6 and LP10	HMOs are increasing and leading to a gradual decline in the area. This leads to the problems overcrowding, transient population and poor quality of the environment. LP6 will further encourage this type of development. Changes to the ward boundaries will mean new areas are designated as Metropolitan, District or Local centres. Inconsistent with proposals to include significant areas of existing residential areas within town centres boundaries.		Noted – The Council recognises the issues relating to HMOs. Due to Government changes in 2010, changes of use from housing (C3) to HMOs (C4) do not require planning permission and therefore the Council has no ‘control’ over such applications. LP6 seeks to manage such uses to address a number of concerns raised. There are no proposed changes to Ilford’s town centre boundary. Ward boundary changes will not affect this. Whilst existing residential areas are included in Investment and Growth areas they are not directly affected by proposals in the draft Local Plan	No further change required.
R01122/05	Steve Tully	60	Policy LP13	Conversion of houses to hostel/hotels/guest houses should be resisted. Such development leads to associated problems of noise, traffic and parking.		Noted – The Council recognise this issue. Policy LP13 seeks to manage such applications to address issues raised.	No further change required.
R01122/06	Steve Tully	98	Policy LP26	Recent planning applications ‘flout’ the essential directives of LP26. The amenity and health and wellbeing of residents are being ignored.		Noted	No further change required.
R01122/07	Steve Tully	22	LP1A	The Council are pursuing high rise, high density solutions to meet their housing need with little concern for the problems created for Ilford South residents.		Noted	No further change required.
R01122/08	Steve Tully	101	Policy LP27	Pioneer point is a poor example of a ‘successful’ tall building. The tall building designation is too generic. It should be broken down into a number of concentric zones, each zone limiting the height from centre to the perimeter where heights are relative and sympathetic to the surrounding area.		The Council has undertaken a tall buildings study as evidence supporting policy. The study considers the most appropriate locations for tall buildings development in the borough, based on good public transport and local scale and character. The study will be placed on the Council's planning website with all the other evidence base documents supporting the Local Plan, when the Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.	No further change required.
R01122/09	Steve Tully	-	-	Serious concern regarding the legality of the Council ‘cherry picking’ and implementing sections of the draft Local Plan which is still to be submitted for development. Concerns raised in relation to the Exchange Car Park scheme.		Noted.	No further change required.
R01123/01	Janice Burgess Highways England	20	Policy LP1	Highways England will be concerned that the cumulative effect of the proposals set out in each of the five Investment and Growth Areas have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network. The Council will need to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Local Plan proposals have no residual severe impacts on the operation of the SRN or provide proposals to mitigate such impacts to an acceptable level.		The Local Plan is supported by a Transport Assessment (2017) which has considered the impact on the highway network from planned housing growth in the borough up until 2030.	No further change required.

R01123/02	Janice Burgess Highways England	22	Policy LP22	It is noted and welcomed that the Council is taking an active approach to sustainable public transport to better manage demand on the highway network. The Council will also need to deliver a robust parking strategy for the local areas within walking distances of stations to avoid unnecessary car travel into and within Redbridge by use of Crossrail commuters. In such cases, it may be difficult for the Council to avoid the use of Controlled/Residential Parking Zones in these locations.		The Council's Highways Team will lead on the production of any future Parking Strategy to ensure issues like controlled parking zones are dealt with appropriately.	No further change required.
R01123/03	Janice Burgess Highways England	86	Policy LP22	Highways England welcomes the requirement that significant development will be required to be supported by a Transport Assessment. There is concern that the SRN will be overlooked as such assessments by developers will seek to develop individual investment and growth areas and individual impacts on the network are likely to be small, but cumulatively it could have noticeable impacts on the SRN. E.g. the full allocation of 6,000 homes with employment and retail could have detrimental effect on the A13 and its junction with the M25.		The Local Plan is supported by a Transport Assessment (2017) which has considered the impact on the highway network from planned housing growth in the borough up until 2030.	No further change required.
R01124/01	Wendy Taylor	-	-	Plan is not legally compliant as it does not comply with the Planning and CPO Act which requires effective community consultation. This and previous consultations have not complied with Councils consultation statement. Previous consultations took place in Jan/Feb 2013 but it was low key so residents didn't know. This consultation is taking place with little publicity after plan has already been agreed by cabinet allowing little chance to amend it. No public meetings are being held and only a few sessions at local venues. No translations are available although the borough has a high BAME population. No plan is available online or at libraries. This means local people are unaware and unable to take part. To make it legally compliant, the consultation should be repeated with public meetings with officer presentations and interpreters/signers present and meetings with local community groups arranged. They should include question/answer sessions.		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R01124/02	Wendy Taylor	18	Objectives	The objective to deliver 18,500 homes to meet future housing needs is insufficient to meet future social housing need at truly affordable rents.		Noted. The Plan has taken account of the future infrastructure requirements to support growth. These are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017).	No further change required.
R01124/03	Wendy Taylor	46	LP5	The objective to ensure diversity in type, size and tenure isn't met as very few large homes are to be delivered with too many 1 and 2 beds at high densities and no properties at social housing rents are identified.	Reduce the density of housing planned for Ilford to Goodmayes with more low rise and/or houses. Also increase the dwelling mix by increasing the number of three beds units or more.	Policy LP5 sets out the Councils preferred dwelling mix which includes a range of household sizes including family housing	No further change required.
R01124/04	Wendy Taylor	22	LP1A	The objective to improve health and well being through good special planning and environmental improvements is not met as from Ilford town centre to Goodmayes, high density tower blocks are proposed which are unsuitable for families (no play space or parking)		Policy LP18 sets out the Council's approach for promoting health and well-being through the contribution a high quality environment with services to support health, social and cultural well-being.	No further change required.

R01124/05	Wendy Taylor	93	LP24	Plan wont promote green environment as proposed population density will cause environment to deteriorate with increased traffic and pollution, stress caused by overcrowding, pressure on infrastructure.		Section 4 of the plan sets out the Council approach for promoting a green environment. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	No further change required.
R01124/06	Wendy Taylor	37	LP2	The plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed housing development and infrastructure requirements. However, the plan seems to be based on how many the current local plan says is the minimum required units and there is not enough affordable housing proposed.		The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough.	No further change required.
R01124/07	Wendy Taylor	68	LP17	Infrastructure is based on how much can be squeezed out of developers through the infrastructure levy which seems very low		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R01124/08	Wendy Taylor	40	Policy LP3	Although the need for 60% homes being affordable is identified in the Outer London plan, the are only proposing 30% based on alleged viability criteria determined by a private company who also wrote the Councils viability strategy so clearly isn't independent. The plan also allows for 'flexibility' on different sites so developers wont be held to 30% if they can argue for less which they are sure to do.	The Council should increase the number of dwellings upwards to nearer the required level identified and increase the number of affordable homes to 50% minimum with rents based on a third of average income.	Noted. The Council has 30% target for the provision of affordable housing which is required for all major housing development in the borough. To respond to various representations, the Council is proposing to insert the word "minimum" into policy LP3.	See response to R01213/07
R01124/09	Wendy Taylor	5	Para 1.8	To be justified, the plan has to have a credible and robust evidence base involving evidence of participation of the local community, research/fact finding and consideration of reasonable alternatives. I cannot find this evidence of participation and the only research is the outer NE plan and hasn't been followed.		The Local Plan has been informed by a wide range of assessments and evidence studies, including a viability assessment. In addition to references throughout the Plan, all evidence base documents (available through the Council's Local Plan web page) have been used to inform the Plan.	No further change required.
R01124/10	Wendy Taylor	40	LP3	There is no plan for young people who are double disadvantaged by rent caps. Other vulnerable groups like the homeless who need supported housing are ignored just saying there is a provision to reduce homelessness		Recommendations made by the Redbridge Fairness Commission 2015 have been incorporated throughout the policies in the Local Plan. Planning and housing was a prominent theme which has been considered.	No further change required.
R01124/11	Wendy Taylor	22	LP1A	The timescales aren't practical with a high concentration of building sites in limited areas coming on stream together especially in central Ilford which is already congested and will turn into a big building site as this area is being developed in phase one and two. The green belt area in phase three where it is easier to build and where family homes are urgently needed are left to a later stage.	Phase three should take place first with other phases staggered appropriately.	Noted. The areas of Green Belt proposed for release in the Council's Green Belt study, and part of Local Plan policy have not been released and are not currently available for development. The Planning Inspectore will decide whether Green Belt sites will actually be released for development through the Examination of the Plan.	No change required.
R01125	Rashi Sharma	-	-	consultation on this plan and consideration of alternatives has been extremely poor. Residents only became aware of the plan in the last few months, which has meant considering the plan in the last stage of its completion. Due to this, there is virtually no room for change. It has simply been assumed that Ilford south will take 75% of all future housing needs.		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.

R01126	Nina Babaie	36	Policy LP1D	Object to the loss of green fields and sports resources. The area has suffered from significant traffic increases in recent years. Insufficient consultation has been carried out.		See response to R01088/01. Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan.	No further change required.
R01127	Gholamreza Babaie	36	Policy LP1D	Object to loss of green fields and playing fields at Oakfield. Roads are too congested. Former Kelvin Hughes site not yet occupied.		See response to R01088/01. Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Additional developments to those already permitted are needed to help address housing need.	No further change required.
R01128	Madeleine Munday	120	LP34	Green Belt around Claybury Hospital and Fairlop Plain should be protected		All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R01129/01	Angela Raina	47	Policy LP6	Ilford was once a sought after area but is now becoming a slum. Landlords are getting away with beds in sheds and the council is doing nothing to stop this decline		Policy LP6 sets out criteria to ensure a high quality of private rented accommodation. More specifically, paragraph 3.12.8 sets out the Council's intention for enforcement action against landlords who rent out poor quality accommodation.	No further change required.
R01129/02	Angela Raina	26	LP1B	You ignore the affluent areas of Wanstead and dump more housing in south Ilford with no extra infrastructure in place. You have to wait a week for a doctor's appointment so what will it be like with even more people.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Additionally, further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01130/01	Yasmin Ramjohn	32	Policy LP1D	650 homes are being proposed for South Woodford which is too high a density for the area. How are you going to accommodate all of this housing within the existing infrastructure		See response R00416/02	See response R00416/02
R01130/02	Yasmin Ramjohn	32	LP1D	The 40 temporary housing units proposed for Charlie Brown's roundabout will cause further pressure on the existing infrastructure, traffic volumes are very high, creating major traffic issues and noise pollution for the area. The high volume of traffic makes it difficult to walk safely and undermines the quality of the urban environment for residents. What are you putting in place to mitigate these issues?		See response R00416/03.	No further change required.
R01130/03	Yasmin Ramjohn	101	Policy LP27	London Plan Policy 7.7 'Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings', contains a helpful definition for tall buildings that could be suitably applied to all locations in order to identify buildings as tall for their location. It states that, "tall and large buildings are those that are substantially taller than their surroundings, cause a significant change to the skyline, or are larger than the threshold sizes set for the referral of planning applications to the Mayor." What are the threshold sizes set for the referral of planning applications to the Mayor?		The Local Plan also uses the London Plan definition for tall buildings in Policy LP27: Tall Buildings. Each planning application is considered on its merits and impacts when referred to the Mayor.	No further change required.

R01130/04	Yasmin Ramjohn	98	LP26	All tall and large buildings in all parts of the borough will be assessed against the design criteria set out in LP26. Can you advise how you will be applying the Density Matrix of the London Plan when residential development schemes are being proposed?		The Local Plan does not have a policy for density, and the density for planning applications will be considered based on the London Plan density matrix. This will be applied by considering local PTAL and deciding the correct category for the location, whether suburban, urban or central areas of the borough. The London Plan density matrix will then be applied on that basis. With regard to design and scale Local Plan Policies LP26 and LP27 will be applied, and a decision will be made on overall site capacity/density, scale and design, based on the context of the area.	No further change required.
R01130/05	Yasmin Ramjohn	68	LP17	The expansion of Nightingale School will cause additional pressure on the infrastructure. What steps are being taken to ensure that local traffic is well managed and does not cause additional pressure on local residents? Does the expansion of the school take into account drop off points/zones for parents to alleviate traffic congestion for local residents?		See responses R00416/02 and R00416/03.	See responses R00416/02.
R01130/06	Yasmin Ramjohn	86	Policies LP22 and LP23	Parking at Snaresbrook tube station is problematic, at the week end people are parking outside the tube station making it dangerous for two way traffic to pass. The restriction of parking between 9.30am and 10.30am is no longer working. How are you proposing to deal with this in the Local Plan?		The borough's parking strategy is produced by the Council's Highways and Engineering Service, and is a separate strategy to Local Plan. However Local Plan Policy LP23 tackles parking issues in the borough by requiring new development to provide public parking and undertake parking stress surveys to consider the impact of new development on traffic and parking. Where development proposes reductions in off street parking, developers will be required to ensure there will be sufficient parking to meet local needs, or provide appropriate temporary facilities to ensure that development can ultimately provide for existing and future local needs. Local Plan Policy LP22 also seeks to promote more sustainable modes of transport and encourage a modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable modes of transport, whilst providing adequate levels of off street parking. The Council's separate parking strategy is for 2015-2020. It addresses issues relating to inconsistency in parking provision, and contains an action plan for Council car parks, parking for shoppers and visitors, permit parking and parking and traffic enforcement.	No further change required.
R01130/07	Yasmin Ramjohn	120	Policy LP34	The proposed release of parcels of existing Green Belt in the borough which do not meet the purposes of the Green Belt are substantial large tracts of land, are these sites subject to further consultation and can these proposals be changed?		The Green Belt study has been consulted on and updated at several stages of the consultation process for the Local Plan, as supporting evidence. The final Addendum has been produced in 2017. Examination by an independent Planning Inspector will assess if the Local Plan provides a sound strategy for addressing the borough's future development needs, which includes whether the proposed Green Belt release in the Plan should go ahead.	No further change required.
R01130/08	Yasmin Ramjohn	120	Policy LP34	The proposal to designate the additional parcels of new Green Belt and boundary amendments to ensure the remaining Green Belt is robust and defensible are by way of comparison substantially smaller thereby creating a significant loss of green belt overall. Are these subject to further consultation? What is the council doing to ameliorate this loss of green belt?		The Council's Green Belt study considers those areas of Green Belt proposed for release is land that does not meet the functions of Green Belt, and which can come forward for alternatives uses.	No further change required.

R01130/09	Yasmin Ramjohn	124	Policy LP35	The Alternative Playing Pitch Assessment (2016) demonstrates that there are a range of alternative, suitable and deliverable sites in the borough that have the potential to accommodate the level of existing provision at Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground. In relation to Oakfield sites at Forest Road Recreation Ground and Hainault Recreational have significant potential. In relation to the Ford Sports Ground, Seven Kings Park and Goodmayes Park Extension have significant potential. Can you provide more detail on these sites and give a commitment that these sites will provide like for like compensation for the loss of Oakfield and the Ford Sports Ground as 'Opportunity Sites'?		Noted - The Council has undertaken further feasibility work on these alternatives undertaken by the Institute of Groundsmanship which sets out how these sites could provide 'like for like' replacement.	No further change required.
R01130/10	Yasmin Ramjohn	124	Policy LP35	The local plan has identified significant deficiency of open spaces across the borough, yet there are no detailed plans of how these deficiencies will be re-provided for within the timeframe of the local plan. Please provide this information.		Policy LP37 supports investment in green infrastructure. Detailed proposals, either in terms of requirements for on-site green infrastructure, or financial contributions towards such provision off site, will be considered as individual development proposals come forward.	No further change required.
R01130/11	Yasmin Ramjohn	86	Policy LP22	Sustainable Travel Plans are necessary to support sustainable transport choices. The Local Plan identifies three methods to ensure that new developments mitigate any impact on the existing transport infrastructure and the environment (Transport Impact Assessment, Green Travel Plans and Service Management Plans.) How will the council ensure that these plans are monitored and implemented and infringements are dealt with to the benefit of the local environment and residents?		Travel Plans are reviewed by the Council's Highways and Engineering Service, who are consulted on Travel Plans where they are made part of planning conditions within planning applications, and their agreement is required when such conditions need to be discharged.	No further change required.
R01130/12	Yasmin Ramjohn	81	Policy LP21	The local plan should take into account any policy recommendations from the emerging Surface Water Management Plan.		Noted. The Council has an up-to-date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) published for 2016, which identifies the different levels of flood risk across the borough. Risk of surface water flooding is identified in the SFRA, and Local Plan Policy LP21 requires site specific flood risk assessments to be submitted for new development, taking into account measures to mitigate surface water flooding.	No further change required.
R01130/13	Yasmin Ramjohn	47	Policy LP6	The Council will resist the conversion of a larger home(s) to smaller self-contained home(s) (C3) and hotels (C1). How will the Local Plan monitor and report on this commitment?		Local Plan policy is monitored through the Council's Annual Monitoring Report, and data will be gathered from statistics for planning applications and any enforcement cases.	No further change required.
R01130/14	Yasmin Ramjohn	49	Policy LP7	The Council will seek to protect and enhance the positive contribution gardens make to the character and biodiversity of the borough. The Council will prioritise the appropriate reuse of previously developed land in order to encourage sustainable forms of residential development. How will the Local Plan monitor and report on this commitment?		The quote used in the comment is not an actual policy within the Local Plan, it is supporting text that expresses an aim or objective of the Council's. The policy that seeks to achieve the expressed aim is Policy LP7 Back Gardens, which states that the aim will be achieved by resisting the use of garden space for residential development. The Implementation section of the policy states that the Planning Service will continue to work with other Council service areas to effectively tackle the problem of 'beds in sheds' in the borough, utilising legal powers across planning, fire safety, housing and environmental health. Local Plan policy is monitored through the Council's Annual Monitoring Report, and data will be gathered from statistics for planning applications and any enforcement cases.	No further change required.

R01130/15	Yasmin Ramjohn	101	Policy LP27	The use of outbuildings ordinarily used for ancillary purposes within a dwelling curtilage or garden as separate sleeping and living accommodation will be resisted. The Council will not support residential development in back gardens unless it is compatible with the use, character, appearance and scale of surrounding context (LP26) and does not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents. How will the Local Plan monitor and report on this commitment? The Planning Service will continue to work with other Council service areas to effectively tackle the problem of 'beds in sheds' in the borough, utilising legal powers across planning, fire safety, housing and environmental health. How will the Local Plan monitor and report on this commitment?		Local Plan policy is monitored through the Council's Annual Monitoring Report, and data will be gathered from statistics for planning applications and any enforcement cases.	No further change required.
R01130/16	Yasmin Ramjohn	138	LP41	The Planning Service will continue to work with other Council service areas to effectively tackle the problem of 'beds in sheds' in the borough, utilising legal powers across planning, fire safety, housing and environmental health. How will the Local Plan monitor and report on this commitment?		Local Plan policy is monitored through the Council's Annual Monitoring Report, and data will be gathered from statistics for planning applications and any enforcement cases.	No further change required.
R01131/1	Mr S Sirha Mrs J K Sirha	36	Para 3.6.5	Oakfield should be protected on the basis of: amenity value, the presence of sufficient schools and health facilities in the area, impact on traffic and crime of development, and the value of existing sports facilities.		See response to R01085/01, R01085/06 and R01085/10	See response to R01085/01, R01085/06 and R01085/10
R01131/2	Mr S Sirha Mrs J K Sirha	36	Para 3.6.5	Duplicate of R01085/01-10		See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01132	David Matson	32	LP1D	I would have the following comments to make on the draft local plan: I do not believe that the plans for South Woodford are justified as the the area cannot sustain the level of growth proposed. The addition of 650 new homes is suggested in part as the area is well served by public transport. This proposal, however is not reasonable given the level of development that has been seen in the area in the past 10 years and the resulting increase in public transport use, notably the central line. The central line is now so overcrowded on the Epping Line with considerable increases in footfall at South Woodford such that there is simply not the capacity to accommodate further increased usage. The Hainault branch of the central line has not seen anywhere near the same increases in usage/ footfall. I do not therefore believe that this aspect of the Local Plan can be considered sound. In addition the character of South Woodford with period properties needs to be maintained with well designed, low level buildings. The suggestion of a "contemporary landmark" within the town centre should be carefully considered as a tall,high rise build would be out of keeping with the area and against the wishes of the local population.		R00416/02, R00416/10 and R00416/11	R00416/02, R00416/10 and R00416/11

R01133	Annette Machon	36	Policy LP1D	Object to Oakfield proposals on the basis that green spaces need protecting and recent schemes have had major traffic implications		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport.	No further change required.
R01134	Francis Roads	32	Policy LP1D	The Local Plan must show what extra public transport is to be added in Sotuh Woodford. The Central Line is currently at capacity, if there is no additional provision the Plan should not go ahead.		See response R00416/03.	No further change required.
R01135	Rowena Rudkin	32	Policy LP1D	The proposed number of new homes will put a greater strain on services such as school places, hospitals, medical centres and doctor's surgeries. There are also implications for transport. The Central Line is already overcrowded. There are traffic and parking problems. What is the Council providing to ameliorate the situation?		See responses R00416/02; R00416/03 and R00416/05.	See response R00416/06.
R01136	Paul Mudondo	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplicate of R01085/01-10		See response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01137	David Symonds	20	LP1	Concerned that rapid population growth will be harmful to quality of life.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. The direct impacts of proposed developments and their impacts on amenity, neighbourhood and infrastructure will be considered through the application policies contained within the plan.	No further change required.
R01138/01	Michael Victore Davis	36	Para 3.7.6	Oakfield has benefitted from countless hours of volunteering from club members, to the benefit of the local community and successive generations		Noted. The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their reprovision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. The borough's high level of housing need, and supporting infrastructure requirements, are considered exceptional circumstances to amend the borough's green belt	No further change required.
R01138/02	Michael Victore Davis	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplicate of R01085/01-10		See response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10
R01139	Susan Scorer	120	Policy LP34	Green belt should be protected for leisure purposes		All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R01140	Lynn Saad	120	LP34	Object to the release of green belt for housing development		All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R01141	Howard Berlin					The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. See also response to R01085.	See also response to R01085.

R01142/01	Wendy Black	36	Para 3.7.5	Object to identification of Oakfield as a Development Opportunity Site on the basis of its current community use, importance as open space, increases in traffic and air pollution.		See responses to R01088/01 and R01088/04	See responses to R01088/01 and R01088/04
R01142/02	Wendy Black	56	Policy LP10	Barkingside High Street needs an improved restaurant and retail offer.		Policies LP9 and LP10 support new commercial space in town centres. Increased population in the local area will support demand for commercial premises	No further change required.
R01142/03	Wendy Black	40	Policy LP3	Queries how much new housing will be social housing rather than shared ownership		Policy LP3 sets out the Council's approach to affordable housing, which will include a range of products catering for different levels of housing need.	No further change required.
R01142/04	Wendy Black	86	Policy LP22	Fullwell Cross Roundabout requires traffic lights.		Noted. Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable transport. The implications of new developments in the locality will be fully considered at the planning application stage, and mitigation measures sought	No further change required.
R01143	David Lyon	120	Policy LP34	Oakfield should be protected as green belt. Green spaces are needed for children to play safely. Current levels of infrastructure struggles to cope with existing population levels.		All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1). The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R01144	Johanna Flitman	36	Para 3.7.5	Development of Oakfield will put a strain on local services and result in a loss of valued facilities.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21).	No further change required.
R01145	Ian Turner	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield should not be identified as an opportunity site.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.
R01146	Peter Williams	61	LP14	I would like policies relating to live/work units, urban design developments implemented. This will support local artists, the community and housing problems.		Policy LP14 includes the promotion of live/work units to help stimulate businesses and the local economy.	No further change required.
R01147	Alan & Lesley Saunders	36	Para 3.7.5	Inclusion of Oakfield Sports Ground as a Development Opportunity Site is contrary to paragraph 74 of the NPPF. Also its inclusion goes against local objections and advice from major sports bodies.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. This is in accordance with NPPF requirements. The Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council have considered comments received through the preparation of the plan.	No further change required.
R01148	Gagan Dulay	86	Policy LP22	Development of Oakfield will cause major traffic disruption and pollution, and reduce the amount of green space and sports facilities in the area.		Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.
R01149	Denise Curtis	32	LP1D	South Woodford has always had a village feel and whilst I can see the need for more housing, I don't understand why this has to all in our area. We would lose that village feel. We have always been limited for leisure and sports facilities and so the teenagers have to travel elsewhere as there is little for them to do.		The Local Plan is considered to be consistent with National Policy that promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Plan is focused on the objectively assessed needs for Redbridge and a key focus is to ensure that the benefits of this growth are captured for residents and to help reduce inequalities in the borough.	No further change required.
R01150	David Day	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplicate of R01085/01-10		See response to R01085/01-10	See response to R01085/01-10

R01151/01	Colin McMillan	26	Policy LP1B	Object to proposed changes at Billet Road and A12. Changes will have an adverse effect on the area, and a major impact on quality of life. New homes will put strain on the roads, and increase noise, which we object to.		The Local Plan discusses at Policy LP1B the development of the site at Billet Road, as part of a master planning exercise, implementing sustainable design principles and high quality, distinctive architecture. The aim is to develop the area in the appropriate scale and with the best design. A borough wide transport assessment has been undertaken by the Council to fully consider the impact of growth in Redbridge.	No further change required.
R01151/02	Colin McMillan	26	Policy LP1B	Additional housing will affect privacy, as open space will be replaced by homes.		Any new housing built in the Billet Road area will be subject to planning regulations and the amenity and privacy of local residents will be protected.	No further change required.
R01151/03	Colin McMillan	26	Policy LP1B	The proposed changes would affect the tranquility of the neighbourhood and local character.		As stated above at response R01151/01, the aim of the Local Plan is to retain the local character and use the best architectural design where new homes are developed.	No further change required.
R01152	Iris Frost	86	LP22, LP23 and LP27	I do not think the area around S. Woodford Station is an ideal location for housing, and I object to any high rise blocks. Currently it is very difficult to find anywhere to park, building even more houses or flats in this vicinity, will only make the matter worse? Any high rise properties will be out of keeping with the character of the area. Please do think carefully about this before you implement any plans. If we need anything in the South Woodford area it is a swimming pool. Are there any plans for this?		South Woodford has an active, thriving district centre located around good levels of local public transport including South Woodford Underground Station, and has capacity for further development. The Local Plan does not propose to build high rise blocks in South Woodford. See responses R00416/10 and R00416/11. With regard to Parking in the borough Local Plan Policy LP23 tackles parking facilities for new development and Policy LP22 promotes sustainable modes of transport.	See responses R00416/10 and R00416/11
R01153	Fergus Maclaine	32	LP1D	What would the impact of growth at South Woodford be upon the already highly stressed South Woodford Station service. I would hope that you are already in close discussion with TfL as part of Council's rationale of the development of the Plan, on resolutions to the impending collapse of service and community cohesion. Of all the issues involved, resolution of this matter will have greater consequences on the viability and cohesion of South Woodford than almost all of the other factors put together!!!!		See response R00416/03.	See response R00416/03.
R01154/1	B Kline	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield should be protected as a valued sports facilities used by a diverse selection of users, and maintained by present clubs		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.
R01154/2	B Kline	36	Para 3.7.5	The amount of development proposed at Oakfield will add to existing congestion and air pollution.		Policy LP22 sets out the Council's approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	No further change required.
R01154/3	B Kline	36	Para 3.7.5	Little consideration has been given to the biodiversity value of the site		Policy LP39, as proposed for modification in response to rep R01090/37 promotes the enhancement of all sites of biodiversity value including any sites with protected and priority species. Furthermore, Policy LP39 also seeks new developments to include measures to improve biodiversity.	No further change required.
R01154/4	B Kline	36	Para 3.7.5	The existing covenant for the site has been overlooked		See response to R01088/03	See response to R01088/03
R01155	Tom & Val Sharpe	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield should not be developed for housing - it is a treasured local amenity		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.
R01156/01	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Object to the inclusion of Oakfield as a Development Opportunity Site. It provides high quality sports facilities that are maintained at no cost to local residents, and there have been sustained objections to its loss.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.

R01156/02	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Club houses provide a variety of functions for community benefit.		See response to R01156/01	See response to R01156/01
R01156/03	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Playing fields were donated for sports use, and are in use all year round		See response to R01156/01	See response to R01156/01
R01156/04	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Replacement pitches will be at a cost to residents		The Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (LBR 2.44.1) demonstrate that suitable pitch and facility re-provision is feasible, and sets out ongoing maintenance requirements.	No further change required.
R01156/05	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Proposed replacement pitches flood and have insufficient car parking.		See response to R01156/04	See response to R01156/04
R01156/06	Gill Cawser	86	Policies LP22, LP24	The area suffers from existing traffic congestion and poor air quality		Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	No further change required.
R01156/07	Gill Cawser	36	Para 3.7.5	Existing fields provide shelter for wildlife		See response to R01154/03	See response to R01154/03
R01156/08	Gill Cawser	86	Policies LP22, LP34	The Mayor of London has pledged to protect the Green Belt and reduce pollution		Noted. All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Assessment (REFXXX) and Addendum (REFXXX). Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation.	No further change required.
R01157	Sheila & Chris Johnstone	81	Policies LP21, LP22, LP24	Object to inclusion of Oakfield as a Development Opportunity Site on the basis of traffic and pollution concerns, and existing high levels of use for sporting and community use. Developing on green belt could also increase flood risk.		Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Policy LP24 addresses pollution issues, including requirements for air quality assessments and appropriate mitigation. The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. Policy LP21 sets out the Council's approach to flood risk, which includes the use of SuDS in new developments.	No further change required.
R01158	Jonathan Pike	36	Para 3.7.5	Object to the inclusion of Oakfield as a Development Opportunity Site due to its benefits as a leisure facility. Proposed alternative sites are inadequate.		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35. See response to R01088/02 regarding relocation sites.	No further change required.
R01159	Leigh Riches	154	Site 116	I was very concerned that the community site at Oakdale Park at the bottom of Rose Avenue had been included as an area 'earmarked' for potential development. It was pointed out to me that the council had wrongly included the park in Rose Avenue this time round. The council officials in attendance at the meeting also acknowledged that this was likely to be an error. In proposing changes to South Woodford the council is under pressure to deliver increased facilities for the area, but it should also look to protect where is here already. The site on Rose Avenue is a park with swings, a slide and a grass area that the local community use and therefore should not be included for housing. Can I ask you therefore to remove the Oakdale Park area from the redevelopment plans on the basis that it has been incorrectly included.		See response R00108/18. The Council has amended the site boundary on site ref 116 to remove Rose Avenue Park from the opportunity site boundary	See response R00108/18.

R01160	Pamela Watkinson	153	Site 99	Object to inclusion of land south of Billet Road as an opportunity site on basis of traffic concerns. Concerns over the ability of health infrastructure to cope with increased population.		Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01161	Mark Long	120	Policy LP34	Green belt should be protected from development		All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Assessment (LBR 2.41) and Addendum (LBR 2.41.1)	No further change required.
R01162/01	David Martin	93	Policy LP24	Geological Surveys raise doubts as to whether Oakfeld can be safely developed for housing		Policy LP24 sets out requirements for site investigations and remediation works prior to the development of any sites with a risk of land contamination	No further change required.
R01162/02	David Martin	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplication of R01085/01-10		See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01163/01	Lynn Hull	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield should remain protected as green belt and as an important green space for sport and play. There are existing problems with traffic congestion and air pollution, and schools and health services are struggling to cope with increased population.		See response to R01085/01 and R01088/04. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01163/02	Lynn Hull	36	Para 3.7.5	Duplication of R01085/01-10		See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01164	Dr Rod Armstrong	120	LP34	Green belt should be protected from development		See response to R01161	See response to R01161
R01165	Ann Mcginley	32	LP1D	This representation is a replica of the representation R00416/ and other representations regarding South Woodford.		See responses R00416/01 to R00416/16	See response R00416/02 R00416/08 R00416/10 R00416/11 and R00416/16
R01166/01	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	-	GEN	The Plan is not sound. It has not been positively prepared, it's not justified or effective. The Plan demonstrates a lack of ambition for the borough and should refer more to the contribution that the arts, culture and sport can make to regeneration.		The provision of sporting, leisure and cultural facilities are covered by Policy LP17 Delivering Community Infrastructure.	No further change required.
R01166/02	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	-	GEN	There is a failure to link inter-related issues such as the impact of leisure and sports facilities on health, or the impact of undesirable types of housing on the local economy or too many take aways.		The Plan and its policies should be read as a whole and all policies are linked in order to deliver a sustainable strategy. This is evident in the Sustainability Appraisal. Furthermore, policy LP18 Health and Wellbeing is a cross-cutting policy which deals with an integrated approach to health and wellbeing stating that housing quality, access to open space, access to work and training and accessibility and active travel all help contribute to healthier communities.	No further change required.
R01166/03	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	-	GEN	There is a complete absence of commitment to the role of local communities in contributing to the planning process. Community consultation on the whole has been inadequate.		he Local Plan Consultation Statement (2017) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan. Section 1.3 of the Plan refers to Neighbourhood Planning and how communities can influence their area by preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their own area.	No further change required.
R01166/04	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	18	Objectives	Support for maintaining and improving the borough's open spaces. Support for promoting high quality design and character of the borough's neighbourhoods.		Support noted.	No further change required.

R01166/05	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	40	LP3	Support LP3.		Support noted.	No further change required.
R01166/06	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	71	Policy 3.25.2	Recognition that places of worship need to avoid causing disturbance to the surrounding community but could be strengthened into a guideline.		Criteria 2 in policy LP17 addresses this issue.	No further change required.
R01166/07	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	91	LP23	Support the need for new developments to provide parking spaces for service and delivery vehicles.		Support noted.	No further change required.
R01166/08	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	111	LP31	Support new policy on basements.		Support noted.	No further change required.
R01166/09	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	4	1.3.2	This section should state that the Council will encourage and facilitate Neighbourhood Planning.		Section 1.3 adequately addresses neighbourhood planning.	No further change required.
R01166/10	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	7	1.11.7	Better explanation required about how the London Stansted Cambridge Corridor will benefit Redbridge.		1.11 adequately covers this issue.	No further change required.
R01166/11	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	7	1.17.8 & 3.21	No consideration is given to the need to expand the Borough's business rate base. The Plan does not mention the need to ensure that there are up-to-date communications infrastructure such as fast broadband and free Wi-Fi.	Improve policy on communications infrastructure and tax base	Noted. Modifications have been suggested to Local Plan Policy LP25 Telecommunications to include more detail with regard to improving communications infrastructure/superfast broadband.	See Proposed Modifications Schedule.
R01166/12	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	13	1.20.4	The third indent about Redbridge people's general health is at odds with the other indents. What message is intended to be conveyed here?	Statement appears contradictory	The message clearly states that people in Redbridge generally enjoy good health.	No further change required.
R01166/13	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	32	LP1D	The proposal to create a 'contemporary landmark' building in the Station Estate (para 3.6.5) is not only misconceived in itself but in clear contradiction of several statements elsewhere in the Plan about the need to respect the character of existing areas, resist inappropriate developments, etc. (Objectives 3 and 4; para. 3.6.8; LP 32 and 33). A building over 3-4 storeys in height would be completely out of scale and character of South Woodford which is composed largely of 2-3 storey Victorian and Edwardian buildings, and where the residential areas abut very closely upon the retail centre.		The term 'landmark building' does not necessarily mean a 'tall building', rather it relates to the Council's aspiration of bringing forward a development of high quality design that respects and contributes to the existing character of the South Woodford area. The emerging Local Plan does not make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford. The Tall Building designation for Station Estate, as set out in the Core Strategy (2008), has been removed from the draft Local Plan. The Council has also undertaken a Tall Buildings study of the borough, to support the policy position of the Local Plan and to ascertain areas in the borough that can accommodate this type of development. Agree to amend paragraph 3.6.5 to make clear the Council's aspiration for high quality developments in South Woodford.	See response to R00416/10
R01166/14	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	32	LP1D	There is limited information in relation to delivering community infrastructure to support growth.		See responses R00416/02; R00416/03 and R00416/05.	No further change required.
R01166/15	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	40	LP2 (c)	It's difficult to see how high density housing could be appropriate in areas like South Woodford. Even with higher density, there are choices about the type of building that may deliver it, which are not reflected in the Plan; for example terraces of town houses may deliver high density without being as visually intrusive and destructive of community as high-rise flats.		The Plan does not specifically state that high density housing is appropriate in South Woodford. The Council agrees that the Plan should reference that different housing typologies can deliver high density housing, and this doesn't necessarily mean tall buildings.	See response R01218/16

R01166/16	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	101	LP27	LP 27 policy on Tall Buildings is wholly unsatisfactory. The statement that tall buildings have been 'successfully accommodated within the Borough' is not borne out by the fiasco of Pioneer Point in Ilford. Although South Woodford and Barkingside are not mentioned in the list of areas where tall buildings may be developed, there is a reference to Investment and Growth areas which could be considered to include them (especially given the reference in LP 1 D to a 'landmark' building). The possibility of allowing tall buildings there should be excluded altogether.		As parts of the borough where growth and intensification is to be encouraged, it is appropriate for the Council to 'consider', any proposals for tall buildings in Investment and Growth Areas. All applications will be fully assessed based on both Local Plan Policy LP26 and LP27, which contain rigorous and complete criteria for assessing such proposals. Where proposals are considered not to be appropriate or insensitive to the character of a specific local area, they will be refused planning permission, and both policies provide Council officers with the tools to come to the correct recommendation.	No further change required.
R01166/17	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	107	5.4.3	It is concerning that the Council proposes to undermine its own proposed amenity space standards (para. 5.4.3) by allowing developments to avoid provision of enough private amenity space. An all-weather gym is NOT a substitute for outdoor amenity space. This is inconsistent with the 'green' and sustainability policies elsewhere in the Plan.		Policy LP29 states firm requirements for amenity space provision. Paragraph 5.4.3 merely gives examples of flexible amenity space provision in town centre locations.	No further change required.
R01166/18	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	47	3.11.5 & 3.11.6	Paras. 3.11.5 and 3.11.6 rightly refer to the undesirability of flats being developed outside 'town centres' but it assumes that the boundaries of 'town centres' are clearly distinct and distant from the residential areas, and that existing family housing which does exist within town centres does not need protection. This particularly affects South Woodford (see para 34 below about the South Woodford District Centre boundary.). 3.12 correctly points to the difficulties associated with the conversion of existing buildings into flats and HMOs and it is inconsistent that this is acknowledged whilst similar problems caused by building of new flats are not. For example LP 11 and 3.18.2 fail to recognise that an over-representation of certain types of housing in town centres is likely to lead to the proliferation of undesirable retail uses.		Noted. Policy LP11 is concerned with ground floor uses in town centres.	No further change required.
R01166/19	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	141	7.3.3	The section on Community Infrastructure is weak, as is the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		Policy LP17, LP41 and the IDP set out how the Council will manage the delivery of new infrastructure and lists the type of infrastructure required to support growth over the plan period. The IDP has been updated since Regulation 19 consultation, and full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No further change required.
R01166/20	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	71	3.28	The section on the CIL (3.28) is inadequate because the system currently used in Redbridge for allocating the CIL that is to be spent in individual wards is secretive and inefficient. The description of the system at 7.2.7 is unrecognisable from the reality – Neighbourhood forums (where they exist or meet – infrequently) do not discuss CIL bids.		The Council's allocation of the local Neighbourhood CIL element is as per the systems agreed in November 2014. Systems and process in relation to local CIL is not relevant to the Local Plan.	No further change required.

R01166/21	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	71	3.25.3	Para. 3.25.3 states that new community facilities will normally only be allowed in town centres and stipulates that they should respect the surrounding area etc. Presumably this should apply to all community facilities whether outside or in town centres, and the text should make this clear.		All new development anywhere in the borough will need to satisfy criteria in Policy LP26 regarding design, in relation to architectural quality, scale and massing, amenity, landscaping, and all other issues relevant to the development of buildings of good and appropriate design.	No further change required.
R01166/22	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	86	LP22	4.10.6 mentions school travel plans, which are generally ineffective. More imaginative solutions to the 'school run' congestion are needed. Para. 4.13.2 states that lower levels of parking can be provided in new developments with good PTAL scores. Although this is a feature of regional and national planning policy, experience shows that new developments do generate extra pressure on parking and the Plan should emphasise that this does not mean that no or very little parking should be provided, as often happens with planning applications in such cases.		Noted. Lower parking provision in areas with high PTAL is the one of the best approaches in terms of planning policy, to promoting sustainable transport - encouraging people to use public transport.	See response to R01213/26 and R01213/26a
R01166/23	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	91	LP23	LP 23 1 b should be redrafted to say 'requiring the developer to' [provide parking spaces . . .] LP 23 (5) mentions charging points for electric vehicles but greater efforts should be made to provide charging points in the Borough, not simply in new developments. This should dovetail with other environmental aims in section 4.		Agreed to modification of Policy LP23 1b.	Re-word Policy LP23: Cycle and Car Parking, at point 1 (b) to read as follows: 'requiring new development to provide parking spaces for servicing and delivery vehicles in new development. '
R01166/24	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	109	LP30	LP 30 on household extensions does not fully reflect the impact of the enormous number of extensions being carried out in certain parts of the Borough. It should include consideration of the possible loss of garage/parking space with consequent increase in demand for on-street parking. (1j could cover this but is not specific enough.)		The development of garage space is permitted development. Policy LP30 relates to extensions that the Council can control through planning applications for domestic alterations.	No change required.
R01166/25	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	59	LP12	LP 12 (b) says the Council will ensure there is no 'undue' impact on residents' amenity from the night economy, but no definition of 'undue' is offered. The word should be removed.		It is considered that the wording of the policy is clear and relevant.	No change required.
R01166/26	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	153	Site 98	LP 17(f) and 3.27.1 say that existing waste sites in the Borough will be safeguarded and yet Appendix 1, item 98, designates the Redbridge Recycling centre site for housing. There is nothing about replacing this, or improving the existing sites. If Redbridge is to improve its poor performance in recycling it may need to make improvements. 3.29.1 re. air quality mitigation measures – should state what type of measures would be considered acceptable		Appendix 1 has been reviewed in light of representation received during the consultation for the Pre-submission Local Plan. Site 98, the Redbridge Recycling Centre has been removed as an opportunity site from the modified Appendix 1. Paragraph 3.29.1 is an overview of specific Local Plan policies to show how they integrate. Policy LP24 Pollution goes into more detail regarding what is required of new development in terms of measures to ensure good air quality.	No change required.
R01166/27	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	82	Para 4.5	The section on flooding (4.5) should state that the Council will press the Environment Agency to progress flood alleviation measures on the Roding as they have delayed action on an agreed scheme for several years.		The Council has worked with the Environment Agency on the sequential and exemption tests process in relation to the development opportunity sites listed in Appendix 1.	No change required.

R01166/28	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	129	Policy LP36	LP 36 (3) should go further in explaining whether any form of agricultural building development might be permitted to enable the land to continue to be economically viable		The type of buildings given planning permission on land is a detailed matter decided through the normal planning application process.	No change required.
R01166/29	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	133	Policy LP39	LP 39 (2) should be cross-referenced in other policies on the sustainability of new build in Section 5. Paras. 6.2.4 on green areas in high density developments and 5.4.3 on amenity space also need to be consistent on the efforts that need to be made to promote a 'green' environment e.g. with roof gardens, green walls, pop-up gardens and the like.		Policy LP 39 relates to land in those parts of the borough that are part of the natural environment - open spaces, local parks, areas of local conservation importance and protected sites within the borough. Some approaches to green development in these parts of the borough will differ to sustainable design and construction standards applied to the predominantly urban parts of the borough, where space is a strong factor.	No change required.
R01166/30	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	154	Sites 116, 120, 192	<p>Item 192 – no justification is given for including this site (Maybank Road) as residential – currently it provides employment and part of the site is a day nursery, a much needed local facility. It may be that it would be suitable for residential development but without any rationale it is hard to support it.</p> <p>Site no. 120 appears to include the South Woodford Tube station car park. This must be a mistake since it would be catastrophic if the station were to lose its dedicated car park.</p> <p>Site 116 – Rose Gardens play area – should not be designated for housing.</p> <p>The area of South Woodford designated as a 'secondary shopping area' includes the Station estate, the Viaduct and the South Woodford Mosque, which seems inappropriate as there are no shops in any of these locations.</p> <p>The area designated as the South Woodford District Centre should not run as far to the east as it does.</p> <p>There is no reason for the area at the top of Mulberry way, including the mosque, to be in the District Centre as it is here that the residential zone clearly begins.</p>		<p>Site 192 was first designated as a housing opportunity in the 2008 Local Development Framework, and is also an opportunity site in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The site has not come forward for development and has been retained as an opportunity site within the Local Plan. It represents a good opportunity for housing development. This applies to site 120. Rose Avenue Park has been deleted from site 116 in the modified Appendix 1. Again the boundary of South Woodford district centre has not been changed since the 2008 LDF, and the Council is satisfied that the boundary remains relevant and correct.</p>	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.
R01166/31	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	170	Appendix 4	Churchfields Recreation Ground should also be included in the list as it has a play area and is one of the few green spaces west of the Central Line. It is also close to Churchfields School.	Add Churchfields Recreation Ground to list of Local Open Spaces	Noted	No further change required.
R01166/32	Gwyneth Deakins Liberal Democrat	-	IDP	No mention is made of the future of the gas storage site in Snakes Lane East – the only 'major hazard' site in the Borough.		Noted	No further change required.
R01167/01	Joyce Ryan	86	LP22	Development at Oakfield will further increase traffic at Fullwell Cross Roundabout	Oakfield should be removed from the list of opportunity sites	See response to R01088/04	See response to R01088/04
R01167/02	Joyce Ryan	36	Para 3.7.5	Removing Oakfield from the Green Belt is contrary to the NPPF and PPG2		See response to R01088/01	See response to R01088/01
R01167/03	Joyce Ryan	36	Para 3.7.5	Proposals for Oakfield have been subject to high levels of objections		The Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how issues raised throughout the development of the plan have been considered.	No further change required.
R01167/04	Joyce Ryan	36	Para 3.7.5	Proposed development could be easily built on the land the Council wishes to relocate pitches to		The Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) has found that Oakfield does not meet NPPF Green Belt tests and should therefore be removed from its Green Belt designation. Sports facilities are a green belt compatible use, and can therefore be relocated to an alternative Green Belt site.	No further change required.
R01167/05	Joyce Ryan	36	Para 3.7.5	Little regard has been given to Sport England requirements and the governments health agenda		The value of existing facilities at Oakfield are recognised in the Local Plan, hence requirements for their re-provision prior to any development as set out in Policies LP1E (Oakfield) and LP35	No further change required.

R01167/06	Joyce Ryan	5	Section 1.8	The plan contains many inconsistencies and conflicts with its evidence base		The Council considers the plan to be fully justified by its supporting evidence base. Proposed modifications to the Pre-Submission Plan overcome any inconsistencies within the document.	No further change required.
R01167/07	Joyce Ryan	36	Para 3.7.5	The value of facilities to people living outside the borough has not been recognised		See response to R01167/05	See response to R01167/05
R01168/01	Kevin Page London Green Belt Council	120	Policy LP34	The Local Plan is not legally compliant or sound. It is not positively prepared. The Council has not demonstrated that there is not enough brownfield land in or out of the borough to meet its housing need. I endorse the submission made by CPRE.	LP34 and the Policies Map should be amended to read: "The Council will protect all Green Belt and MOL. Amend 1B to check the unrestricted sprawl particularly within Redbridge (why has this aim been left out?) The Council has prematurely assumed the loss of Fords and Goodmayes Hospital from the Green Belt and their vital role in preventing Newbury Park merging with Seven Kings, Goodmayes & Chadwell Heath. Para 6.1.9 needs to be amended assuming the Inspector upholds our objections. Para 6.1.10 - the Council needs to specify that the new green belt includes Goodmayes Park and Goodmayes Park Extension.	All brownfield sites with reasonable prospects for development have been included in the Local Plan. Beyond this, green belt release is required to meet the boroughs development needs. The Council considers its inability to meet minimum housing targets and other development needs on brownfield land are exceptional circumstances for green belt release. The Green Belt Review (LBR 2.41) has found that the proposed Green Belt release sites do not meet NPPF Green Belt tests and should therefore be removed from their Green Belt designation.	No further change required.
R01168/02	Kevin Page London Green Belt Council	146	Appendix 1	The Plan is not sound because it has not been positively prepared and its not consistent with national policy. Despite the Council's identified brownfield land sites in Appendix 1, the Plan doesn't make it clear that the 200 sites could deliver over 12,000 homes over the plan period without touching the Green Belt. The Plan doesn't mention Ebbsfleet or the Olympic Park - why not?	Insert a new policy LP2A to read: "The Council will prioritise the residential development of its opportunity sites both in and outside Redbridge targetting especially Barking Riverside and Ebbsfleet to address the ongoing housing shortage. The Council will introduce measures to curb widespread land banking by time limited planning permissions of under 3 years. The Plan is amended to simplify the complex rules for bedroom extensions and fast tracking suitable planning applications and expedite the development of residential windfall sites.	The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets as set out in the London Plan (2016). The Council considers it has met the Duty to Cooperate and detailed information regarding how it has met its duty is set out in the separate Redbridge Duty to Cooperate Statement (2017). As London is treated as a single housing market area, there is no requirement for Redbridge to include strategic housing sites beyond its neighbouring boroughs. A robust assessment of existing brownfield land and former employment land following the methodology of the London Plan (2013) SHLAA has concluded that the Mayor's minimum housing target cannot be met on brownfield land alone. In order to provide a comfortable buffer over the Mayor's minimum target (necessary due to the boroughs full Objectively Assessed Housing Need as identified through the East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment and meet other development needs including infrastructure requirements, Green Belt release is considered necessary.	No further change required.
R01168/03	Kevin Page London Green Belt Council	22	Policy LP1B	The Crossrail Corridor designation as an Investment and Growth Area is unsound because it is not consistent with the NPPF, it hasn't been positively prepared and its not effective.	Major modifications are essential to this Investment and Growth Area if as the Council expects Fords Sports Ground and the land around Goodmayes hospital with its rich biodiversity are all protected under NPPF. Much of the development of the southern part of the Crossrail Corridor will become an all prevailing area of open space deficiency (Figure 22) and increased obesity due to a clustering of take aways. Figure 6 Key Diagram should be modified so its compatible with Map 5.3 from the Crossrail Corridor AAP.	The Council's aspirations for the redevelopment of King George and Goodmayes Hospital sites and the Ford Sports Ground are set out on page 28 of the draft Plan. It is recognised that the ecological aspects could be made more explicit in the policy boxes. For the Ford Sports Ground, add the following in the policy box: "Development to be of the highest quality design, respecting the ecological nature and landscape of the area".	Add the following criteria to the Ford Sports Ground policy box: "Development to be of the highest quality design, respecting the ecological nature and landscape of the area".

R01168/04	Kevin Page London Green Belt Council	40	Policy LP3	LP3 is unsound as it has not been positively prepared, it's not effective, consistent with national policy and doesn't meet the duty to cooperate. It will not be effective in dealing with the affordable housing deficit since 2010.	LP3 should be amended to read: "an affordable housing target of 45% per year. The 336 units should be increased to 500.. Expediting the delivery of affordable housing and extensions through simplified procedures in regard to bedroom extensions, local authority new builds and estate enlargements/regeneration"	Agree to amend LP3 to insert the word "minimum" in order to maximise affordable housing in the borough.	Please see response to R01213/07
R01169/01	Harold Moth	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP2 Policies 128-129 & 133-135	Appendix 1 is not consistent with the figures in table 3		Noted. Appendix 1 has been update.	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.
R01169/02	Harold Moth	36	Para 3.7.5 Policy LP2 Policies 128-129 & 133-135	Oakfield, Fullwell Cross Car Park and Medical Centre, and Coral Bing Hall should all be retained for current use.		See response to R01088/01 regarding Oakfield. The Coral Bingo Club is identified as an opportunity site for a mixed use scheme which could include community facilities or leisure space. Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of supporting sustainable transport and reducing reliance on the private car. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan that supports the Local Plan sets out proposals for future health provision.	See Appendix 1 Modification Schedule.
R01170	Suhas Winter	20	LP1	Ilford could be a beautiful place to live if all the amenities are sufficient to meet the needs of local people living here. In my experience, even without the influx of new housing and 65,000 people, amenities are not sufficient. Our standard of living will go down and crime will increase.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21)	No further change required.
R01171/01	Richard White	120	LP34	This policy seems to use customary or informal definitions of toponyms, and in some cases, possibly wrong definitions (Woodford Bridge). Future planning decisions could be exposed to legal challenge and justification of evidence base.		Noted. The Council considers the naming of places within Policy LP34 to be accurate, and clear.	No further change required.
R01171/02	Richard White	120	LP34	I propose replacing (c) of LP34 with the following "(C): Protecting the dispersal settlement character of Woodford Bridge (defined as parts of Woodford lying east of the river Roding) consequent upon it being a recently rural community, by preventing further merging of its component estates (Hill Farm Great Gales, Uplands etc.) cantered on former farmsteads.		In the interests of adopting clear, accessible policies that are easily understood by the public, the suggested modification will not be applied.	No further change required.
R01171/03	Richard White	120	LP34	I propose replacing (d) of LP34 with the following "Preventing its merging with developed areas to its east, Hainault (including Repton Park), Barkingside and Ilford and maintaining a degree of separation between the last two. Similarly, maintaining its separation from the rest of Woodford and that of Wanstead from Ilford. Maintaining the comparable isolation of Alderbrook estate from its neighbours, Wanstead and Ilford."	Delete and replace LP34 (d) with "Preventing its merging with developed areas to its east, Hainault (including Repton Park), Barkingside and Ilford and maintaining a degree of separation between the last two. Similarly, maintaining its separation from the rest of Woodford and that of Wanstead from Ilford. Maintaining the comparable isolation of Alderbrook estate from its neighbours, Wanstead and Ilford."	In the interests of adopting clear, accessible policies that are easily understood by the public, the suggested modification will not be applied.	No further change required.
R01171/04	Richard White	20	LP1 - LP6	Generally my reaction to these policies is one of relief and congratulate the council on their good sense in allocating Oakfield's and Barkingside for housing development. Although there is a campaign to stop development here, far more people would be adversely impacted by the prevention of development than if development went ahead.		Support welcomed	No further change required.

R01171/05	Richard White	161	Site 209	There are concerns around entry 209 in appendix 1 relating to the Claybury Hall Farm site in Roding Lane north. The entry states that there is no current planning applications or new permissions is out of date as the site has now been developed by Beckett and Fitzherbert		Noted	No change required.
R01171/06	Richard White	115	LP33 4(a)	I did not find the Oxford Archaeology report on the evidence base until five days before the end of consultation. Most of the contact was already written on the basis of the policies map alone. My general conclusions on the document is that a system of APAs /APZs is the wrong way to do things, there should be a presumption in favour of archaeological throughout the borough excepts on sites where all archaeological features have demonstrably been destroyed		Noted. The Redbridge Archaeological Priority Areas Appraisal (April 2016) follows the newly developed guidance on undertaking a review of Archaeological Priority Areas (APA) produced by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS), which is part of Historic England's London Local Office. The aim of the tiering of APAs is to allow for adequate archaeological assessments where needed, but also allow for discretion based on the available evidence, with regard to sites in the lower tiers. This ensures assessments where required, whilst maintaining efficiency in the planning process.	No further change required.
R01172/01	Richard Hallgate-Hills	22	LP1A	concerned about the increase in housing density in Ilford town centre and along the cross rail corridor		The borough has a statutory duty to plan for minimum housing targets set out in the London Plan	No further change required.
R01172/02	Richard Hallgate-Hills	22	Policy LP1A	Ilford has had big increase in population, resulting in overcrowding and no infrastructure or leisure amenities in place to support this growth. It has become a sad dormitory town with no sense of place or belonging. Don't understand how it is going to support further growth		Section 2 of the Local Plan has set out the vision and objectives for the borough. Policy LP1 and LP1A sets out in more detail how this vision will be delivered by managing growth and investment in the area. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01173	Donald Baker	-	-	Does not believe that the plan is legally compliant. No further information provided.	No change sought.	Noted	No further change required.
R01174/01	Elizabeth Murphy	-	-	The consultation is a meaningless box ticking exercise. The document, diagrams and graphics are unreadable, unclear and unaccompanied by a logical key to enable understanding and inaccessible to the majority of the population. A permanent exhibition should be erected in a suitable space that enables people to view documents.		The Council's approach to engaging with communities on planning matters is set out in the Redbridge Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan Consultation Statement (LBR 1.13) sets out how the Council engaged with all consultees throughout the production of the Redbridge Local Plan	No further change required.
R01174/02	Elizabeth Murphy	20	LP1	Don't object to increase in density as long as sufficient thought, planning and infrastructures issues are prioritised. However, can't see how a 25% increase in population can be achieved without consequences to town centre.		Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with infrastructure providers since Pre-Submission consultation has informed proposed modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to add further detail.	No further change required.
R01174/03	Elizabeth Murphy	86	LP22	What is being proposed for the River Roding passing along the western edge of Ilford. Are there plans for making this area more accessible to pedestrians and cyclists?		Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritise walking and cycling.	No further change required.
R01175/01	Eileen Croghan	-	-	Does not consider the local plan to be legally compliant as not enough information given		Noted	No further change required.
R01175/02	Eileen Croghan	68	LP17	Not enough info given - reps were pleasant but didn't know answers to questions. For example, didn't know health care plans. Not possible to talk about housing for 18,500 when you are not aware of local NHS services. Services must work alongside each other, not separately.		The Plan facilitates sustainable development in the specific circumstances of Redbridge, in accordance with national planning policy, and plans for the infrastructure necessary to support Redbridge's expected growth. Full details of planned infrastructure improvement/new provision are set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21). Further partnership working with the CCG has resulted in clearer proposals in terms of matching population growth with future health requirements. Based on this latest understanding, modifications to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been put forward to add further detail.	No further change required.

R01175/03	Eileen Croghan	86	LP22	Transport is an issue and more buses will not help as people will never give up their cars.		Policy LP22 sets out the Councils approach of promoting sustainable travel that prioritise walking, cycling and public transport.	No further change required.
R01176/01	Richard Leighton	120	Policy LP34	LP34 does not give sufficient weight to giving Goodmayes Park and Goodmayes Park Extension sufficient legal protection in as far as giving them the protection afforded under the green belt and/or metropolitan land. Goodmayes Park has sought the views of local residents who overwhelmingly wish to remain as a park and in respect of the extension, to remain as green open space. With the pressure on green open space, there is a need to maximise the statutory safeguarding of these parks. ensure that Goodmayes Park/extension will remain as green open space. This will allow the park to act as vital contribution to biodiversity and be there in times of crises/		Goodmayes Park and Goodmayes Park extension is protected as open space, as shown on the Policies Map.	No further change required.
R01176/02	Richard Leighton	58	Policy LP11	LP11 does not mention effective monitoring of fast food outlets, especially under 3-18 "managing clustering of town centre uses". These establishments need to be effectively monitored not only within the town centre but throughout the borough. It is noted that in some areas, there is an over abundance of fast food outlets, such as Seven Kings. These do not contribute to a vibrant retail environment and encourages anti-social behaviour and obesity	To rewrite LP11 to ensure that fast food outlets are restricted	Policy LP11 sets out the Council's approach for managing the proliferation and over concentration of hot food takeaways. More specifically, paragraph 3.18.4 states that the Council will carefully manage A5 uses.	No further change required.
R01176/03	Richard Leighton	101	Policy LP27	There is evidence to support the adverse impact tall buildings have on migratory bird life	Developers submitting an application for a tall building should be required to undertake an environmental study to investigate the impact that development will have on bird life.	Policy LP39 sets out the Councils approach for protecting and enhancing the boroughs biodiversity. This policy includes measures that encourages bird and bat nesting and rooting opportunities.	No further change required.
R01177	Brian Hartnett	153	Site 99	We believe that the local plan being put forward by the L.B of Redbridge is sound and we wish to support it. Part of the proposal to recommend release of green belt land in the Billet road area will make use of existing vacant/derelict land and put it back into good use. Development in this area is a good idea because: it will cause minimum effect on local neighbourhood and enhance the area; access from this area is good onto Billet Road; local infrastructure is already in place; will create employment in the area		Support welcomed.	No further change required.
R01178/01	Bernard McDermott	154	Sites No 116, 118 and 121	Development sites around Charlie Brown's roundabout, with the already developed former Unigate site, total a huge number of new homes in a very confined area, and unfair to people already living in the area, in terms of the local impact.		On the basis of the findings of the Employment Land Study (2016), it is proposed that Woodford Trading Estate and Raven Road Industrial Estate are removed as development opportunity sites in Appendix 1, in order to protect them as employment sites. See response R00416/08.	See response R00416/08.
R01178/02	Bernard McDermott	32	Para 3.6.5	Chigwell Road and Southend Road around Charlie Brown's roundabout is already congested. More homes will mean more traffic, more congestion and pollution.		Charlie Browns Roundabout is on the strategic road network and is therefore under the control of TfL. The Local Plan (para 3.6.7) has committed to continuing to work with TfL to seek improvements and to address some of the issues at the roundabout, particularly in relation to air quality. TfL has recently notified the Council that it is considering a scheme to signalise the roundabout and make improvements. Consultation is expected later in 2017.	No further change required.

R01178/03	Bernard McDermott	86	Policy LP22	What provision will be made for additional parking in the area?		Local Plan Policy LP22 promotes sustainable transport in the area and sets out what is required of new development in terms of mitigating the impact on traffic and the road network in the borough. Appendix 7 contains standards for car and cycle parking provision, which will be applied to all new development.	No further change required.
R01178/04	Bernard McDermott	32	LP1B	Businesses and jobs in South Woodford should not be threatened by development. Appears to be a contradiction in the Council's thinking.		See response R00416/08.	See response R00416/08.
R01178/05	Bernard McDermott	86	LP17	The Local Plan does not discuss the development of community infrastructure.		R00416/02, R00416/03, R00416/05 and R00416/06.	See response R00416/02.
R01179	Olive Smith	159	Sites 184 and 66.	With more new homes planned it's time to review the shortage of surgeries in the local area. I would like to suggest site 184 is a preferred site for a new GP surgery; site 66 is another possibility for such facilities.		Noted.	No further change required.
R01180	Paul Scott	36	Para 3.7.5/ LP1E, LP2	The Local Plan is unsound because it includes development on Oakfield site, and does not limit high rise buildings. The Oakfield site should be conserved for health and well being of residents. Should be a restriction on high rise.		The site will involve a mix of uses including health facilities and some sports facilities will be retained on sites, with more re-provided on a site nearby. Policy LP35 protects open spaces and play space by resisting inappropriate development unless firm policy criteria are met, which includes re-provision of sports facilities. The area around Oakfield is largely an area made up of low rise development and opportunities for high rise development in the area will be very few.	No further change required.
R01181/01	Chris Thomas Ltd	106	Policy LP28	In line with NPPG a Local Plan does not have to contain advertising control policies. There is no evidence to support the proposed policy for advertising and therefore we consider Policy LP28 and supporting text is unnecessary.		National guidance clearly states at section 2 of the NPPF that planning policies should promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period. Part of making town centres competitive is keeping them attractive and not allowing the town centre environment to become run down and delapidated. Many of the town centres in Redbridge are historic in character, South Woodford, Wanstead, Woodford Green and parts of Ilford town centre, all retain elements of the early settlement of the borough and establishment of centres. Guided by advice from Historic England the Council recognises the important relationship between the character of the borough's historic town centres, and their vitality and competitiveness. Shopfronts and shopfront signage play a key role in the preservation of the character of historic town centres in the borough, and town centre prosperity. It is important that signage is sensitive to the essential historic identity of centres in the borough.	No further change required.
R01181/02	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The Policy only repeats what is in the NPPF and PPG and is superfluous.		Policy LP28 does not repeat text from the NPPF, but the policy is guided by the principles within it.	No further change required.
R01181/03	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The only consideration for advertising control is amenity and public safety, which the policy does not mention.		The overall objective of Policy LP28 is ensuring good design, this is a matter of public amenity. Parts of the policy also relate to public safety.	No further change required.
R01181/04	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	Policy LP28 is at odds with the law and national policy.		See response R01181/01, the Council believe the policy is justified, and in line with national policy, although it is agreed that some modification for the purpose of clarity is needed. See response R01181/07.	See response R01181/07.
R01181/05	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The whole section on advertising must be re-written. Some restrictions should be deleted, as it is too onerous.	Re-write Policy LP28 to state that advertisements must be considered on merit and their impact on amenity and public safety. The Policy should introduce requirements on national policy and explain why the policy is necessary.	See response R01181/04. Agreed, parts of the policy need clarification. See response R01181/07	See response R01181/07.
R01181/06	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The policy should be deleted and replaced by a reference to amenity, public safety and the NPPF.	Delete the policy and refer to the NPPF.	See response R01181/01, the Council believe the policy is justified and it will not be deleted.	No further change required.

R01181/07	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The policy suggests any signage in conservation areas should not be supported.		<p>Policy LP28 states aims to control rather than ban advertisements in conservation areas, but it is agreed that the wording of the policy is confusing and must be made clearer.</p>	<p>LP28: Advertising and Shop Fronts</p> <p>1 The Council will support signage in designated town centres and key retail parades that: where ensure that shopfronts and signs placed on buildings respect the overall character and appearance of the building and the street scene generally by:</p> <p>(a) Supporting signage in designated town centres and key retail parades where the premises concerned are not in a Conservation Area. Ensure that shopfronts and signs placed on buildings respect the overall character and appearance of the building and the street scene; Outside of these locations, advertisements will generally not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that they are necessary for the use of the premises on which they are located</p> <p><u>(b) Demonstrate in planning applications for advertisement consent in Conservation Areas, a respect for the historic and architectural character. Applications for advertisement consent in Conservation Areas that are not part of a town centre will be refused permission; Outside of these locations, advertisements will generally not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that they are necessary for the use of the premises on which they are located.</u></p> <p>2 Where For proposals are to be acceptable in principle the following criteria should be taken into consideration: <u>requirements must be adhered to:</u></p> <p>a) Supporting advertisements that <u>Advertisements must</u> respect the design of the building on which they are erected and the character and amenity of the surrounding area;</p> <p>b) Requiring advertisements where the <u>The</u> scale, colour, materials, content, illumination and siting of an advertisement are must be appropriate to its their location;</p>
R01181/07a	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	LP28	As above	As above	As above	<p>c) Supporting fascia signs and projecting signs which must <u>must</u> respect the architectural and design features of the host building, are <u>must be</u> of an appropriate height relative to overall height of the shop front, and not intrude above ground floor levels. Projecting signs should be fixed at fascia level; and <u>Fascia and projecting signs should adhere to height stipulations referred to in the 'Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers' (DCLG 2007), guidance in order to benefit from deemed consent;</u></p> <p>d) Only supporting Large poster hoardings where they <u>must</u> screen a vacant site, a temporary use or an unsightly building or feature. Their design, means of support and illumination (if provided) should not detract from the building, or site or character of the area.</p> <p>e) Only supporting Small poster panels where must:</p> <p>i. Their position clearly relates <u>Relate</u> to an existing building or its forecourt and does not detract from the appearance of a street;</p> <p>ii. Their size is <u>Be</u> in proportionate to the site and surrounding area; and</p> <p>iii. Their design and appearance does n <u>Not</u> detract from the character and amenity of the surrounding area.</p> <p>3 The Council will Resisting <u>resist</u> advertisements that:</p> <p>a) Obscure or are likely to be confused with traffic signs or signals; and</p> <p>b) Impede the visibility or distract the attention of drivers or pedestrians at any access road, junction or point where special care is needed.</p> <p>4 The Council will support shopfronts that:</p> <p>a) Respect the overall character of the building on which they are located;</p> <p>b) Add interest to the shopping parade in which they are located and help stimulate a vibrant pedestrian street scene;</p> <p>c) Are wheelchair accessible;</p> <p>d) Utilise ing appropriate lighting and security shutters so that they do not become dark and unwelcoming frontages at night. Generally the Council will refuse internally lit signs and solid shutters unless the proposal can be justified, e.g. for specific security reasons; and</p> <p>e) Demonstrating where cash machines, serving windows or other additions to shopfronts are proposed which could lead to customers queuing outside the shop, that the public footpath is wide enough to accommodate this without undue interference with pedestrian flows or giving rise to safety concerns over pedestrian/vehicular conflict.</p>
R01181/08	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	It is not for the Council to determine signage applications on need.		See response R01181/07.	See response R01181/07.

R01181/09	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	The policy contains poor grammar, such as at (2)(b)..		Agreed that the wording of the policy must be checked and modified for clarity. See response R01181/07.	See response R01181/07.
R01181/10	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	No justification for banning signs above fascia level.		Agreed that the text is confusing and must be modified. See response R01181/07	See response R01181/07.
R01181/11	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	There should be no presumption against internally lit signs.		Agreed that the wording of criteria 3(d) in LP28 should be modified. See response R01181/07	See response R01181/07.
R01181/12	Chris Thomas Ltd	105	Policy LP28	Para. 5.3.2 accepts shop signs in conservation areas and contradicts Policy LP28(1)(a).		Paragraph 5.3.2 is now in line with modified criteria 1(a). See response R01181/07.	See response R01181/07.
R01182	Sally Reed	-	-	The Local Plan is impressive and shows considerable attention to detail. If implemented it should make improvements to life of Ilford residents. Bye-laws should be created to such as making it illegal to pave over front or back gardens without using permeable materials.		Noted and welcome.	No further change required.
R01183	John Swallow	-	-	The Plan is a very full and thorough review of the borough's considerable facilities and of the possible ways in which these facilities can be developed.		Noted and welcome.	No further change required.
R01184/01	Nilesh Thakeria	86	Policy LP22	Development of Oakfield will result in increased traffic at Fullwell Cross roundabout, which is already close to capacity		The Council has undertaken a borough wide transport study which will inform the Council's decision making towards proposals for major development. Transport assessments for individual sites and further work will be required to assess detailed schemes, and adequate mitigation measures will also be required to be implemented to reduce impact on traffic.	No further change required.
R01184/02	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield meets the Green Belt purposes of the NPPF and PPG2. Surrounding housing was built pre green belt and the railway line was built in 1902.		The Council's Green Belt study considers that Oakfield is one of those areas of Green Belt land that does not meet the functions of Green Belt, and therefore does not meet the purposes of including land in Green Belt, and can come forward for alternative uses.	No further change required.
R01184/03	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	The need to build 31,977 new homes is approximately double the London Plan target, which does not constitute exceptional circumstances		The London Plan housing target is problematic for the Borough to achieve on brownfield land alone, whereas meeting the Borough's need, double the Mayor's target, just on brownfield land is not possible. The Council does consider these to be exceptional circumstances.	No further change required.
R01184/04	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	Housing shortage is not sufficient justification for developing on green belt		Noted. See response R01184/03.	See response R01184/03.
R01184/05	Nilesh Thakeria	120	LP34	Only minor development of sports and school facilities have occurred since the Green Belt was defined; so there is nothing to justify a change in boundary.		The Council holds historic aerial mapping records of large areas of the borough within its GIS database. These show major housing development having occurred around proposed Green Belt release sites since the late 1940s early 1950s, when Green Belt land was designated.	No further change required.
R01184/06	Nilesh Thakeria	120	LP34	Green Belt boundaries are intended to be enduring		Noted.	No further change required.
R01184/07	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	The small contribution Oakfield makes to the overall housing numbers is not sufficiently important to form the exceptional circumstances necessary for release from Green Belt		The Oakfield site is projected to deliver an estimated 600 new homes, if the land is released from Green Belt for alternative uses. This is a major contribution to the Borough's housing target The Local Plan has also proposed community infrastructure on the site in the form of a new school, which the Borough needs.	No further change required.
R01184/08	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	Oakfield is protected by Crown Covenants and has been declared an Asset of Community Value		See responses to R01088/03 and R01086/01	See responses to R01088/03 and R01086/01
R01184/09	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	The Alternative Playing Pitch Assessment does not demonstrate replacement provision for the loss of Oakfield, only the location of sites that are already fully used for playing fields		The Council has undertaken further feasibility work on alternative playing pitches sites. The work was carried out by the Institute of Groundsmanship, and it sets out how sites could provide 'like for like' replacement.	No further change required.
R01184/10	Nilesh Thakeria	36	Para 3.7.5	For the above reasons Oakfield should be removed from the Local Plan		Noted.	No further change required.
R01185	Pranavan Mahendrarajah	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10

R01186	Sarbjee Singh	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01187	Anitha Singh	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01188	Hary Markatis	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01189	Manjit Diocee	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01190	James Foley	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01191	Parminder Kalley	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01192	Leigh Munden	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01193	Sasha Staines	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01194	Om Thakeria	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01195	Edward Boyle	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01196	Haaris Shah	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01197	Amit Kalley	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01198	Tony Munden	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01199	Randeep Diocee	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01200	Balvinder Diocee	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01201	Sabastion Taylor	51	Para 3.15/6.28/6.19/6.16/6.29	duplication of R01184/01-10	duplication of R01184/01-10	see response to R01184/1-10	see response to R01184/1-10
R01202	Richard Ford Runnymede Borough Council	-	-	No comments to make on Local Plan		Noted.	No further change required.

R01203/01	Ceri Alefounder	21	Para 3.2	<p><u>Para 3.2. Investment & Growth Area designation</u> - South Woodford designated for more than 650 homes with no infrastructure improvements, will not cope with increased population</p>	Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment & Growth Area	<p>South Woodford has been identified as an Investment & Growth Area because it has an active, thriving district centre located around good levels of local public transport including South Woodford Underground Station, and has capacity for further development. The area also includes a key Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) at Southend Road that the Council wants to protect and direct industrial activity towards.</p> <p>The Local Plan approach of directing growth towards Investment & Growth Areas and town centres is a positive strategy to enable the delivery of successful places and a thriving economy, and provide a robust planning framework against which the aspirations of the Council can be successfully delivered. It is considered that the preferred approach in the Local Plan is on balance the most sustainable. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan, which has informed the Plan and supports the preferred strategy within it.</p> <p>The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 (LBR 2.21) is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan, as well as the policy position. The IDP plans for the expansion of schools in the borough by looking at current provision and identifying future requirements between 2015 and 2022, and includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough, supporting the South Woodford Area, including schools at... (NOTE: awaiting updated expansion list for the west of the borough). The IDP also discusses provision of infrastructure for open space, leisure, health facilities, community facilities and other key infrastructure to support growth in the borough. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.</p>	<p>Add the following text to the end of para. 3.6.4 lows:</p> <p><u>3.6.4 The purpose of the designation of South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Area is to implement a strategy for growth that boosts local business and commercial activity through new mixed use development, as well delivering additional homes in the area. The objective is to increase footfall in South Woodford Centre and create jobs, strengthening it economically. Opportunities have been identified where improvements can take place, but the Council also recognises the special character of South Woodford and the centre, and preserving that character is also a key aim of the strategy for the Investment and Growth Area. The designation is about positive economic and physical improvement, so that the area only gains economically and environmentally and does not lose any of the features that make it special. This approach involves a balanced approach to development and the preservation of local heritage assets and their settings, and new buildings will be required to respect local character and make a positive contribution to the area.</u></p>
-----------	-----------------	----	----------	---	--	---	--

R01203/02	Ceri Alefounder	13	Para 1.21.4	<u>Transport</u> - South Woodford station unable to cope with current footfall (1.21.4), how can its capacity be improved? Growth should be focused at stations with less footfall, such as Hainault station		<p>Policy LP22 within the Local Plan states that the Council will resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on capacity within local and strategic road networks and the public transport system, unless it contributes towards effective mitigation measures. As statutory consultees TfL is notified on all planning applications for new development, and will inform the Council where serious capacity issues are implied by new development on roads or at train stations. The Local Plan also concentrates growth at other stations within the borough, at Fairlop, Barkingside, Gants Hill Underground Stations, and in particular at Ilford Station and three Overground Stations within the Crossrail Corridor. All of the Overground Stations in the borough are due to be upgraded to Crossrail Stations in 2019 with improved rail infrastructure. TfL have also identified in their business plan improved signalling on the Central Line and walk through trains as ways in which capacity can be increased.</p> <p>The Council is working in partnership with strategic transport authorities such as TfL and network rail to deliver Crossrail and invest in renewing transport infrastructure and public realm. Improved infrastructure in South Woodford will include improved cycle infrastructure and improvements to the junction at Charlie Brown's roundabout to reduce the level of traffic congestion and improve the pedestrian and cycle network.</p> <p>Overall, the Council seeks to enhance an already excellent transport network (including rail, road, cycle and public realm) within the borough, and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Local Plan states that the additional improvements to transport links in Redbridge's town centres are likely to have a significant positive effect on transport efficiency and options within the borough.</p>	No further change required.
R01203/03	Ceri Alefounder	33	Para 3.6.7	<u>Para. 3.6.7.</u> - How can the Council make improvements to the junction at Charlie Brown's roundabout where much of the development is proposed? (sites 116, 118 & 119). Lack of consideration for road infrastructure	No change sought	See response R00416/04.	See response R00416/04.
R01203/04	Ceri Alefounder	69	LP17	<u>Schools</u> - No plans for schools with the planned new homes		The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan. The IDP plans for the expansion of schools in the borough by looking at current provision and identifying future requirements between 2015 and 2022, and includes a number of school expansions in the west of the borough, supporting the South Woodford Area. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.	No further change required
R01203/05	Ceri Alefounder	69	LP17	Current school expansion not planned to cope with future demand resulting from planned growth	No change sought	See Council response to See response to R00416/02 and See response to R00416/05.	No further change required

R01203/06	Ceri Alefounder	69	LP17	Woodbridge school will struggle to cope with plans for expansion. Sports facilities will be sacrificed to accommodate excessive pupil numbers. The Council is taking risks with children's education and safety	No change sought	The Council is aware of the need for school places in the borough, specifically secondary school places, which is the main focus of the Council's School Improvements strategy which is annually updated. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies the infrastructure needed to deliver planned growth set out in the Local Plan sustainably. The IDP will be used to inform decisions on infrastructure delivery, including sites for schools or other infrastructure. The IDP has identified school expansions for the first phase of the Local Plan (2015-2020), which includes the Woodford area.	No further change required
R01203/07	Ceri Alefounder	69	LP17	<u>Other Infrastructure</u> - Local Plan does not plan for doctor's surgeries, community/leisure services, childcare and hospitals	No change sought	The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2015-2030 is a strategy for the delivery of infrastructure in the borough that supports the growth planned for in the Local Plan. The IDP also discusses provision of infrastructure for open space, leisure, health facilities, community facilities and other key infrastructure to support growth in the borough. The IDP is a 'live' document that is continually updated with internal and external partners.	No further change required
R01203/08	Ceri Alefounder	32	Policy LP1D	How will South Woodford cope with increased population and no plans for infrastructure?	No change sought	See response to R00416/02.	See response to R00416/02.
R01203/09	Ceri Alefounder	69	LP17	Infrastructure plans in the Local Plan are unsustainable and will create increased travel patterns for South Woodford residents in order to use schools and sports/leisure facilities	No change sought	See response to R00416/02. With regard to access for South Woodford residents to facilities for sport and leisure, the Infrastructure Development Plan (LBR 2.21) for Redbridge states that there are 4.54 hectares of recreation space per 1,000 population in the borough, which meets the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) standard of 2.43 hectares per 1000 people for outdoor sport. The IDP also outlines initiatives to address open space deficiencies, including providing small, high quality spaces and generally improving the public realm in town centres; improving pedestrian and cycle connections between residential areas and existing larger parks, and to the 'All London Green Grid'; the Goodmayes Park Extension to establish Goodmayes Park as a destination for sport; retaining; and where practical expanding the provision of allotments As well as what is stated in the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) Local Plan Policy LP35 states that the Council will support new high quality outdoor sports facilities and promote sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports.	No further change required

R01203/10	Ceri Alefounder	155	Site 112	No adequate plans for leisure provision in South Woodford (site 122 is inadequate)	No change sought	<p>The Wanstead and Woodford area of the borough has two major sports and leisure facilities, Wanstead Leisure Centre and Ashton Playing Fields, and a number of sports pitches and playing fields, including Wanstead Flats, with affiliated clubs that play football, cricket and rugby. The provision of leisure facilities is part of the Council's strategy to deliver adequate levels of community facilities and is considered in the supporting text of Policy LP17 <i>Delivering Community Infrastructure</i>. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) also considers the current and future provision of leisure facilities, and is informed by the Redbridge Cultural and Leisure Strategy 2015-19. Investment for future provision will focus on intensification of existing use/facilities and increasing access to this provision. This will involve developing new facilities; making existing facilities open for use to the community; improving existing facilities; and bringing unused facilities back into use to meet future demand.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy LP35 also states that the Council will protect and enhance the quality of open space and will improve access to existing green space. The policy commits the Council to support for new high quality outdoor sports facilities and the promotion of sport and recreation across the borough, including the promotion of the shared use of existing open space for play and sports.</p>	No further change required
R01203/11	Ceri Alefounder	32	Para 3.6.5	<p><u>Para. 3.6.5 Key Business sites in South Woodford</u> - All business sites in South Woodford planned for housing in the Local Plan; businesses have already been lost; the loss of businesses damages the local economy and jobs</p>	Preserve the local business economy by removing sites 116, 117, 118 and 120	<p>Some business sites in South Woodford have been identified as opportunity sites for mixed use development, which can include new business and commercial uses on redeveloped sites. As part of the strategy for growth in the South Woodford Investment and Growth Area the Local Plan seeks an additional 2,000sqm of new retail floorspace, 5,000sqm of new employment floor space and at least 100 new jobs. The aim is to maintain South Woodford Centre as a vibrant and busy centre with a strong daytime and evening economy. The objective is not to displace businesses, but rather facilitate business growth by increasing footfall and creating more activity within South Woodford centre through mixed use development.</p> <p>Local Plan LP14 states that key business areas and industrial land, including those within the South Woodford Investment Area at Southend Road and Ravens Road, will be protected and mixed use employment led schemes that include housing will be supported provided they do not prejudice the ongoing use of the area for business purposes, and where residential use is compatible with existing employment uses.</p>	No further change required
R01203/12	Ceri Alefounder	12	Para 1.17.8	Para. 1.17.8 references poor office space; there has been no new office space in South Woodford for many years	No change sought	Paragraph 1.17.8 discusses some of the economic issues and challenges facing the borough. The Local Plan sets out a strategy to deal with these issues, which includes identifying investment areas targeted for growth.	No further change required
R01203/13	Ceri Alefounder	32	LP1D	Business are displaced by homes and must relocate; local people travel further to work placing burdens on transport, traffic and childcare	No change sought	See Council response to R01203/12 above	No further change required

R01203/14	Ceri Alefounder	32	Para 3.6.5	<p><u>Para. 3.6.5 Landmark building on Station Estate</u> – Residents petition with 2,000 signatures rejected tall buildings</p> <p>Para. 3.6.5 proposes a landmark building on Station Estate conflicting with para 3.6.8 regarding local character</p> <p>Why is the strategic Local Plan specifically identifying a landmark building in South Woodford?</p>	Remove reference to landmark buildings on Station Estate	<p>Agree that this sentence has been misinterpreted and the Council will re-word it to remove any ambiguity.</p> <p>With regard to the suggestion that Station Estate could be used as specialist accommodation, the Local Plan does not preclude that possibility. The adopted brief for the site does put forward options for the a mixed use development scheme containing community facilities, and there is a possibility that this could come forward as specialist accommodation – there is nothing in the Local Plan that discounts such a use, if a local need could be demonstrated.</p>	See response to R00416/10
R01203/15	Ceri Alefounder	101	LP27	How do proposals for tall buildings in the South Woodford Investment and Growth Area fit in with protecting local character and heritage?	No change sought	<p>The emerging Local Plan does not make proposals for tall buildings in South Woodford. Development options for South Woodford Centre have been made in the adopted Planning Brief for the Station Estate at Eastwood Close which put forward options for the development site, under the current Local Development Framework (LDF) where the site is designated as a tall building zone. The Council agreed in July 2015 to update the brief in light of responses from the local community. The emerging Local Plan proposes to remove the tall building designation at the Station Estate once the Plan has been adopted, after that time the planning brief for the Station Estate can be re-worked to reflect the new policy approach in the Local Plan, i.e. when the Station Estate is no longer a designated tall building zone.</p>	<p>Add the following text at line 2 of bullet point 2 in the Implementation section of the policy box for Local Plan Policy LP1:</p> <p>2 The Council will prepare and facilitate the production and updating of planning briefs and/or Masterplans for the key Opportunity Sites as required. In particular, master-planning frameworks will be prepared to guide the future development at Oakfield, Goodmayes and King George Hospitals, Ford Sports Ground, land at Billet Road, Station Estate and Gants Hill Opportunity Sites;</p>
R01203/16	Ceri Alefounder	154	Sites 116, 120	<p><u>Site 116, 120 Chigwell Road & Rose Avenue Park</u> – the map for the development opportunity site includes Rose Avenue Park. This is an error and should be removed</p>	Remove Rose Avenue Park from site map 116	Agree to proposed modification.	Amend site boundary on site ref 116 to remove Rose Avenue Park from the opportunity site boundary.
R01203/17	Ceri Alefounder	4	Para 1.4.2	Conclusion – the Local Plan is about sustainable growth (para. 1.4.2.) for homes, jobs, infrastructure, but does not deliver this in South Woodford	No Change sought	Noted	No further change required
R01204/01	Mark Haris Barton Willmore(Mikproud Ltd)	101	Policy LP27	<p>Comments relate to Policy LP27 and considers the Local Plan to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legally compliant • Unsound on grounds of unjustification • Complies with duty to cooperate 	No change sought	Noted	No further change required
R01204/02	Mark Haris Barton Willmore(Mikproud Ltd)	101	Policy LP27	<p>Mikproud supports principle of Tall Building Zone in Ilford, and LP27 policy approach. Mikproud would like to comment on the Tall Buildings Study when published to ensure justified evidence base for policy LP27 and Local Plan. Request notification and opportunity to comment when the study is published</p>	No change to the Local Plan sought	<p>The Local Plan will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in early 2017. At that time the Submission version of the Local Plan and the evidence base will be made available for the public to view on the Council's website. The evidence base will include the Tall Buildings Study. All those that submitted representations will be notified when the Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	No further change required
R01204/03	Mark Haris Barton Willmore(Mikproud Ltd)	101	Policy LP27	<p>Suggested modifications: Publicise Tall Buildings Study when complete, allow interested parties to comment in Examination</p>	No change to the Local Plan sought	<p>This is not a modification to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in early 2017. At that time the Submission version of the Local Plan and the evidence base will be made available for the public to view on the Council's website. The evidence base will include the Tall Buildings Study. All those that submitted representations will be notified when the Plan is submitted.</p>	No further change required
R01204/04	Mark Haris Barton Willmore(Mikproud Ltd)	101	Policy LP27	Mikproud would like to participation in oral part of Examination to inform a discussion regarding LP27 and Evidence Base	No change to the Local Plan sought	Noted	No further change required

R01204/05	Mark Haris Barton Willmore(Mikproud Ltd)	101	Policy LP27	Mikproud would like to be notified when the Local Plan is submitted.	No change to the Local Plan sought	The Local Plan will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in early 2017. At that time the Submission version of the Local Plan and the evidence base will be made available for the public to view on the Council's website. The evidence base will include the Tall Buildings Study. All those that submitted representations will be notified when the Plan is submitted.	No further change required
R01205/01	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	LP36	The Local Plan does not reflect NPPF regarding community health and food growing; no relevant food growing policies from the London Plan. Support for community gardening not carried into Local Plan policy Policies for food growing would make the Local Plan sound, and improve the borough and the physical and mental health of residents	No change suggested	Local Plan Policy LP18: 'Health and Well-Being' states that: <i>'The Council will improve and promote strong, vibrant and healthy communities through ensuring a high quality environment...'</i> The supporting text for the policy discusses the importance of access to open space and nature, which is considered essential for <i>physical exercise, relaxation and stress relief... and providing areas for local volunteer groups and access to food growing plots.</i> London Plan (March 2015) Policy 7.22 Land for Food, states that: <i>'Boroughs should protect existing allotments. They should identify other potential spaces that could be used for... community gardening, including for allotments...'</i> This policy is reflected in the Local Plan by Policy LP36 <i>Allotments and Local Products</i> , which refers to the Council aim of increasing the amount of land in the borough used for sustainable food growing. It states that: <i>'The Council will maintain and enhance and where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...'</i> and sets out criteria in the policy to achieve the policy objectives. The Council has considered these issues and included them in Local Plan policy, reflecting national and regional policy.	No further change required
R01205/02	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	Policy LP36	Support for LP36, though does not provide adequate provision for future residents in new development. Would like to see a solid commitment to maintaining and growing allotment sites.	No change suggested	Local Plan Policy LP36 states: <i>'The Council will... where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...'</i> Part (d) of the Policy also states that the Council will work: <i>'...with partners and local communities to identify sites with potential for local food growing and gardening projects...'</i> These are criteria that commit the Council to finding land for new/future residents of the borough.	No further change required
R01205/03	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	106	Policy LP29	LP29 should be strengthened to require community amenity space on site for major development, suitable for community food. Allotments tend to need special trips to get to, community spaces bring local residents together closer to home, where they can share food growing experiences and take responsibility for their area	No change suggested	Amenity space for new development is important, but the amount of space available for new schemes is limited, and the amount of space required is based on national and regional standards. The provision of on-site private amenity space within development for community food growing is not required, and not appropriate. In some instances for new housing development schemes it may not actually be necessary to provide the full complement of private amenity space, if a local park is close by, or where people occupying town centre apartments, where space is very limited, and it is often accepted that shared amenity space, such as communal roof terraces, are appropriate substitutes for a private garden.	No further change required

R01205/04	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	LP36	The Council should promote more food growing projects in the borough, which can improve community cohesion.	No change suggested	Noted	No further change required
R01205/05	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	120	LP34	Borough lacks green spaces that bring people together, particularly in less wealthy areas.	No change suggested	Redbridge has approximately 2000 hectares of open space and is one of the greenest boroughs in London. There are areas of open space deficiency, which the Council is seeking to address through policy commitments in the Local Plan (Policy LP34). However there are many very large open spaces and parks within the borough for residents within the borough to meet and engage in recreational and social activities.	No further change required
R01205/06	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	106	Policy LP29	LP29 2(b) – insert ‘growing food’ between ‘child’s play’ and ‘social interaction’, to create new policy text	Policy LP29 Amenity and Internal Space Standards 2 (b) Be of an appropriate scale to maximise usability and to be of a functional and practical configuration to enable a range of reasonable activities including sitting out, dining, child’s play, growing food and social interaction...	Agreed that ‘gardening’, which may or may not include growing food, could be added to the policy as a, reasonable activity within private amenity space.	No further change required
R01205/06a	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	Para 6.3.2	<u>Para 6.3.2</u> – LP36 does not carry supporting text at para. 6.3.2 which supports the expansion of community food growing and gardening, into the policy. This means opportunities to deliver community gardens in new development will be lost.	No change suggested	Local Plan Policy LP36 does state that: <i>‘The Council will maintain and enhance and where possible <u>increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...</u>’</i> This clearly reflects the text at paragraph 6.3.2 in the policy.	Make changes to Policy LP29, part 2(b), to read as follows: Policy LP29 Amenity and Internal Space Standards 2 (b) Be of an appropriate scale to maximise usability and to be of a functional and practical configuration to enable a range of reasonable activities including sitting out, dining, child’s play, gardening and social interaction...
R01205/07	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	107	Para 5.4.4	Para. 5.4.4 – insert ‘community gardens’ between ‘loggia’ and ‘winter gardens’, and insert ‘space for community interaction, local food growing’ between ‘functional spaces’ and ‘even wildlife habitats’ to create new policy text	Local Plan paragraph 5.4.4: There are many innovative ways of providing amenity space including well integrated terraces, balconies and loggia, community gardens winter gardens and green roofs. These can provide quality, functional space, space for community interaction, local food growing and even wildlife habitats on constrained sites, as well as reducing urban run-off and providing insulation.	Agreed	Make changes to Local Plan paragraph 5.4.4 to read as follows: There are many innovative ways of providing amenity space including well integrated terraces, balconies and loggia, community gardens winter gardens and green roofs. These can provide quality, functional space, space for community interaction, local food growing and even wildlife habitats on constrained sites, as well as reducing urban run-off and providing insulation.
R01205/08	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	Policy LP36	LP36 (d) – insert ‘and requiring provision within major residential development’ at end of sentence, to create new policy text	Local Plan Policy LP36: Allotments and Local Produce, part (d): Working with partners and local communities to identify sites with potential for local food growing and gardening projects and requiring provision within major residential development.	There are already a number of policy constraints and requirements on development sites, without further limiting site sizes, in terms of developable space, by requiring more space for gardening projects, which may negatively impact on site viability and deliverability.	No further change required
R01205/09	Natalie Szarek Audacious Veg	129	Policy LP36	LP36 Implementation – Insert ‘The Council will support and encourage new community food growing spaces as part of the landscape provision within residential development’ as second implementation action.	Local Plan Policy LP36: Allotments and Local Produce - Implementation section 1 The Council will work with its allotments section to manage allotment land and assess demand for land to grow food. <u>2. The Council will support and encourage new community food growing spaces as part of the landscape provision within residential development</u>	Agreed.	Make the following changes to Local Plan Policy LP36: Allotments and Local Produce - Implementation section 1 The Council will work with its allotments section to manage allotment land and assess demand for land to grow food. <u>2. The Council will support and encourage new community food growing spaces as part of the landscape provision within residential development</u>

R01206/01	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	154	Sites 116, 118, 192	Representation relates to LP1D South Woodford Investment and Growth Area; Appendix 1 and Appendix2; LP17; LP21; LP24; LP27; site 117; <i>Representation considers the Local Plan to be unsound on grounds of not being positively prepared, and being ineffective</i> <u>Appendix 1</u> - sites 116,118, 192 – there are 822 new properties proposed in/near our area, mainly houses, some business and commercial	No change sought	Noted.	No further change required
R01206/02	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	80	Policy LP21	<u>LP21 Water Flooding</u> - Opportunity sites 116, 118 and 192 shown as flood risk 3 on Environment Agency website and Local Plan map. New homes on these sites are inappropriate due to flood history of River Roding	Remove sites 116, 118 and 192 from Appendix 1.	See Council response R00416/08.	See response R00416/08.
R01206/03	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	93	Policy LP24	<u>LP24 Pollution</u> – new homes should not be built near Charlie Brown’s roundabout at sites 116, 118 and 192 due to contamination; the sites should be investigated for contamination	No change sought	Planning proposals for the development of the sites around Charlie Brown’s roundabout will require an assessment of the level of land contamination and proposals for mitigation measures. With regard to air pollution, Redbridge Council has produced an air quality action plan for the borough and subsequent progress reports, the latest being completed in 2015, (Air Quality Progress Report for London Borough of Redbridge, Local Air Quality Management February 2015). The Council is aware of conditions for air quality in the area of the M11/North Circular, which are part of the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for the borough, and which are also regularly monitored for pollutants and particulates. Policy LP24 in the Local Plan also seeks to require air quality assessments for development where they might have significant impacts on local air quality, or where they are located in areas of poor air quality.	No further change required.
R01206/04	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	154	Site 116	The boundary of the site at 116 should be amended to exclude ‘Oakdale Play area’ (‘Rose Avenue Park’)	Remove Oakdale Play area from the site 116	Agree to suggested modification	Re-draw the boundary for site 116.
R01206/05	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	154	Site 117	<u>Site 117</u> – petition submitted to the Council of 2,000 signatures against tall building in South Woodford Centre	Remove site 117 from Appendix 1	See response R00416/08.	No further change required
R01206/07	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	There is a need to address the lack of detail in the Plan in addressing the need for health facilities	Additional detail needed regarding new health facilities to support proposed development	See response R01206/07	No further change required

R01206/07	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	68	Policy LP17	<u>LP17 and Appendix 2</u> Currently LP1D, South Woodford cannot cope with demands of high increases in population, and the Local Plan does not propose enough improvements to infrastructure	No change stated, suggestion of additional information on improved infrastructure	In response to the general comments regarding the provision of infrastructure for planned new growth and housing development, the Local Plan contains planning policy for the delivery of community infrastructure where required to support new growth. Policy LP17: <i>Delivering Community Infrastructure</i> states that new infrastructure to support growth will be delivered in the form of either new infrastructure development or the enhancement of existing community facilities. As well as planning for infrastructure through Local Plan policy, the Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) (July 2016) identifies the infrastructure needed to deliver planned growth sustainably, and aims to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided to support the growth anticipated in the Redbridge Local Plan. The IDP will be used to inform decisions on infrastructure delivery, including the allocation of CIL receipts to projects or allocating specific sites for use as schools or other infrastructure. The IDP has identified school expansions for the first phase of the Local Plan (2015-2020), which includes the Woodford area, and outlines future health and transport requirements. The IDP can also be used as supporting evidence in bids for infrastructure funding, and will be updated annually providing a fresh assessment of need for community infrastructure in the borough. The Council will also consider a review of the Redbridge CIL charging schedule after the Local Plan is adopted, to maximise receipts for funding infrastructure provision for schools/education, medical, and sporting/recreational facilities etc.	Make the following changes to Local Plan Policy LP1D: Key infrastructure/Projects – High Street and public realm improvements – Education and Health infrastructure (Appendix 2) – Improved cycling infrastructure – Preserve and enhance the George Lane and South Woodford Conservation Areas. <u>As reflected in Policy LP17 the Council will support growth with appropriate community infrastructure for mixed use development, supporting the expansion of facilities for schools and healthcare, and revisiting the loss of existing facilities</u>
R01206/08	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	No proposals to build new schools or expand existing schools	No change stated, suggestion of additional information on expansion of/building new schools	See response R01206/07 above.	No further change required
R01206/08	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	14	Para 1.21.5	Cosmetic improvements in para. 1.21.5 will not help the Woodford area cope with increased traffic congestion and pollution and poor quality of life for local residents	No change stated, suggestion of additional information on improved infrastructure for traffic/modes of transport	Policy LP22 within the Local Plan states that the Council will resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on capacity within local and strategic road networks and the public transport system, unless it contributes towards effective mitigation measures. Transport for London (TfL) and London Underground Ltd (LUL) have been consulted on the content of the Local Plan and the Council have received a detailed response. As statutory consultees TfL and LUL are notified on all planning applications for new development, and will inform the Council where serious capacity issues are implied by new development on roads or at train stations	No further change required
R01206/09	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	Tall buildings in South Woodford will harm local character which the Council seeks to protect	No change sought	The Local Plan does not propose a tall building development in South Woodford, indeed the tall building zone designated for South Woodford in the Local Development Framework (LDF) is proposed to be de-designated in the emerging Local Plan. As an Investment and Growth Area proposals for tall and large buildings in South Woodford will be considered on the basis of Local Plan policies LP26, LP27 and LP33. In order to gain planning permission all development anywhere in the borough, whether for tall buildings or other forms of development, must satisfy requirements in those policies, where they are relevant. This means that all new development in the borough must respect the character of the surrounding area, and must be designed to integrate with existing development in the surrounding area to a high degree of compatibility. This means that planning permission will not be granted for new development that is not fully integrated with the local character of an area, its scale, massing, and height etc.	No further change required

R01206/10	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	South Woodford Investment and Growth Area should be removed	Delete the designation of South Woodford as an Investment and Growth Area from the Local Plan	The area around South Woodford has been designated as an Investment and Growth Area to reflect the very real, existing growth opportunities in the area. Whether the area is designated or not opportunities for investment and growth in the form of new development will remain, and will continue to be recognised as such by developers, who may still submit planning applications for development in the South Woodford area. The Council must recognise where opportunities for investment and growth exist in the borough in order to set appropriate planning constraints and ensure that new development comes forward in a sustainable manner.	No further change required
R01206/11	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	Schools and Education – no proposals to build schools to cope with 822 new homes. A sufficient number of school places must be available before homes are built	No change sought	See response to comment R01206/07 above. The Council is aware of the need for school places in the borough, specifically secondary school places, which is the main focus of the Council's School Improvements strategy which is annually updated. The Redbridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LBR 2.21) (July 2016) identifies the infrastructure needed to deliver planned growth set out in the Local Plan. The IDP will be used to inform decisions on infrastructure delivery, including sites for schools or other infrastructure. The IDP has identified school expansions for the first phase of the Local Plan (2015-2020), which includes the Woodford area. The IDP can also be used as supporting evidence in bids for infrastructure funding, and will be updated annually providing a fresh assessment of need for community infrastructure in the borough. The Council will also consider a review of the Redbridge CIL charging schedule after the Local Plan is adopted, to maximise receipts for funding infrastructure provision for schools/education.	No further change required
R01206/12	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	Health facilities – lack of detail regarding provision of health facilities for increased population	No change sought	See response R00416/02 and R01206/11.	See response to comment R00416/02 and R01206/11.
R01206/13	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	154	Sites 116, 118, 192	Conclusions – delete sites 116, 118 and 192, and remove South Woodford Investment Area	Remove sites 116, 118 and 192 from Appendix 1.	See response to comment R00416/02 and R00416/08	See response to comment R00416/02 and R00416/08.
R01206/14	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	Council infrastructure plans are unsustainable and will cause increased number of journeys from South Woodford area to access schools, health facilities etc. This needs clarification in Local Plan	No change sought	See response R00416/02	See response R00416/02
R01206/15	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	LP1D	No homes should be built near Charlie Brown's roundabout; Council should liaise with TfL on reducing pollution	No change suggested, but the implication is sites 116, 118 and 192 should be removed from the Local Plan	See responses R00416/04	See responses R00416/04
R01206/16	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	101	Policy LP27	LP27- modify text in policy at top of p102 to read 'Outside of these areas planning applications for tall and large buildings will not be considered'. Remaining text should be change accordingly	Make modifications to text in Policy LP27 to confine tall buildings only to tall building zones	The Council is committed to delivering growth in the borough, a large part of this is housing, for which the target set by the London Plan is challenging at 1,123 homes per year. The proposed growth in the borough is significant and requires a level of intensification of development. However apart from the Ilford Investment and Growth Area, the entirety of which is a tall building zone, Investment and Growth areas are not considered as areas appropriate for tall buildings, but such proposals will be given consideration. All proposals for development in the borough are required to meet criteria in Local Plan policies LP26 and LP27, proposals for tall buildings in Investment and Growth Areas will need to meet firm criteria related to character, scale, massing and height, and must fit in with their surroundings to a high degree of compatibility, in order to receive consent.	No further change required.

R01206/17	Brian Mazdon Maybank Community Association	32	Policy LP1D	Appendix 2 should include text on urgently needed infrastructure projects. More thought is needed for building schools in LP1D	No change sought	Appendix 2 includes a summary of key infrastructure projects and programmes to support growth. This list is from the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) (LBR 2.21) and will be updated following further discussions and commitment from internal and external partners.	See Appendix 2 Modifications Schedule.
R01207/01	Sarah Williams Sustain	72	Policies LP18, LP36	National and London Planning policy are not applied to the circumstances of Redbridge borough where the interest in local food growing and its health and environmental benefits are increasingly of concern to residents. The Local Plan policies do not ensure that new residential development will adequately meet the future needs of the population.	No change suggested	Local Plan Policy LP18: 'Health and Well-Being' states that: <i>'The Council will improve and promote strong, vibrant and healthy communities through ensuring a high quality environment...'</i> The supporting text for the policy discusses the importance of access to open space and nature, which is considered essential for physical exercise, relaxation and stress relief... and providing areas for local volunteer groups and access to food growing plots. London Plan (March 2015) Policy 7.22 Land for Food, states that: <i>'Boroughs should protect existing allotments. They should identify other potential spaces that could be used for... community gardening, including for allotments...'</i> This policy is reflected in the Local Plan by Policy LP36 <i>Allotments and Local Products</i> , which refers to the Council aim of increasing the amount of land in the borough used for sustainable food growing. It states that: <i>'The Council will maintain and enhance and where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...'</i> and sets out criteria in the policy to achieve the policy objectives. The Council has considered these issues and included them in Local Plan policy, reflecting national and regional policy.	No further change required.
R01207/02	Sarah Williams Sustain	129	Policy LP36	Should be a focus on new suitable open space for food growing, with current spaces protected. The opportunity for community food growing in any suitable open space needs to be the focus, rather than the narrow definition of allotments.	No change suggested	Local Plan Policy LP36 states: <i>'The Council will... where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...'</i> Part (d) of the Policy also states that the Council will work: <i>'...with partners and local communities to identify sites with potential for local food growing and gardening projects...'</i> These are criteria that commit the Council to finding land for new/future residents of the borough. There are also further criteria for the protection and improvement of existing allotment sites and the protection of agricultural land in the borough. The council is fully committed to protecting, improving and increasing land used for sustainable food growing and gardening, and this is considered that this is already reflected in Local Plan policy.	No further change

R01207/03	Sarah Williams Sustain	129	LP36	<p>Lack of application of the NPPF and London Plan on food growing.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not cover the wider scope of NPPF and London Plan policy on provision and protection of open space for local food production/growing</p>	No change suggested	<p><i>'The Council will improve and promote strong, vibrant and healthy communities through ensuring a high quality environment...'</i></p> <p>The supporting text for Local Plan Policy LP18: <i>'Health and Well-Being'</i> discusses the importance of access to open space and nature, which is considered essential for <i>'...physical exercise, relaxation and stress relief... and providing areas for local volunteer groups and access to food growing plots.'</i></p> <p>London Plan (March 2015) Policy 7.22 Land for Food, states that:</p> <p><i>'Boroughs should protect existing allotments. They should identify other potential spaces that could be used for... community gardening, including for allotments...'</i></p> <p>This policy is reflected in the Local Plan by Policy LP36 Allotments and Local Products, which refers to the Council aim of increasing the amount of land in the borough used for sustainable food growing. It states that:</p> <p><i>'The Council will maintain and enhance and where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening...'</i> and sets out criteria in the policy to achieve the policy objectives.</p> <p>The Council has considered these issues and included them in Local Plan policy, reflecting national and regional policy.</p>	No further change required.
R01207/04	Sarah Williams Sustain	129	LP36	Local Plan does not recognise the value of open space for local food production, which should be designed into residential development	No change suggested	<p>There are already a number of policy constraints and requirements on development sites, without further limiting site sizes, in terms of developable space, by requiring more space for gardening projects, which may negatively impact on site viability and deliverability.</p>	No further change required.

R01207/05	Sarah Williams Sustain	129	LP36	<p>A new Local Plan policy to cover the following points:</p> <p>a) Protect existing community food growing spaces. b) Encourage the temporary use of vacant sites and land awaiting development. c) Require all development to incorporate measures that will contribute to on-site sustainable food production (from productive landscaping through to spaces suitable for food growing) commensurate with the scale of development. d) Use planning conditions or Section 106 agreements to secure space for food growing in new development as part of the essential infrastructure required for that development. e) Request landscape plans demonstrate the potential use of any open space for community food growing. Integrate community food growing spaces, productive trees and plants in any landscaping proposal as part of a cohesive design of the development – recognising that these are good for wildlife and people. f) Ensure the design and layout of open space in new development is flexible so that spaces may be adapted for growing opportunities in the future. g) Include maintenance plans as part of an application to ensure spaces will be managed successfully.</p> <p><u>Modifications to the Local Plan - request policies that require new development to provide amenity space for food growing</u></p> <p>Policies can be either amended or a new policy on food growing inserted (Example of a new policy provided in representation)</p>	<p>The Council has already made a commitment to maintain and enhance and increase where possible land for food growing and gardening in Local Plan Policy LP36 <i>Allotments and Local Products</i>. With regard to requiring all development to incorporate measures or space for food growing, such a requirement is not feasible as there are already a number of policy constraints and requirements on development sites, further limitations on the developable space of site is likely to negatively impact on site viability and deliverability. Since the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) section 106 is strictly for affordable housing, or any work necessary in order to enable a particular scheme to come forward for development. Space for food growing does not fall into the criteria. Furthermore space for food growing or food growing projects is not an essential infrastructure requirement that could be charged under CIL.</p> <p>With regard to points e), f) and g), these could certainly be considered for new development schemes coming forward, where appropriate, as part of a range of conditions for new proposals. These could be added to the implementation section of Policy LP36.</p>	<p>Make changes to the implementation section of Local Plan Policy LP36 as follows:</p> <p>Implementation 1 The Council will work with its allotments section to manage allotment land and assess demand for land to grow food.</p> <p><u>e) Request landscape plans demonstrate the potential use of any open space for community food growing. Integrate community food growing spaces, productive trees and plants in any landscaping proposal as part of a cohesive design of the development</u> – recognising that these are good for wildlife and people.</p> <p><u>f) Ensure the design and layout of open space in new development is flexible so that spaces may be adapted for growing opportunities in the future.</u></p> <p><u>g) Include maintenance plans as part of an application to ensure spaces will be managed successfully.</u></p>
R01207/06	Sarah Williams Sustain	-	-	<p>Examination – Sustain would like to be notified when the Examination takes place and appear if it would be helpful.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No further change required.</p>

R01208/01	Nick Hayes	101	LP27	<p>The Local Plan is considered to be legally compliant, but unsound on grounds of inconsistency with national policy, and unjustified. It is also considered that the Local Plan complies with the duty to cooperate</p> <p>Policy LP27 - is unsound as it doesn't comply with London Plan Policy 7.7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP27 should be modified to include the full rigour of London Plan Policy 7.7 for tall buildings outside designated tall building zones <p>The Policy should be modified as set out in the response form continuation sheet, Box 6</p> <p>LP27: Tall Buildings As part of a strategy to adopt a plan-led approach towards overall growth in the borough, planning applications for the development of Tall and Large Buildings will be supported in the following Tall Building Zones, as identified on the Local Plan Policies Map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ilford Metropolitan Town Centre <u>in Investment Area One</u>; 2. East Ilford, Seven Kings District Centre, and Goodmayes District Centre <u>in Investment Areas Two</u>; and 3. Gants Hill District Centre <u>in Investment Area Three</u> <p>Outside of these areas planning applications for tall and large buildings will only be considered in areas of intensification, such as on sites in Investment and Growth Areas, and in centres (in both cases) that</p>	<p>Suggested changes to Policy LP27 agreed.</p> <p>In drafting Policy LP27 Tall Buildings is in line with London Plan Policy 7.7 Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings. However the Council considers that the changes put forward are acceptable. As a result a number of consequential changes are being inserted to ensure clarity and to strengthen the links with London Plan Policy 7.7.</p>	<p>Make the following modifications to Policy LP27 Tall Buildings, in response to representations from Cllr. Nick Hayes, Historic England and the Redbridge Tall Buildings Study (ARUP, Feb 2017)</p> <p>Policy LP27 Tall Buildings.</p> <p>As part of a strategy to adopt a plan-led approach towards overall growth in the borough, planning applications for the development of Tall and Large Buildings will be supported in the following Tall Building Zones, as identified on the Local Plan Policies Map in the following areas, as shown on Figure 21:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ilford Metropolitan Town Centre <u>in Investment Area One and Growth Area</u>; 2. East Ilford, Seven Kings District <u>Local</u> Centre, and Goodmayes District <u>Local</u> Centre, <u>in the Crossrail Corridor Investment and Growth Area</u> Areas Two; and 3. Gants Hill District Centre <u>in Investment and Growth Area</u> .Area Three <p>Outside of these areas p Planning applications for tall and large buildings will only be considered in areas of intensification, such as on sites in Investment and Growth Areas, and in centres that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Which have good public transport; ii. Where the character of the surrounding area would not be harmed or adversely affected by the scale, mass or height of the building; iii. and Where it relates well to the urban layout, streets, open spaces, <u>heritage assets</u> and public realm of the surrounding area; <u>and</u> iv. <u>Where the proposals make a significant contribution to local regeneration.</u>
R01208/01a	Nick Hayes	101	LP27	<p>As above</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Which have good public transport II. Where the character of the surrounding area would not be harmed or adversely affected by the scale, mass or height of the building III. and Where it relates well to the urban layout, streets, open spaces and public realm of the surrounding area; and IV. Where the proposal makes a significant contribution to local regeneration <p>All tall and large buildings in all parts of the borough will be assessed against the design criteria set out in LP26, and <u>should:</u> attention paid in particular to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>how the building integrates integrate well with</u> the site and surroundings, in terms of how buildings fit in with the street, and how they affect the skyline; b) relate well to the architectural and historic context of the surrounding area of the building, and the effect it has <u>not impact adversely</u> on heritage assets; c) <u>not impact adversely on</u> the relationship between the building and the views <u>having regard to the</u> and natural topography of the area; 	<p>As above</p>	<p>All <u>proposals for</u> tall and large buildings in all parts of the borough will be assessed against the design criteria set out in <u>Local Plan Policy</u> LP26, <u>as well as criteria set out in London Plan Policy 7.7</u>, and <u>should:</u> attention paid in particular to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) how the building integrates <u>integrate well with</u> the site and surroundings, in terms of how buildings fit in with the street, and how they affect the <u>day and night time</u> skyline; b) <u>relate well to</u> the architectural and historic context of the surrounding area of the building, and the effect it has <u>not impact adversely</u> on heritage assets <u>and their settings</u>; c) <u>not impact adversely on</u> the relationship between the building and the views <u>having regard to the</u> and natural topography of the area; d) <u>not impact adversely on</u> the overshadowing effect the building has on other buildings, public spaces and open spaces <u>by reason of overshadowing</u>; e) the contribution a building makes to <u>contribute to improving</u> way-finding, pedestrian permeability and improved access for the public; f) <u>incorporate</u> the highest standards of architecture and materials, including sustainable design and construction practices; and g) the incorporation of <u>incorporate</u> an appropriate public realm setting and ground floor active uses. h) <u>Ensure effective management regimes for the continued maintenance of the building and shared areas etc.</u> i) <u>Use the highest standards of design and construction for redeveloped and refurbished tall buildings</u>

R01208/01b	Nick Hayes	101	LP27	As above	<p>d) not impact adversely on the overshadowing effect the building has on other buildings, public spaces and open spaces by reason of overshadowing;</p> <p>e) the contribution a building makes to contribute to improving way-finding, pedestrian permeability and improved access for the public;</p> <p>f) incorporate the highest standards of architecture and materials, including sustainable design and construction practices; and</p> <p>g) the incorporation of incorporate an appropriate public realm setting and ground floor active uses.</p>	As above	<p>Tall and large buildings will also be assessed against all other relevant policies within the Local Plan in relation to high quality design, mixed use development, amenity and internal space standards, built conservation of the historic environment, renewable energy and sustainability sustainable design and construction, parking standards, water and flooding, and infrastructure for high speed broadband</p> <p>Planning applications for the development of Tall Buildings will be required to contain an urban design analysis that demonstrates a design strategy for the building that meets criteria in LP26, and the criteria set out in this policy.</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p>1. The Council will update the Urban Design Framework (2004) in the light of changes in national, regional and local policy and to take account of the Redbridge Urban Characterisation Study (2014).</p> <p>2. The Council will promote good design and 'front-loading' by encouraging:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of its pre-application service • Developer-led public engagement ahead of application submission, and • Design review of appropriate major schemes. • The Council will develop master plans for major opportunity sites within the Investment Areas. <p>3. Incorporate up to date guidance on Tall Buildings in the Ilford Framework for Growth SPD.</p> <p>4. The Council will review its Local Validation Checklist to include additional application requirements for tall and large buildings. Such documents will include assessments for lighting, wind-tunnelling and microclimate.</p> <p>NB: Re-number subsequent Figures accordingly.</p>
R01208/02	Nick Hayes	101	Policy LP27	Does not apply London Plan Policy 7.7 to areas of intensification and Investment and Growth Areas	No further changes suggested	<p>Policy LP27 clearly states in paragraph two: <i>'...planning applications for Tall and Large Buildings will only be considered in areas of intensification such as investment and growth areas, and in centres that have good public transport...'</i> This approach is in conformity with part C (a) of London Plan Policy 7.7, and criteria (a) to (g) of LP27 are also in line with London Plan Policy 7.7. Furthermore LP27 refers to LP26 making it explicitly clear that all proposals for tall buildings must adhere to these design criteria.</p>	No further changes required.
R01208/03	Nick Hayes	101	Policy LP27	Results in a looser and non-compliant policy. The other considerations in LP27 are substantially weaker than London Plan policy 7.7	No further changes suggested	<p>Developers are directed to not consider Policy LP27 in isolation when making proposals for new, major development, and policies LP26 and LP27 together will effectively prevent the development of tall buildings in areas where they are not appropriate, as rigorously as London Plan Policy 7.7.</p>	No further changes required
R01208/04	Nick Hayes	101	LP27	LP27 has less stringent design standards than London Plan Policy 7.7 and is inconsistent with Strategic Objective 3: Promoting High Quality Design	No further changes suggested	<p>As stated above LP27 should be read in conjunction with Local Plan Policy LP26 <i>Promoting High Quality Design</i>, which is clearly stated in the third paragraph of LP27 – <i>'All tall and large buildings in all parts of the borough will be assessed against the design criteria set out in LP26...'</i> LP26 states clearly that the Council will promote high quality design in the borough by requiring development that to meet criteria b) to d). This approach, and the approach in criteria (e) to (o) in LP26, is in conformity with the London Plan in relation to avoiding harm to the existing character of areas surrounding new tall and large buildings.</p> <p>Furthermore, the definition of a tall building used in the supporting text of Policy LP27 avoids using a specific height such as 30m, and instead uses the definition stated in London Plan Policy 7.7 which expresses tall buildings as being <i>'...substantially taller than their surroundings...'</i> and causing <i>'...a significant change to the skyline...'</i> This definition will be observed when deciding on all planning applications for tall and large buildings.</p>	No further changes required

R01208/05	Nick Hayes	101	Policy LP27	There has been no explanation given as to why the borough should have a looser tall buildings policy than in the London Plan	No further Changes suggested	The Council considers Policy LP27 is not looser or less effective than London Plan policy, for the reasons set out in R01208/03 above.	No further changes required
R01209	Robert Deanwood National Grid	-	-	National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation		Noted.	No further change required.
R01211/01	Katherine Jones Savills (Thames Water)	138	Policy LP41	<p>In line with paras.156 and 162 of NPPF and NPPG respectively relating to infrastructure for water supply and wastewater, Thames Water recommends that Redbridge should work with neighbouring authorities to assess the quality of and capacity for water supply and waste water.</p> <p>Thames Water support for LP41. Local Plan should go further requiring developers to provide appropriate infrastructure to support their development prior to development coming forward.</p> <p>Taking the above into consideration, Thames Water suggests a specific policy in the Local Plan for water and sewerage infrastructure is required.</p>	<p>Proposed new Local Plan Policy – <u>WATER AND SEWERAGE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY:</u></p> <p><u>Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site service infrastructure where:</u></p> <p><u>1. sufficient capacity already exists or</u></p> <p><u>2. extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development which will ensure that the environment and the amenity of local residents are not adversely affected.</u></p> <p><u>When there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, planning permission will only be granted where the developer funds appropriate improvements which will be completed prior to occupation of the development.”</u></p>	<p>The capacity of sewerage and drainage network is the responsibility of Thames Water. The Plan seeks to reduce stress on the drainage network by supporting the increased use of SuDS, deculverting of existing water courses, and working with partners to meet the objective of the Water Framework Directive. Nevertheless, a reference to ensuring that sufficient capacity exists to support proposed developments would be beneficial.</p>	<p>Insert additional point (l) into Policy LP24 to read:</p> <p><u>“(l) Requiring that major new developments demonstrate through liaison with Thames Water that sufficient capacity exists within the sewerage and drainage network to serve the proposed development, and where necessary, that capacity upgrades will be secured.”</u></p>
R01211/01a	Katherine Jones Savills (Thames Water)	138	Policy LP41	As above	<p>PROPOSED NEW POLICY SUPPORTING TEXT:</p> <p><u>The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, the Council will require the developer to fund appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development.</u></p>	As above	As above

R01211/02	Katherine Jones Savills (Thames Water)	138	Policy LP41	<p>Thames Water recommends mini integrated water management strategies (IWMS) for new settlements or urban extensions, to assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply infrastructure in the local area • Sewerage and drainage infrastructure in the local area • Range of demands for water supply, sewerage and drainage through development phases • Range of options to minimise drinking water demand, maximise rain water re-use, maximise use of sustainable drainage systems • Spatial implications of required infrastructure • Costs and programming of required infrastructure 	Add text to Policy LP41 'Delivery and monitoring', or its supporting text, or within the suggested new policy, requiring an integrated water management strategy (IWMS) for new settlements within the borough.	Infrastructure for water supply, sewerage and drainage are required as new development comes forward, and is implemented through the relevant Government Approved Documents by the Council's Building Control Service. Regional Water Authorities are also consulted as a statutory consultee on planning applications for new development, and any particular requirements, such as those outlined in the representation, for specific development schemes can be discussed with the local planning authority at an early stage.	No further change required.
R01211/03	Katherine Jones Savills (Thames Water)	84	Policy LP21	The Local Plan should have a policy for Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS)	Add text for an additional policy for sustainable urban drainage systems.	Policy LP21 encourages use of SUDs in new developments	No further change required.
R01211/04	Katherine Jones Savills (Thames Water)	81	LP21	The Local Plan should have a policy to require new development to meet the water efficiency requirement of no more than 110 litres per person per day, and policies for water conservation and the efficient use of water		<p>Water efficiency requirement is stated in Approved Document G: sanitation, hot water safety and water efficiency, which states at Schedule 1 and regulation 36, 'Water efficiency for new dwellings' that:</p> <p><i>'The potential consumption of wholesome water by persons occupying a new dwelling must not exceed... either —</i></p> <p><i>(a) 125 litres per person per day; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) ... 110 litres per person per day...'</i></p> <p>Approved Document G are part of the Building Regulations 2010, as amended, and is implemented for all new development schemes by the Council's Building Control service, and additional policies in the Local Plan are therefore unnecessary.</p>	No further change required.
R01212/01	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	37	LP2	Why have Redbridge selected a min housing target of 1,123 considering the evidence from the SHMA regarding need and borough capacity of 18,774?	No change sought	As stated in the representation, the Redbridge Housing target is a minimum, not a maximum target, and is what the Council aims to achieve at the very least. This target is set by the Mayor in the London Plan (2015) rather than a target 'selected' by the Council. However the Council assesses that available developable land within the borough, with windfall sites, indicates capacity for an indicative figure of 18,774 new homes over the Plan period (assessed at mid-range density levels), exceeding the Mayor's target of 16,845 (1,123 per annum), so the Council considers there to be potential within the borough to exceed the London Plan target of 1,123 homes per annum. The objectively assessed need for housing in the borough, at more than 2,000 new homes per annum, is not achievable as there is not enough developable land within the borough to achieve such an extremely challenging annual target.	No further change required. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly between the LB Waltham Forest and Redbridge. There are no outstanding matters.

R01212/02	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	61	LP14	It is unclear how the Local Plan will meet the requirements of the Employment Land Review for B8 floorspace, when uses outside of B1 and B2 will not be supported in the borough's strategic Industrial Locations. The plan should make it clear where B8 uses will be supported to meet need for additional floorspace		Noted. It is intended to accommodate B8 growth in land designated as Strategic Industrial Land (SIL) and other existing industrial estates designated as Local Business Areas on the basis of the findings of the Employment Land Study. It is acknowledged that Policy LP14 requires some modification to clarify this.	<p>Modifications: Amend LP14 (1) (a) to read: Protecting and directing industrial activity to the borough's Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs) at Hainault Business Park and Southend Road Business Park as the prime locations for Class B1 (business), Class B2 (general industry), and class B8 (storage and distribution) development. Proposals for uses falling outside the above uses will be resisted;</p> <p>Amend LP14 (c) to read: Intensifying and managing Local Business Areas of Newton Industrial Estate, Forest Road, Hainault Works, and Ravens Road, and Connaught Road West. In these areas the Council will support:</p> <p>Intensification of Class B1 (business), Class B2 (general industry), and Class B8 (storage and distribution) uses; particularly premises to accommodate small and medium enterprises (SMEs); and</p>
R01212/03	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	61	LP14	LP14 – welcome the opportunity to continue dialogue on cross-borough infrastructure issues	No change sought	Noted	No further change required.
R01212/04	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	162	Appendix 2	Would be useful to get more detail on projects in the IDP. Some areas listed (esp. health) have not identified any individual infrastructure projects with a catchment area for multiple LPAs	Include text regarding infrastructure projects from the IDP. Identify projects with a catchment that includes neighbouring boroughs	Appendix 2: <i>Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule of Projects</i> in the Local Plan outlines infrastructure projects coming forward in the borough The IDP (LBR 2.21) and associated Appendix 2 will be updated for Local Plan Submission. The Local Plan will also be modified to reflect these updates where relevant	Modify Appendix 2 and Policies LP1A to LP1E of the Local Plan to reflect an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)
R01212/05	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	80	LP20	Policy LP20 should also encourage business users to reduce energy consumption and retrofit energy efficiency measures, rather than focus primarily on domestic users.	Include text in Policy LP20 aimed at encouraging businesses to reduce energy consumption and implement energy efficiency measures.	Policy LP20 actually focuses on all forms of development, and the policy text relates to major development, particularly at point 3 which is aimed at 'All new major development (10 dwellings of more residential and 1,000sqm for non-residential development) should...' the measures and criteria in the policy are not focused on domestic developed but major development in general, implying all kinds of major development.	No further change required.
R01212/06	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	80	LP20	LP20 - Widen reference to Decentralised Energy Networks rather than focusing on Combined Heat and Power	Add text to Policy LP20 relating to Decentralised Energy	Policy LP20 aims to support and promote sustainable forms of energy in the borough by protecting existing DE networks and supporting their expansion. It also states that new major development schemes should be evaluated for the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power Systems. It is considered that the policy does not particularly focus on either DE networks or CHP systems, but expresses Council support for both where feasible. Overall it is considered to be a balanced approach.	No further change required.
R01212/07	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	80	LP20	CHP is not often viable in development under 300 units. LP20 says development over 10 units, re-word policy to refer to communal heating and use of DE networks rather than CHP for development over 10 units.	Include wording in LP20 stating that communal heating and DE networks will be considered instead of CHP, which is not viable for development under 300 units.	Policy LP20 states that major development over 10 units should be evaluated for the feasibility and viability of CHP systems, CHP is not required by the policy for all schemes over 10 units (or over 1,000sqm in size). Major development over 10 units must first undergo an evaluation for the feasibility and viability of CHP, which may well demonstrate that some major schemes are not viable.	No further change required.

R01212/08	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	80	LP20	The GLA Housing SPG requirement for Carbon Offset Fund contributions is in place, the words 'where appropriate' in LP20 at 3(b) should be removed.	Make the following change to Policy LP20: '3(b) Where appropriate make a financial contribution to an agreed borough-wide programme of carbon reductions...'	The Council's understanding of the GLA Housing SPG requirement for Carbon Offset Fund contributions, is that they are applicable where development does not meet Standard 35 (and Policy 5.2), which states: 'Development proposals should be designed in accordance with the LP energy hierarchy, and should meet the following minimum targets for carbon dioxide emissions reduction. Year: improvement on 2013 Building Regulations 2014 - 2016 35 per cent 2016 - 2036 Zero carbon Energy hierarchy To achieve the targets for minimising carbon dioxide emissions, the Plan outlines a three step energy hierarchy to guide developers on how they may design low or zero carbon development. The hierarchy consists of the following steps: Step 1. Be lean: use less energy Step 2. Be clean: supply energy efficiently Step 3. Be green: use renewable energy Where schemes are not meeting zero carbon standards a carbon dioxide off-set price can be applied. This is also reflected in London Plan (March 2015) Policy 5.2 'Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions'. Therefore the words 'where appropriate' are suitable in the policy.	No further change required.
R01212/09	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	80	LP20	Include calculation for carbon offset fund in LP20 (3b)	Add text to Policy LP20 at point 3b showing how the carbon offset fund is calculated.	The Council does not yet have a calculation for a Carbon Offset. This work will follow, and will inform a Planning Obligations SPD.	To reflect this future work, insert the following into the Implementation Box of policy LP20: <u>5. The Council will produce a Planning Obligations SPD that will include details on how a carbon offset fund could work in the borough.</u>
R01212/10	Joe Addo-Yobo London Borough of Waltham Forest	115	LP33	LP33 – change references to English Heritage to Historic England	Make corrections to the title 'English Heritage' wherever it occurs by changing it to 'Historic England'.	Suggested modifications agreed. See response to Historic England on the same issue.	See response R01218/20.
R01213/01	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	18	Objectives	Support Redbridge's commitment to meet its minimum housing target of 1,123 homes per year but notes that this is significantly below the borough's OAN of 2,132 homes per year. Whilst the Mayor recognises that addressing the borough's target is challenging, he is not convinced that this justifies the scale of Green Belt release proposed as 'exceptional circumstances'.		The Council has undertaken an exhaustive search of all brownfield land across the borough. The housing capacity of all sites in Appendix 1 has been reassessed. In accordance with the SHLAA (2013) methodology the Council has reviewed the PTAL, character, constraints of each site and applied densities in accordance with the London Plan Density Matrix to form a revised capacity estimate. This demonstrates that all brownfield sites within the borough do not offer sufficient development capacity to meet or exceed London Plan minimum targets. Without any Green Belt release, London Plan minimum housing targets cannot be met, let alone exceeded.	No further change required.

R01213/01a	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	18	Objectives	As above	As above	<p>The Council considers the fundamentals of the Pre-Submission Plan are sound. In line with London Plan (2016) policy 3.3, the Plan's strategy is to meet and exceed the minimum housing target of 1,123 homes a year, and seeks to close the gap between need and supply, Redbridge's OAN of approximately 2,000 per year.</p> <p>The Council considers it has exceptional circumstances to justify releasing some land from the Green Belt to meet its housing and social infrastructure needs. A robust assessment of existing brownfield land and former employment land following the methodology of the London Plan (2013) SHLAA has concluded that, along with windfall sites, 16,171 units can be delivered over the life of the Plan. This is 674 units under the Mayor's minimum target. Therefore, in order to attempt to close the gap between need and supply, it is necessary to look into the Green Belt to accommodate the borough's development needs.</p>	No further change required.
R01213/02	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	20	LP1	Despite Redbridge having explored other opportunities to further close the gap between local supply and need, the GLA considers that further work could be done that releases additional capacity. Most of the sites identified in proposed policy LP1B-E appear large enough to be able to result in a neighbourhood with a distinctive character at a higher density in line with policy 3.7 of the London Plan. A new SHLAA process to be undertaken by the GLA could identify possible additional housing capacity.		<p>The Council has reviewed the housing capacity of all identified Opportunity Sites, most of which are covered by policies LP1B-E (on brownfield land) as set out in Appendix 1. This has been undertaken in accordance with the SHLAA 2013 methodology and the London Plan Density Matrix (2016). As a result of this work, the Council has proposed modifications to Appendix 1, which has also necessitated updates to LP1A-E for consistency.</p> <p>It is clear that capacity testing at a higher density in line with policy 3.7 of the London Plan would result in the Council being able to meet and exceed the London Plan. However, further intensification of these areas are likely to have a significant impact on the borough's key transport junctions and links, character, townscape, sustainability and the inability of smaller sites to deliver key education infrastructure. The Transport Assessment (2017) and Sustainability Appraisal (2017) support this.</p>	See proposed modifications to Appendix 1 and LP1A-E as set out in Modifications schedule.
R01213/03	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	49	Para 3.12.7	The Mayor would not support constraints on rebuilding flats on small infill sites as set out in paragraph 3.12.7 of the Local Plan.		<p>The intention of the statement set out in paragraph 3.12.7 is not about restricting new development on small infill sites. This is a wider issue in relation to how the Council is seeking to maintain a balanced housing stock in certain parts of the borough. The policy aims to manage the proliferation of HMOs (especially large HMOs that need planning permission) as an overconcentration of such uses can have a negative impact, affecting character and amenity of an area.</p>	No further change required.
R01213/04	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	20	LP1	Given that other Opportunity Areas in London have shown that they can provide much higher numbers of new homes than indicated in the London Plan, it is likely that Ilford and other and Investment & Growth Areas have capacity for more housing. This could be achieved particularly by increasing densities to at least the higher end of the London Plan Density matrix.		<p>As part of developing the growth scenarios for the Local Plan, sites located within Ilford, the Crossrail Corridor and Gants Hill Investment & Growth Areas have been assessed against the higher end of the London Plan Density Matrix, as per the response to R01213/02. Whilst this demonstrates that the minimum housing target could be achieved, it is likely to have significant impacts upon the borough's transport, townscape, heritage and character. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal, Transport Assessment and Tall Buildings Study.</p>	No further change required.
R01213/05	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	32	LP1D	Given South Woodford's Investment & Growth Area's location in the London-Stansted Cambridge Corridor (LSCC), there could be opportunities to increase the number of new homes in South Woodford (from 650) as well as other areas within the LSCC through higher density and infill development.		<p>See response to R01213/02 above.</p>	No further change required.

R01213/06	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	120	LP34	<p>London Plan policy 1.1 B a is clear that growth is supported without encroaching on the Green Belt. Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development, policy 7.16 A. The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of London's Green Belt and believes that "exceptional circumstances" for the release of the sites in Redbridge has not been demonstrated.</p> <p>No assessment has been made of the potential contribution these sites make to London's green infrastructure, in line with London Plan policy 7.17. Further discussion provided on each site:</p> <p>Billet Road - this site meets the Green Belt and wider open space tests and should be retained as Green Belt.</p> <p>Hainault Fields (Oakfield) & Fairlop Plain – this site would most likely meet the London Plan criteria for MOL. There is some small scope within any re-designation for limited development on the existing built footprint of the sports centre and pavilion buildings located close to the high PTAL accessible Fairlop Central Line tube station.</p> <p>Claybury Hospital – the site is partially developed, relatively low density and appears as a settlement within the Green Belt. To maintain the area's character, it is not considered to alter the Green Belt boundary. Should the boundary be altered, it should be drawn tight around the developed land.</p>		<p>All sites proposed for green belt release have been determined not to meet NPPF Green Belt tests as set out in the Green Belt Assessment (2016) and the Green Belt Addendum (2017). The Council has not made an assessment of the potential contribution these sites make to London's green infrastructure because the Council requires these sites to be released from the green belt to meet the borough's development needs. The Council's development needs, in particular, the need to provide land for housing and infrastructure, amounts to "exceptional circumstances" which the Council considers is justification to amend green belt boundaries. The Council is releasing them for this purpose, not to contribute towards green infrastructure or MOL as set out in London Plan policy 7.17. Releasing land from the Green Belt and designating it as MOL does not constitute "exceptional circumstances".</p> <p>The Green Belt Assessment (2016) and Green Belt Addendum (2017) set out in detail the key findings for each of the proposed green belt sites.</p>	No further change required.
-----------	--	-----	------	---	--	---	-----------------------------

R01213/06a	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	120	LP34	<p>Roding Hospital & surrounding area – as the site is pepper-potted with large scale development which fragments the site as a whole, the boundary changes should be tight around the developed areas. The Mayor welcomes the re-designation of the undeveloped sites as open space, and encourages the Council to consider whether these large parcels of open green land would contribute to London’s Green Infrastructure and therefore designated as MOL.</p> <p>King George and Goodmayes Hospital & the Ford Sports Ground – a significant portion of the site is developed and could be justified for Green Belt release which could achieve a more efficient and effective use of the land which could help the Council meet its housing targets. In addition, the site is disconnected from the main body of Green Belt by the A12. Site ownership is split between a small number of landowners including two NHS Trusts and the Council.</p> <p>There is significant potential to bring forward a comprehensive masterplan for these previously developed sites that could help the Council deliver housing and social infrastructure whilst providing for enhanced Green Belt, MOL or open space re-provision. The Mayor would like to investigate ways of achieving this with all partners. In advance of a comprehensive/framework, the Mayor believes that any release of Green Belt would be premature. Finally, the Council should also apply the tests for MOL on any Green Belt land proposed for release to ensure that open space is afforded the highest possible protection from inappropriate development, and that a proactive approach is taken to addressing the identified open space deficiency.</p>	As Above	As Above	As Above
R01213/07	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	40	LP3	<p>The Mayor will be issuing guidance through an Affordable Housing & Viability SPG on how he will seek to increase the delivery of affordable housing in line with his manifesto commitment to 50% of new homes being affordable.</p> <p>The Council’s Viability Assessment states that schemes could deliver between 20% and 40% affordable housing, excluding grant, which suggests that the strategic target should be higher than 30%. This would encompass all schemes including those using delivered by Housing Associations, ones with grant and those built on public land as well as S106.</p> <p>The Mayor suggests that the Council should set a higher strategic affordable housing target. This is because the gap between the affordable homes target and objectively assessed affordable housing need is large. The Outer North East London SHMA assesses Redbridge’s affordable housing need as 695 homes per year, twice the number of Redbridge’s target for affordable homes (336).</p>		<p>The Council recognises that policy LP3 as worded would restrict more affordable housing being delivered. In addition, to reflect the Mayor’s position in relation to maximising affordable housing from all sources, insert some additional text in supporting text following para 3.9.6.</p>	<p>Amend policy LP3 Affordable Housing as follows:</p> <p>The Council will seek to maximise the provision of affordable housing in the borough by setting a minimum strategic affordable housing target of 30%.</p> <p>Insert the following after 3.9.6 as follows:</p> <p><u>“All schemes are expected to maximise the delivery of affordable housing and make the most efficient use of available resources to achieve this objective in accordance with the London Plan (2016) and the policies of this Plan. In accordance with the Mayor’s Draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2016), the Council will ensure affordable housing delivery is maximised from all sources, by considering a variety of funding and design solutions such as use of grant, RP’s own funding and innovative funding models to increase the overall number of affordable homes”.</u></p>

R01213/08	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	44	LP4	The Mayor welcomes the Council's general approach to supporting a wide range of housing needs. LP4 provides support for older, vulnerable and homeless residents in the borough. Also, the reference to monitoring against the London Plan is welcomed. But no mention is made of students even though the Outer North East London SHMA makes reference to part of Redbridge having a concentration of students. Policy 3.8 of the London Plan specifically requires boroughs to plan for strategic and local accommodation needs of students, not local need alone.		The SHMA (2016) references part of Redbridge, Waltham Forest and Barking and Dagenham having some concentrations of students. However, there is little evidence of further expansion from the two local universities that operate in the area – University of East London and London South Bank University. Notwithstanding the above, the Council recognises that the Plan should reference the strategic and local accommodation needs of students to plan for any future need.	Include new section in policy LP4 Specialist Accommodation to refer to student accommodation as follows: <u>3. Student Accommodation</u> <u>Where student accommodation is required to meet strategic and local need, it will be supported where it is appropriately located within:</u> <u>(a) One of the borough's Investment and Growth Areas;</u> <u>(b) Within or at the edge of a town centre; and</u> <u>(c) In an area of good public transport accessibility.</u> <u>In addition to meeting the requirements of the above, proposals for student accommodation will also need to demonstrate that:</u> <u>(a) There would be no loss of existing housing;</u> <u>(b) There would be no adverse impact on local amenity, in particular, the amenity of neighbouring properties and on-street parking provision;</u> <u>(c) The accommodation is of a high standard, including adequate unit size and compliance with daylight and sunlight standards;</u> <u>(d) Provision is made for units that meet the needs of students with disabilities;</u> <u>(e) The need for the additional bedspaces can be demonstrated; and</u> <u>(f) The accommodation can be secured by agreement for occupation by members of a specified educational institution(s).</u>
R01213/09	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	61	LP14	In policy LP14, it would be useful to know whether the new SIL allocations (site part IBP and PIL) on Southend Road Business Park refer to the whole site or whether different parts will be allocated as PIL and IBP.	Show clearly which part of Southend Road Business Park will be an IBP and which part will be a PIL.	Noted.	Amend Policies Map to clearly show which part of Southend Road Business Park refers to PIL and which refers to IBP.
R01213/10	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	61	Para 3.21.3	The Mayor acknowledges the proposed release of 14.45ha of non-designated employment land as this is close to the 11ha benchmark for employment land release in the Mayor's Land for Industry and Transport SPG. As set out in London Plan policy 2.17 and 4.4, Redbridge should prioritise the release of sites with good access to public transport, open space and town centres for higher density residential or mixed use development.	Ensure a comprehensive assessment of employment land is carried out to ensure the overall function of industrial land is not undermined.	Support noted. The approach to employment land in the Local Plan is to continue to protect the borough's two SIL and Business Areas. As such, the Council has prioritised the release of other non-designated employment land with good access to public transport, open space and town centres. The majority of these non-designated employment sites have been identified as Opportunity Sites for mixed use development in the Local Plan. The Council's Employment Land Review supports this approach.	To provide clarity, the Council is proposing the following change to paragraph 3.21.3: "Industrial land uses continue to make a valuable contribution to local employment and provide important local services. The Council recognises the role these play in providing a suitable range of jobs and acting as locations in the borough for jobs, and therefore seeks to protect its best quality industrial land alongside planned growth of new business space. A number of leading UK companies have made Redbridge their head office location in recent years."
R01213/11	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	66	LP15	The Mayor is supported of proposed policy LP15 which seeks a range of new and flexible business space, including space at affordable rents.	No change sought.	Support noted.	No further change required.
R01213/12	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	30	LP1C	Policy LP1C Gants Hill Investment & Growth Area states a potential for 5,000 sqm of new retail floorspace, whereas the supporting text at para 3.5.6 states a potential for 10,000sqm. This should be clarified.	Clarification required on what the correct amount of retail floorspace is for the Gants Hill Investment & Growth Area.	Agree to clarify floorspace figures.	Update content of LP1C policy box as follows: "New homes 500 600 New retail floorspace – 5,000 7,000 sq.m New employment floorspace – 10,000 2,500 sq.m New Jobs – 500 550 Update penultimate sentence in paragraph 3.5.6 to read: "The town centre has the capacity to provide approximately 10,000 7,000 sq.m of new retail floorspace (Policy LP9)" . Also see response to R01213/02
R01213/13	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	78	LP19	The Mayor welcomes the Council's commitment towards mitigating the effects of climate change, as set out in LP19. This is in line with the Mayor's manifesto pledge for London to become a 'zero carbon' city by 2050.	No change sought.	Support noted	No further change required.
R01213/14	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	86	LP22	Particular support for policy LP22 and the Council's commitment to improving air quality across the borough. Reference to the Mayor's Transport Strategy and London Freight Plan is welcomed.	No change sought.	Support noted.	No further change required.

R01213/15	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	86	LP22	LP22 is supported, however, a number of modifications should be made to make the policy clearer.	Criteria i) – add something to show that we can help mitigate development if we secure appropriate funding and changes to their measure of impact. In criteria h), remove the ‘Green’ from Travel Plans. Reword the sentence to ‘demonstrate what measures will be introduced to ensure that future users of development will be less reliant on private motor vehicles. Criteria i) – “Resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on available transport capacity within the Local and Strategic Road Network...”	Agreed	Amend LP22 as follows: h) Require major development to provide Green Travel Plans to demonstrate <u>what measures will be introduced to ensure that</u> how the future users of developments will be less reliant on private motor vehicles, and promote sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling”. i) Resist new development that results in an unacceptable adverse impact on traffic congestion <u>available transport capacity</u> within the Local and Strategic Road Network or public transport system unless it incorporates <u>or contributes towards</u> effective mitigation measures. k) Require new development to provide a Service Management Plan– <u>Construction Logistics Plan</u> to ensure that development can be adequately serviced within the site, to encourage shared servicing arrangements and timing and <u>consolidation</u> of deliveries. l) Require major development to provide a <u>Construction Logistics Plan</u> Construction Management Plan to particularly demonstrate how it will manage trips generated <u>throughout the demolition and construction programme</u> ”. through its construction phase
R01213/16	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	87	Para 4.9.2	Correct typo in second sentence of para 4.9.2	Correct typo in second sentence of para 4.9.2	Agreed	“This will be transformative and will bring approximately £70 million of direct public sector investment into our town centres the town centre providing an important catalyst for growth and regeneration”.
R01213/17	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	87	Para 4.9.3	Delete unnecessary text in paragraph 4.9.3 as it doesn’t make sense.	Delete unnecessary text in paragraph 4.9.3 as it doesn’t make sense.	Agreed	Amend first two sentences in para 4.9.3 to read as follows: “The two traffic gyratories in Ilford are a cause of great severance within the town centre. with relatively isolated areas within the system of traffic lanes. To improve this situation the Council will seek to alter the land use of these areas to improve pedestrian links and local access issues whilst being mindful of the accommodation of the tidal commuter flow through the borough.
R01213/18	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	88	Para 4.10.1	Promoting a modal shift is welcomed but it is important to ensure the Plan doesn’t say the whole transport system is congested as that implies public transport too.	Amend first three sentences in para 4.10.1 to be more explicit around PTAL explaining that low PTAL is as a result of the car being a more practical option.	Agreed	Amend second and third sentences of para 4.10.1 as follows: “This is reflected in the lower levels of public transport accessibility and higher rates of private motor vehicle ownership in outer London. This, coupled with increased traffic from outside the borough, has put severe pressure on the local <u>highway network</u> , resulting in increased traffic congestion.”
R01213/19	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	88	Para 4.10.2	The beginning of paragraph 4.10.2 doesn’t make sense and needs to be clarified.	Amend first sentence of para 4.10.2	Agreed	Amend second sentence of para 4.10.2 as follows: “a substantial modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable <u>transport options</u> means is therefore essential to addressing these issues by reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality in the borough.”
R01213/20	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	88	Para 4.10.3	Ensure consistency when describing TfL and London Buses, it is one of the same.		Agreed	Amend para 4.10.3 as follows: “The Council will continue to work with TfL and London Buses to develop and improve the bus service network in the borough. The Council will lobby TfL buses to increase provision and frequency of services to improve connectivity particularly to the borough’s Growth and Investment Areas where significant number of new homes and jobs will be located. Improvement in the level of provision and frequency to feeder routes to Crossrail stations are considered to be of particular benefit to encouraging residents not to drive to stations. In addition, the Council is keen to work with TfL and London Buses to provide additional penetration to the more remote parts of the borough and in particular to parts of Fairlop and Hainault.
R01213/21	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	89	Para 4.10.7	Clarification and grammatical corrections required in para 4.10.7.	Clarification and grammatical corrections required in para 4.10.7.	Agreed	Amend last sentence of para 4.10.7 to read as follows: The Council will seek to overcome barriers to cycling and to increase the level of cycling in the borough by securing safe and attractive cycling infrastructure, particularly to provide the facilities required at the start and end of local journeys to make these modes more attractive to use, especially encouraging this to be provided in new developments.
R01213/22	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	90	Para 4.11.2	Expand on last sentence in para 4.11.2 to list measures that are included in new developments to encourage more sustainable forms of transport.		Agreed	Amend last sentence in para 4.11.2 to read: “Measures which can be included in new development include <u>end of journey facilities such as lockers and</u> showers, <u>high quality</u> cycle parking <u>facilities</u> (see LP23), reduced travel cost schemes and car parking management.
R01213/23	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	90	Para 4.11.3	Ensure consistency with wording of LP22.	Insert wording in last two sentences to ensure consistency with LP22	Agreed	Amend last two sentences in para 4.11.3 to read: “DSPs are key strategy documents outlining how an organisation will <u>manage its</u> freight transport efficiently, safely and in a sustainable way. CLPs have similar objectives to DSPs, but are applied to the <u>design demolition</u> and construction phases of <u>premises development</u> , specifically to improve construction freight efficiency, to reduce by reducing CO2 emissions and congestion and improving the safety of vulnerable residents <u>road users</u> ”.

R01213/24	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	90	Para 4.12.1	The paragraph sets out the issues but not what the Council are going to do to resolve them.		Agreed	Add the following sentence to the end of para 4.12.1: <u>“The Council will therefore resist any development that does not satisfy its servicing demands within its own site”.</u>
R01213/25	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	90	Para 4.13	Limited commentary on encouraging cycle parking.		Agreed	Amend last sentence of para 4.13.2 as follows: The excellent PTAL in Investment and Growth Areas coupled with the range of sustainable transport options means that lower levels of parking, <u>in line with the London Plan</u> , can be provided in new development.
R01213/26	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	91	LP23	New wording required to strengthen the policy.		Agreed	To respond to TfL and to bring the policy in line with the Minor Alterations of the London Plan, the Council considers the following changes are required to policy LP23. In addition, cycle parking standards for Residential (C3) use will also be deleted from Appendix 7. “1. The Council will ensure new development provides sufficient cycle and car parking by: (a) Seeking new development to meet the minimum and maximum parking standards set out in Appendix 7. <u>For residential development, London Plan Parking Standards will be used unless the site falls within an area of PTAL 0-1 and PTAL 6; where the local standards set out in Appendix 7 will apply.</u> Where a lower provision of parking is proposed than that indicated as a maximum standard and where no minimum standards apply, proposals will be considered on the basis of the following: i Transport Assessment, which indicates adherence to Green Travel <u>Plan</u> planning measures and contribution to local sustainable transport schemes; ii Levels of public transport accessibility; and iii Availability of public <u>on-street</u> parking and the outcomes of any parking stress survey.
R01213/26a	Stewart Murray Greater London Authority	91	LP23	As above	As above	As above	2. Supporting residential development within Growth and Investment Areas that are in close proximity to public transport nodes to be low parking development <u>in line with the standards set out in Appendix 7</u> 6. Requiring secure accessible and sheltered cycle parking <u>in accordance with the London Plan</u> ; and 7. Regular car parking spaces should achieve a minimum size of 4.8m by 2.4m. Those intended for use by disabled people should be at least <u>2.4m wide by 4.8m long 4.8m by 2.7m</u> ; and Amend para 4.13.3 as follows: The Council’s approach to off-street car parking standards is to ensure that parking is not over-provided at destinations served by good public transport (maximum levels of provision), but to recognise and respect the decision many residents make to continue to own a car and ensure that adequate levels of off-street parking are provided. in new residential development in areas with lower levels of PTAL. <u>The provision of minimum standards for residential development in areas of low PTAL is consistent with London Plan guidance that outer London boroughs should consider higher levels of provision in low PTAL areas to address ‘overspill’ parking pressures.</u>
R01214/01	Karen Beech Code Development Planners	149	Site 51	Support the allocation of the site as an ‘Opportunity Site’ and agree with the phasing period 2015 – 2020.		Support noted	No further change required.
R01214/02	Karen Beech Code Development Planners	20	Policy LP1	Objection to the lack of flexibility in LP1 for potential uses on Opportunity Sites	(c) Other identified Opportunity Sites (set out in Appendix) outside of Investment and Growth areas and town centre, with proposed development protecting and enhancing the existing neighbourhood character of the surrounding area. Standalone housing schemes will be acceptable on such sites, as well as mixed use schemes with employment uses (Class B1) and community facilities (Class D1) at ground floor with housing and or commercial on upper floors.”	Noted – The site is located in the Crossrail Corridor. LP1 support new development including homes, shops, leisure and infrastructure, providing sufficient flexibility. LP1 part c applies to sites outside of Investment and Growth Areas, so would not be applicable to site 51. It is noted that the proposed uses on site 51 include a wide range of in principle acceptable uses including community / employment / housing and healthcare providing further flexibility.	No further change required.

R01214/03	Karen Beech Code Development Planners	149	Site 51	Objection to the indicative development capacity of 56 units for Opportunity 51. Capacity testing indicates that the site could accommodate between 180 – 300 homes. 501 High Road (site 48) should be considered as one site. A planning brief is being prepared in consultation with the Council.	Change indicative housing capacity to 180 – 300 units and include site 501 High Road in site area.	Noted. See modifications proposed to Appendix 1 in response to R01213/02.	See modifications to Appendix 1.
R01215/01	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	122	Para 6.1.9 LP1D LP34	Proposed release of St Swithin's Farm and surrounding grazing land from the green belt is supported		Support noted	No further change required.
R01215/02	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	38	Table 3	Inconsistencies exist between the housing figures listed for South Woodford in Table 3, Policy LP1D, and Appendix 1	Correct inconsistent housing figures	Noted. See modifications proposed to Appendix 1 in response to R01213/02.	See modifications to Appendix 1.
R01215/03	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	146	Appendix 1	The opportunity for St Swithin's Farm to help deliver housing growth has been overlooked, despite it being considered in stage 5 of the original 2010 Green Belt Review	The remainder of land owned by PDSA should be removed from its Open Space designation and identified as an Opportunity Site in Appendix 1 for 118 units	The site has been considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal, and discounted on the basis that other areas of Green Belt proposed for release perform more favourably.	No further change required.
R01215/04	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	-	-	The Open Space Study incorrectly identifies St Swithin's Farm grazing land as PDSA Cemetery for Animals	Correct inaccurate identification of site	Noted. Figure 3.1 of Open Space Study amended to reflect sites status as agricultural land	No further change required.
R01215/05	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	125	Figure 23	The Open Space designation covering the site has not been justified. It is privately owned and never been open to the public, so does not meet NPPF requirements		Whilst the Green Belt Assessment and Addendum have determined the site to not meet NPPF purposes, its current use as agricultural and grazing land means it does still represent existing open space, as identified in figure 3.1 of the Open Space Study, and justifying its designation as such. Neither the NPPF nor Planning Practice Guidance restrict open space designations to land that is publically accessible. The NPPF defines open space as "all open space of public value", and cites visual amenity. Planning Practice Guidance meanwhile indicates that land can be designated as local green space regardless of ownership. Paragraph 17, Reference ID: 37-017-20140306 states: "other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access (e.g. green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty)."	No further change required.
R01215/06	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	127	Figure 24	The site does not fall within an area of open space deficiency		Noted.	No further change required.
R01215/07	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	124	LP35	The open space designation covering the site will constrain the boroughs ability to meet its housing and development needs		The designation covering the site reflects its existing character. The Local Plan sets out how the borough intends to meet its development needs, as justified by its evidence base including Sustainability Appraisal	No further change required.
R01215/08	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	-	-	A masterplan has been drafted, which demonstrates an indicative capacity of 118 units and the provision of on site open space		Noted.	No further change required.
R01215/09	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	146	Appendix 1	The site is surplus to PDSA's requirements and currently underutilised. It could be delivered within phase 1 or 2 of the plan.		It has not been made clear why the site would no longer be needed for its current purposes, and therefore deemed surplus land as set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF.	No further change required.
R01215/10	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	125	Figure 23	The open space allocation of the site conflicts with the Council's proposals to bring forward development on land parcels released from the Green Belt		Parcels proposed for release from the Green Belt are those that are no longer considered to meet Green Belt purposes. Parcels proposed as Development Opportunity Sites are supported by the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal	No further change required.
R01215/11	Emma Penson Dalton Warner Davis (PDSA)	125	Figure 23	It is not considered that the site has been appropriately assessed as open space in line with the NPPF, and it is deemed a sustainable site for development		See responses to R01215/05 and 07	See responses to R01215/05 and 07
R01216/01	Alma Murphy	32	Policy LP1D	See comments R00416/01-16	See comments R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16	See responses to R00416/01-16
R01216/02	Alma Murphy	-	-	Londoners squeezed out of Central London due to high cost of housing and rental markets, Council trying to squeeze people into area that cannot cope		Noted	No further change required.

R01216/03	Alma Murphy	40	Policy LP3	More residents should have ability to apply for council housing, existing stock should not be sold		Noted.	No further change required.
R01217/01	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	20	LP1	Policy LP1: Spatial Development Strategy We support the approach to preferred locations for new development, especially that with respect to 'Other identified Opportunity Sites'. However, these sites should ensure that proposals make the most effective use of brownfield land, as promoted in the NPPF (Para 111) and London Plan Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply, Part E.	No change sought	Support for policy LP1 is welcome. All identified opportunity sites in the borough will be expected to achieve the full potential of the land where proposals for development come forward, taking into account the context and character of the surrounding area, in line with Policy LP26 <i>Promoting High Quality Design</i> , and other relevant policies in the Local Plan.	No further change required.
R01217/02	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	37	LP2	Policy LP2: Delivering Housing Growth Part 1(b). It is important that effective and efficient use of land through the promotion of high density development is pursued, as stated in part 1(c). This criterion should apply across all development sites and locations where good quality design can deliver high or higher density than is typically the norm in any particular area. The approach should therefore be expanded especially to parts 1(b) and 1(c) to reference that high/higher density is suitable on Opportunity sites and in growth areas, where it is demonstrated that there is good design and neighbouring amenity is respected.	Changes to Policy LP2, particularly at points 1(b) and 1(c), to state that higher density development will be sought on all Opportunity Sites in the borough, provided there is good design and neighbouring amenity is respected.	The aim of Policy LP2 is to maximise new development on opportunity sites in the borough, through the promotion of higher density development. However this must be achieved in highly accessible locations because these are the most appropriate, sustainable areas of the borough where higher density development can occur. The sustainable location of higher density development in the borough is an important key consideration and part of a good planning practice approach that the Council must implement as a Local Planning Authority, rather than only considering good design and respecting neighbouring amenity. Not all of the Opportunity Sites in the Local Plan are in highly accessible locations and therefore decisions must be made on a site by site basis, with regard to the London Plan Density Matrix as proposals come forward, rather than just allowing higher densities on all sites in all areas of the borough, only considering the delivery of good quality design.	No further change required.
R01217/03	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	46	LP5	The policy should not be prescriptive on delivering a fixed mix for every site. This approach will limit the overall number of dwellings that may be delivered. The Council should seek a range of dwellings to be delivered when it considers all sites in the round, and not impose artificial mixes on sites that the market or location do not want or warrant.	Change the prescriptive nature of the Policy in order to seek the development of a range of dwellings on sites	As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan the Strategic Housing Market Assessment [SHMA] (LBR 2.01) outlines the level of housing need in the borough and the tenures and housing types needed in priority order, with family size housing the highest priority, as outlined in Table 4 of the Plan. The Council's corporate strategy places a high emphasis on addressing the housing shortages in the borough and tackling homelessness. This means meeting need but with the right mix of dwellings - this issue must be addressed first in Policy LP5: <i>Dwelling Mix</i> . However the Policy also states that in town centre locations, where there are fewer opportunities to develop family size dwellings a more flexible approach will be taken when applying the preferred housing mix. The Implementation section of the Policy states that dwelling mixes will be assessed on a site by site basis as the Council recognises that not all sites will be able to meet the preferred dwelling mix.	No further change required.
R01217/04	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	46	LP5	New development does not need to strictly mimic the surrounding context of an area, as the policy wording "reflect" implies. As such, the wording of the policy should be changed from "reflect" to "respect".	Change the wording of Local Plan Policy LP5 Dwelling Mix at para. 2 line 4 in order to add clarity to the requirements of new development proposals with regard to the context of the surrounding area.	Agree to suggested modification	Modify 2nd sentence of Policy LP5 as follows: The Council will seek the dwelling mix in new development in established suburban residential locations to consider and reflect respect the existing context and character.

R01217/05	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	68	LP17	NHS PS objects to part 1(g) (iv) of the policy, which requires sufficient provision of new community facilities nearby. As part 2 identifies, new facilities should be located in or on the edge of the borough's town centres. Redevelopment of an existing community facility, if deemed appropriate and meeting other tests i.e. 1(g) (i – iii) should not be dependent upon existing other provision, especially if the site is located in suburban areas or further from existing centres. This element of the policy should be deleted, especially as part 1(g) (iii) includes the criterion of re-provision. Thus if the facility is being re-provided elsewhere, there is no need to provide dual community facility sites, otherwise the wording should, at the very least, be reworded to along the lines "there is no identified need or realistic and deliverable demand for new community facilities in this location".	Suggested change sought: (g) Resisting the loss of existing lawful community infrastructure. Where proposals involve the loss of infrastructure this will only be supported where: i. It is clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the existing use within the local community; ii. The building is no longer suitable; iii. The facilities in the building are being re-provided elsewhere in the borough; and iv. There is sufficient provision nearby. <u>there is no identified need or realistic and deliverable demand for new community facilities in this location.</u>	The Policy as written seeks to avoid the reduction of community facilities in a given local area, regardless of where the facility is located. The justification for this policy position is that local facilities should not be reduced where they serve a local need. The position of the Policy referred to by the representation could be addressed by changing the word 'and' at the end of point (g) iii to 'or', which would imply that only one of tests (g) i-iii need to be met, rather than all four tests, for redevelopment proposals to be supported.	Make the following change to Policy LP17 <i>Delivering Community Facilities</i> : (g) Resisting the loss of existing lawful community infrastructure. Where proposals involve the loss of infrastructure this will only be supported where: i. It is clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the existing use within the local community; ii. The building is no longer suitable; iii. The facilities in the building are being re-provided elsewhere in the borough; <u>or</u> iv. There is sufficient provision nearby.
R01217/06	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	72	LP18	NHS PS does not support the need for a HIA in all major development schemes. This impacts all developments of 10 units or 1,000sqm or more and imposes an unnecessary burden on landowners and developers in promoting development schemes. This should only be required for schemes over 100 units or 10,000sqm net additional floorspace. Such assessments aren't required under the NPPF, and so shouldn't be imposed on all developments as set out in the policy.	Re-word the last part of the policy should be reworded as follows: 'The Council will support the provision of new or improved health facilities, or redevelopment of existing, for health or other uses, in line with Redbridge's Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England requirements; and protect existing health facilities, and support redevelopment where the use is demonstrated to no longer be fit for purpose, in line with LP17 Community Infrastructure.'	Local Plan Policy LP18: 'Health and Wellbeing' is in line with London Plan Policy 3.2 'Improving Health and Addressing Health Inequalities', which states at point C that the ' <i>...impacts of major development proposals on the health and wellbeing of communities should be considered, for example through the use of Health Impact Assessments (HIA).</i> ' and later at point D that new development ' <i>... should be designed, constructed and managed in ways that improve health and promote healthy lifestyles to help to reduce health inequalities.</i> ' Planning, transport and housing policies must be integrated in the Local Plan to promote health and wellbeing within the community, and the Mayor's ' <i>Best Practice Guidance on Health Issues in Planning</i> ' should be taken into consideration. Local Plan policy reflects the new public health responsibilities of boroughs and the new drive towards improving public health locally since the Health and Social Care Act of 2012. However Policy LP18 also states that ' <i>Measures that will help contribute to healthier communities and reduce health inequalities must be incorporated in a development where appropriate.</i> ' The Policy will be applied and an HIA will be required, but only in cases where a development is anticipated to have implications for the health and wellbeing of local people, rather than for all development over 10 units.	No further change required.
R01217/07	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	91	LP23	NHS PS considers that parking standards should not seek additional parking provision over that set out in the London Plan. Reference to minimum provision of car parking spaces should be amended to maximum provision, as promoted in – and to retain consistency with – the London Plan.	Change policy approach to parking to reflect maximum provision set out in the London Plan	The Council's parking standards have been amended to bring them in line with the London Plan (2016).	See response to R01213/26.

R01217/08	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	98	LP26	Policy LP26: Promoting high quality design NHS PS objects to the wording of part (d) which states development should be “well integrated to a high degree of compatibility with the surrounding area, in terms of: layout, form, style, massing, scale, density, orientation, materials, and design, in order to reinforce the positive and distinctive local character and amenity as described in the Redbridge Urban Characterisation Study (2014), or its updated equivalent”. This could stifle new design and evolving changes to a neighbourhood. As such we suggest the wording is changed to “has regard to and respects the surrounding area, in terms of layout ...”	Change the wording of the first two lines of Part d) of Policy LP26 ‘Promoting High Quality Design’ to read as follows: well integrated to a high degree of compatibility with the surrounding area, has regard to and respects the surrounding area,...	The Council does not agree that the wording of the policy will stifle new design or innovation within the borough, as a variety of new development can be designed to be highly compatible with the surrounding area, whilst still leaving developers with scope for innovation. The Council has a firm commitment to improving the built environment in the borough and considers the development of robust design policy as crucial to achieving its objectives. However we believe that new schemes should fully integrated with existing development in the surrounding area. The approach is line with Para. 58 of the NPPF. Policy LP26 as drafted does not seek to impose architectural styles or tastes on schemes coming forward, or stifle originality in design, and there are no requirements to conform to particular development forms – a high degree of compatibility can be achieved without replication of surrounding form or styles. Indeed there are examples of new design in the borough that differ architectural in style yet are well integrated and compatible with existing older architectural styles. Para. 60 of the NPPF also states that: <i>‘It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness...’</i> which is what the policy seeks to do.	No further change required.
R01217/09	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	98	LP26	NHS PS objects to policy part (g) which states that development “Responds correctly to, and is completely integrated with the existing layout of buildings, surrounding streets, open spaces and patterns of development” This wording is overly prescriptive and fails to take account of those sites large enough that currently have or can create their own recognisable character, without mimicking the surrounding suburban nature. We suggest the wording is changed to state development should “respect the existing layout of buildings, surrounding streets, open spaces and patterns of development”.	Change the wording of Policy LP26 ‘Promoting high quality design’ to read as follows: (g) Responds correctly to, and is completely integrated with the existing layout of buildings, surrounding streets, open spaces respect the existing layout of buildings, surrounding streets, open spaces and patterns of development...	See response R01217/08 above.	See response R01217/08 above.
R01217/10	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	106	LP29	NHS PS object to this policy as drafted, as it is unclear, confusing, fails to accord with the London Plan and seeks provision which doesn’t take consideration of site or context. The approach is contrary to the advice set out in the London Plan and onerous. The policy wording should be amended to reflect the space standards of the London Housing Design Guide. All new build developments – and conversions where feasible – should provide a minimum of 5 sqm private amenity space per dwelling, through use of a terrace or balcony or private garden. Further, where the site location will allow for some communal space, this should be provided not on the basis of a mathematical calculation, but in accordance with the criteria of Part 2(d – d) of the policy – i.e. being appropriate scale to the scheme, useable, functional, oriented for sunlight and outlook and fit for purpose.	Change policy to be in line with London Housing Design Guide.	The aim of Policy LP29: <i>Amenity and Internal space standards</i> , is to secure an acceptable amount of amenity space, private and shared, appropriate for higher and lower density locations. However the Council’s aim is to only include policies in the Local Plan that are clearly understood, and in the interest of clarity modifications have been made that are both adapted to the local needs of the borough with regard to family size houses, and in line with the Mayor’s Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016). The supporting text of the policy also recognises that circumstances may sometimes warrant a flexible approach, and that it may not be necessary to provide the full complement of private amenity space in all cases.	LP29: Amenity and Internal Space Standards Amenity Space 1 The Council will ensure that new development will provide external private and/or communal amenity space to meet the needs of occupants by: (a) Seeking a minimum amount of private amenity space of: For 1 and 2 bed dwellings/ flatted development: i 15sqm of private amenity space for 1-2 person per dwelling without a balcony, for development within town-centres and tall building zones; ii an additional 15sqm for each additional occupant of private amenity space per dwelling with a balcony in excess of 5sqm for development within town-centres and tall building zones; For 3 and 4+ bed dwellings/flats new housing development: i 50sqm of private amenity space per dwelling for 1 and 2 bed units and for houses containing 3 or more bedrooms an additional 10 sqm per additional bedroom without a balcony, for development within town-centres and tall building zones; ii 5sqm of private amenity space per dwelling with a balcony in excess of 8sqm for development within town-centres and tall building zones;

R01217/10a	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	106	LP29	NHS PS objects to the policy wording of part 2(a) that “amenity space in new residential development should: (a) Be compatible with the prevailing pattern in the surrounding area as set out in the borough Characterisation Study (2013)”. There may be opportunities to deliver good quality schemes which can deliver greater dwelling numbers to meet Redbridge’s and London’s housing need through innovative design that increases density on sites, but respects all other issues, which this policy wording may currently stifle. There may be opportunities to make up any shortfall of private amenity space with communal amenity space, which may actually benefit the wider community as well, however, delivery should be considered on a site by site basis.		As above.	(b) Seeking a minimum amount of communal amenity space of 520sqm of private per habitable room per unit for flatted development from development outside of town centres and tall building zones ; and 5 sqm per unit for housing schemes greater than 50 units. (c) Seeking a minimum 12sqm appropriate scale of private amenity space per habitable room in specialised housing; depending upon end user requirements and the location sensitivities of the scheme. (d) for all development with an additional estimated occupancy of ten children or more, communal play provision of 10 squares metres for each child predicted to occupy the development in accordance with the Mayor’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG (or any successor document); and, 2 . In all cases, amenity space in new residential development should: (a) Be compatible with the prevailing pattern in the surrounding area as set out in the borough Characterisation Study (2013); (b) Be of an appropriate scale to maximise usability and to be of a functional and practical configuration to enable a range of reasonable activities including sitting out, dining, child’s play, gardening and social interaction; (c) Be orientated to maximise sunlight and outlook and be free from adverse microclimate and noise; and (d) Be “fit for purpose” in terms of the particular building it serves and being well located relative to the accommodation within the building envelope. It should not rely on areas used for parking (such as driveways) or narrow buffer strips.
R01217/10b	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	106	LP29	As above.	As above.	As above.	Internal Space The Council has adopted and will implement the National Internal Space Standards for new dwellings published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG, March 2015), when making decisions on new development proposals for housing. All planning proposals for housing development in the borough will be required to comply with the national standards set out in the DCLG document. Implementation 1 The Council will update the Amenity Space and Residential Development SPG (2005) in the light of changes in national, regional and local policy and to take account of the Redbridge Urban Characterisation Study (2013) to inform consideration of amenity space in new development. The regular review of the Characterisation Study SPG will provide further detail with respect to the quality and quantity of amenity space in new residential development.
R01217/10c	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	106	LP29	As above.	As above.	As above.	Supporting text 5.4.3 In order to promote these outcomes, the The Council has adopted numerical standards for amenity space which it believes are the reasonable minimum which new housing should attain, but it recognises that circumstances may sometimes warrant a flexible approach. For instance, it may not be necessary to provide the full complement of private amenity space if a local park is close by and people occupying town centre apartments often accept a lifestyle in which a communal roof terrace of all-weather gymnasium substitutes for a private garden. There are many innovative ways of providing amenity space including well integrated terraces, balconies and loggia, community gardens , winter gardens and green roofs. These can provide quality, functional space, space for community interaction, local food growing , and even wildlife habitats on constrained sites, as well as reducing urban run-off and providing insulation. 5.4.5 The Council expects developers to take a design led approach to determining the appropriate form and intensity of development. Design-led development is informed by the nature of the site, its context, and urban design objectives.

R01217/11	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	160	Site 201	<p>Opportunity site 201 refers to the remaining area of Wanstead Hospital, which is part occupied and in health care use. The allocation states potential land uses as health centre / community and housing with an indicative capacity of 15 dwellings. The representation objects to the limited redevelopment applied to the site, notwithstanding that it is indicative. The majority of the healthcare uses on the site have been decanted to alternative, nearby facilities and the current site is underutilised and represents an opportunity for reconfiguration. The site could accommodate re-provision of improved healthcare space and circa 60---70 dwellings, if not more.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of this site is supported, the housing capacity of this site should be increased to reflect its brownfield status The table should be amended to show capacity for 65 dwellings. Furthermore, there should be recognition that services could be provided in a different location, helping to achieve flexibility in service delivery. NHS PS also object to the allocation including community use.</p>	Amend site 201 in Appendix 1 to show capacity for 65 dwellings. Remove community uses as one of the preferred use for a redeveloped site.	Whilst the Council recognises the site at Wanstead Hospital as an opportunity site, it has also been considered as a fully functional health facility. The potential number of housing units allocated to the site in Appendix 1 is an indicative figure, and like all allocated opportunity sites within the Local Plan, there is an understanding that there is potential for housing development to occur in greater numbers. As an existing health facility the inclusion of community facilities as a future land use on a redeveloped site is considered appropriate. However the Council will consider any development proposals for the site as they come forward, which are not to be predetermined by greater or lesser indications of housing numbers at Local Plan review stage.	Change number of units in Appendix 1 for site 201 from 15 to 60; change the preferred use for site 201 from Health Centre/Community/Housing, to Housing only.
R01217/12	Steve Walters SW Planning (NHS property services)	-	-	Please notify of Local Plan Submission.		Noted.	No further change required
R01218/01	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	146	Appendix 1	Appendix 1 does not contain details for developers on how to accommodate heritage assets within or adjoining sites	Appendix 1 - include information on how to accommodate heritage assets in or near sites, and indicative development figure should be explained, including any further assessments of capacity through master-planning/explain integration of heritage assets etc.	Suggested changes agreed.	<p>Add the following text after A1.1.1 to read:</p> <p><u>The proposed levels of growth have been assessed against the need to provide necessary social and community infrastructure, such as schools and health care; delivering new employment and retail; and conserving the borough's heritage assets, whereby the overall aims of growth in the borough will be balanced with the objective of conserving the borough's heritage assets. Where sites are located within or adjacent to heritage assets, further assessments of capacity and integration of those assets may be required. Detailed discussions at pre-application stage will ensure applicants, where relevant, accommodate heritage assets in or near sites. Listed buildings, their settings and designated areas of character, such as conservation areas will be integrated within new development schemes and will be a key consideration for development proposals. All planning policies within this Plan will apply to development proposals.</u></p> <p>And renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly</p>
R01218/02	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	Map	-	Make conservation areas clearer on inset maps for the Local Plan Policies Map	Make conservation areas on inset maps clearer	Agree to proposed change.	Amend inset maps on the Policies Map to make conservation areas clearer.

R01218/03	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	21	Para 3.2.4	Indicative investment and growth areas take in conservation areas and listed buildings in some cases, and it has not been made clear that growth ambitions should be reconciled with para. 8 of NPPF and Local Plan objectives for respecting and enhancing the borough's heritage	The Local Plan should make it clear that growth ambitions will not conflict with objectives in the Plan for enhancing Redbridge's heritage,	Suggested changes agreed The Vision (page 16) does express both the growth and investment ambitions, and the promotion of heritage and character within the borough, as well as expressing overall policy aims within para. 8 of the NPPF, including connectivity, improved open space and improved open space facilities, and new infrastructure such as schools etc. The Local Plan sets out an ambitious growth strategy for the borough, with a large number of new homes projected for the Plan period up to 2030. Intensification is aimed at areas within the borough able to accommodate it, and with appropriate character to absorb new, high density building typologies. However within these more urbanised areas, the Council is aware that there is also a significant proportion of the borough's heritage assets, and therefore densities for new development must be kept at sustainable levels that do not have a detrimental impact on the borough's important historic character, in a way that density levels at the highest upper end of the London Plan density matrix would.	Insert new para. after 3.2.4 as follows: <u>'New development should also conserve and enhance the character and setting of conservation areas and heritage assets within Investment and Growth Areas, as part of a balanced approach towards growth and the preservation of the borough's historic character.'</u> <u>And renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly</u>
R01218/04	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	18	Section 2	<u>Local Plan Section 2: Objectives</u> - Change Objectives 1 and 4 in Section 2 of the Local Plan	Change point 4, Objective 1 p18 as follows by adding: 'Respect and enhance the character of the borough's established residential neighbourhoods <u>built heritage and residential neighbourhoods</u> Change Objective 4 to read: ' To preserve <u>conserve</u> and enhance the unique character <u>historic environment</u> of Redbridge, and the <u>character and</u> distinctiveness of the borough's conservation areas and other historic and valued buildings, spaces and places'	Suggested changes agreed.	Amend point 4, Objective 1 as follows: 'Respect and enhance the character of the borough's established residential neighbourhoods <u>built heritage and residential neighbourhoods</u> Amend point 4, Objective 4 <u>as follows:</u> <u>To preserve conserve and enhance the unique character historic environment of Redbridge, and the character and distinctiveness of the borough's conservation areas and other historic and valued buildings, spaces and places'</u>
R01218/05	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	20	LP1	<u>Section 3 Policy LP1:</u> The positive approach outlined in para. 3.2.3 with regard to the history and unique qualities of the borough could be expressed explicitly in part a) of Policy LP1.	<u>Section 3: Policy LP1</u> – add positive text from 3.2.3 to part a) of Policy LP1	Suggested changes to Policy LP1 are unnecessary as paragraph 3.2.3 already makes it clear that the growth strategy balances the historic and unique qualities of the borough.	No further changes required
R01218/06	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	22	Para 3.3	Valued townscapes within growth areas should be treated sensitively <u>3.3 Ilford (and inset map 1)</u> – include clarity/additional text over the consideration of heritage assets when assessing the scale and nature of development in Ilford	Add text to paras. 3.2.3 and 3.3 outlining a sensitive approach to important townscapes, and to make clear how heritage assets are to be integrated into intensification of development in Ilford	Suggested changes agreed. Additional text that directly refers to heritage assets could be added to strengthen supporting text.	Add the following text to the last sentence of paragraph 3.2.4 as follows: 'Development within Investment and Growth Areas, but which fall outside of designated town centres should respond to the character and context of surrounding areas, including without limitation, respecting and enhancing the character of the established residential neighbourhoods, <u>and the character of designated heritage assets</u> '
R01218/07	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	-	Inset Map 1	<u>Tall buildings boundary for Ilford is unclear on inset map 1</u>	Show Tall Buildings Zone more clearly in inset map 1 (map of Ilford)	Suggested changes agreed	The Council is currently updating its Policy LP27 <i>Tall Buildings</i> through developing supporting evidence. The Local Plan and relevant mapping will be updated to reflect all changes made to this policy.
R01218/08	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	26	Para 3.4	<u>3.4. Crossrail Corridor</u> – Little Heath Conservation Area falls within the proposed growth area as do locally recognised heritage assets	Include Little Heath Conservation Area within the text as a recognised heritage asset.	Suggested changes agreed	Add the following text to the end of para. 3.4.5. as follows: 'Chadwell Heath Station, the Eva Hart Public House and the Art Deco Bingo Hall on the corner of Wangey Road are important local landmarks, and <u>to the north of Chadwell Heath Centre, Little Heath Conservation Area is an important local heritage asset.</u> '

R01218/09	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	27	Figure 8	<u>3.4. Crossrail Corridor</u> - What is meant by 'improved access' in the figure 8 inset map	Clarify what is meant by improved access on Fig 8 and its impact on heritage assets like Little Heath Conservation Area	The perforated line between Goodmayes Station and Billet Road labelled ' <u>Improved Access to Crossrail Station</u> ' on Figure 8 is an indicative proposal to make improvements to public realm and infrastructure, in order to improve access along the route indicated for walking and cycling. This is discussed in para. 3.4.12 where it is stated: ' <u>Further improvements to cycling and walking routes will improve access to these stations and other key destinations, local parks and open spaces in the vicinity.</u> '	No further change required
R01218/10	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	30	Para 3.5	<u>3.5 Gants Hill</u> – Valentines Park should be shown on Inset Map 4 to help protect its status as an historic park and garden. Clarify improved access in Fig 9. What is meant by improved access for Valentines Park should also be made clearer on Fig 9 (p31).	<u>Gants Hill</u> - Clarify what is meant by improved access at Fig 9 and its impact on Valentines Park	<u>3.5 Gants Hill</u> – Policy LP33 <i>Heritage</i> at para. 3 point (a) already states that development within historic parks and gardens will only be supported where it protects the historic character and setting of Historic Parks and Gardens. However it is recognised that the designation is not clear on inset map 4, and this will be clarified.	Amend inset Map 4 of the Policies Map to make the designation of Historic Parks and Gardens clearer.
R01218/11	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	32	Para 3.6	<u>3.6 South Woodford & Wanstead</u> – define the conservation areas on Inset Maps 5 & 6 more clearly. Remove tall buildings from the legend on Inset Map 6.	Show conservation areas more clearly on inset maps 5 and 6	Suggested changes agreed.	Show conservation areas more clearly on Inset Maps 5 and 6, and remove tall buildings from the legend on Inset Map 6.
R01218/12	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	56	LP10	<u>LP10</u> – change second bullet of part 6 to read: ' <u>Respond to, and work positively with historic and natural assets</u> '	Change second bullet of part 6 to read: ' <u>Respond to, and work positively with historic and natural assets</u> '	Suggested changes agreed	LP10 Implementation - re-order 3-7 as 1-5 and amend 2nd bullet point of existing part 6 to read: <u>Optimise heritage and natural assets 'Respond to, and work positively with historic and natural assets'</u>
R01218/13	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	119	Section 6	<u>Section 5</u> : the historic environment should be seen as an asset, refer to it in Section 6 as well as Section 5	<u>Section 5</u> : add text to Section 6 to the Local Plan making reference to the historic environment as a borough asset	The Council is fully aware of the value of the historic environment in the borough and considers it to be an important, key asset. The absence of text regarding heritage assets in the title of Section 6 does not imply that the Council does not consider them as an important borough asset. However some text can be added to refer to section 5 and policy aims towards heritage assets.	Include reference to heritage assets at the end of paragraph 6.1.2, as follows: <u>Other important assets include the borough's heritage assets, such as conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council's policy approach for the historic environment and its preservation and enhancement as a key borough asset is outlined in detail in Section 5 of the Plan (see Policy LP33).</u>
R01218/14	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	98	LP26	<u>Policy LP26</u> – change wording of policy to read: 'conserves or enhances the character and significance of the historic environment and complements the borough's heritage assets, and their settings, in accordance with LP33' to align Policy LP26 with section 12 of NPPF	Change wording of policy to read: (c) ' <u>conserves or enhances the character and significance of the historic environment and complements the borough's heritage assets, and their settings</u> , in accordance with LP33' to align Policy LP26 with section 12 of NPPF	Suggested changes agreed.	Amend LP26 as follows: (c) ' <u>conserves and preserves enhances the special character and significance of the historic environment and complements the borough's heritage assets, and their settings</u> , in accordance with LP33'
R01218/15	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	101	Para 5.1.15	Add the following to the end of para. 5.1.13: '...well integrated with the surrounding area, and should <i>conserve</i> or enhance the special character of areas of historic or architectural value, <i>and the settings of heritage assets.</i> '	Add the following to the end of para. 5.1.13: '...well integrated with the surrounding area, and should <i>conserve</i> or enhance the special character of areas of historic or architectural value, <u>and the settings of heritage assets.</u> '	Suggested changes agreed	Insert the following text to the end of para. 5.1.13: '...well integrated with the surrounding area, and should preserve or <u>conserve and</u> enhance the special character of areas of historic or architectural value, <u>and the settings of heritage assets.</u>
R01218/16	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	101	LP27	<u>Policy LP27</u> – Consider a range of high density typologies of a lower rise nature in the introductory text of the policy to tie development to the Characterisation Study and keep developers creative	Introduce a range of typologies to the supporting text of Policy LP27 to show how high densities can be achieved through lower rise development. Link text to development to Characterisation Study	Suggested changes agreed	Add the following text to the end of para. 5.2.1, to read as follows: <u>'There are a number of building typologies, as outlined in the Redbridge Characterisation Study (2014), that could be used to achieve higher density development, without the need for tall buildings. Other approaches include the new London vernacular design palette, which involves the development of stacked maisonettes, flats and town houses, intensifying capacity without building tower blocks.</u>

R01218/17	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	101	LP27	Suggested changes to LP27 to consider impact of tall buildings on heritage assets and their settings	Add the following text to Policy LP27 to show how the development of Tall Buildings will be sensitive to heritage assets: o Part 3, add in the end of the first paragraph ‘...and it relates well to the urban layout, streets, open spaces, heritage assets , and public realm of the surrounding area’ o Part 3 (b) amend to read ‘...the effect it has on heritage assets and their settings ’ o Part 3 paragraph following part (g), amend at the end to read: amenity space, conservation of the historic environment an sustainability’	Suggested changes agreed	Include new text at the end of second paragraph of policy to read as follows: ‘...and where it relates well to the urban layout, streets, open spaces, heritage assets , and public realm of the surrounding area’ Also see response to R01208/01
R01218/18	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	105	Para 5.2.12	<u>Para. 5.2.12 in Section 5</u> Reference Historic England’s Advice Note 4 on tall buildings	Reference Historic England’s Advice Note 4 on tall buildings as a background document	Suggested changes agreed	Add the following text to the last sentence of para. 5.2.12 to read as follows: ‘This work will inform future planning brief work for specific sites, and will be guided by Historic England’s Advice Note 4 on Tall Buildings. ’
R01218/19	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	115	LP33	Strongly support this policy - make some small suggested changes – mention the borough’s seven entries in the Heritage at Risk register in policy introduction	Introduce text to the policy introduction to outline the entries that the borough has on the Heritage at Risk register	Support noted, agree to suggested changes.	Insert new criteria i) to paragraph 5.7.4 to read as follows: ‘ i) Entries on the national Heritage at Risk register 2015: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 831 High Road, Ilford; Goodmayes (listed Grade II); • The Dr Johnson Public House, Longwood Gardens, Ilford; • Garden Temple, in Garden of Temple House, 14 The Avenue, Wanstead E11(listed Grade II); • Wanstead Park, Wanstead, Redbridge E11 (registered Park and Garden Grade II); • Mayfield/Bungalow Estate, Conservation Area, Mayfield Seven Kings, Redbridge; • Wanstead Park Conservation Area, Wanstead, Redbridge E11; • Woodford Bridge Conservation Area, Woodford, Redbridge.
R01218/20	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	-	-	Substitute references to English Heritage with Historic England	English Heritage is now called Historic England. Make this correction wherever necessary in the text	Suggested changes agreed.	Make corrections to the name ‘English Heritage’ to read ‘Historic England’ in the following text: Local Plan Policy Box 33, Criteria 4 a), Line 9 – ‘Advice should be taken from English Heritage Historic England and provision should be made for on-site investigations that include the recording of archaeological evidence within the affected area’. Local Plan Policy Box 33, Implementation Action 1, Line 4 – ‘1. Develop criteria for the designation of Conservation Areas in the borough, directed by advice and guidance from English Heritage Historic England and the heritage sector.’ Local Plan Policy Box 33, Implementation Action 5, Line 5 – ‘5. Work with owners, the heritage sector, bodies providing grant funding and local communities to find viable solutions that secure the long-term future of heritage assets on English Heritage’s Historic England’s Heritage at Risk Register.’ Appendix 3 Monitoring Framework, Theme 4, Delivery Agency column - ‘LBR Planning & Regeneration Service LBR Leisure Services Sport England Natural England English Heritage Historic England ’

R01218/21	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	115	Para 5.7.3	Insert paragraphs on archaeology between paras. 5.7.3 and 5.7.4.	Introduce text to discuss archaeology in the supporting text of the policy	Suggested changes agreed. A summary of the suggested text will be inserted.	<p>Include a new sub-heading, 'Archaeology' after paragraph 5.7.5 as follows: <u>5.8 Archaeology</u> <u>5.8.1 'The Council will take advice on the management of its archaeological assets listed in para. 5.7.4 from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS), Historic England. The Council's Archaeological Priority Areas are supported by the 'Draft Archaeological Priority Areas Appraisal' (April 2016), and the Council consults GLAAS, Historic England on planning applications located within the Archaeological Priority Areas.</u></p> <p>Make changes to criteria 4 of Policy LP33 as follows: '4 Archaeology (a) Requiring an archaeological evaluation that proposes effective mitigation measures for development proposals involving significant groundwork within Archaeological Priority Zones Areas (as identified on the Policies Map), or in other areas with archaeological interest. Advice should be taken from English Heritage and p Provision should be made for on-site investigations that include the recording of archaeological evidence within the affected area. <u>b) The Council will resist development which impacts substantially on archaeological assets of national significance</u> <u>c) Where appropriate, public interpretation, access and exhibition of artefacts will be required through appropriate planning conditions'</u></p> <p>In the Implementation Section of Policy LP33 add the following text to create point 9:</p>
R01218/21a	Katharine Fletcher Historic England	115	Para 5.7.3	Insert paragraphs on archaeology between paras. 5.7.3 and 5.7.4.	Introduce text to discuss archaeology in the supporting text of the policy	Suggested changes agreed. A summary of the suggested text will be inserted.	<u>'9. Where archaeological sites are identified and are considered to be nationally important, provision will be made for their preservation in-situ. Where archaeological sites are of less importance planning conditions will be used to achieve appropriate archaeological recording. Where significant archaeology is to be recorded appropriate planning conditions may be used to achieve public and community archaeology, such as site visits, school projects, popular publications and web resources.'</u>
R01219	Sarah Bexley	36	Para 3.7.5	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01220	Brian Condon The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01221	Janice Playle The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01222	Huseyin Memduhoglu The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01223	Burcu Tas The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01224	Shayasta Ashiq	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01225	Sarah Pealling Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01226	Lynn Hellett The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01227	Sarah Lovell The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01228	Leszek Perkolup The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01229	June Cunningham The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01230	Tricia Hanson The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01231	D Hanson The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01232	Karen Coombs The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01233	Wesley Waren Hill The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01234	Russell Sharman The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01235/01	B Charalambous	32	LP1D	Charlie Brown's Roundabout has very high pollution and vulnerable people should have a better place to live		Noted	No change required.
R01235/02	B Charalambous	32	LP1D	Building a park under a viaduct at 24 Primrose Road - children would not be able to run around and there would be no trees		Noted.	No change required
R01235/03	B Charalambous	32	LP1D	Monolithic landmark building next to 1930s housing in South Woodford would block light to houses		See responses R00416/10 and R00416/11	See R00416/10 and R00416/11
R01236	David Rowirtack The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01237	Filitkin The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01238	B Bamen The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01239	R Nicola The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01240	E Faceo The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01241	D Omon The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01242	J Poweeby The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01243	Ratan Singh The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01244	Jonathan Tonnison The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01245	Robert Ikermee The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01246	Matthew Heart The Save Oakfield Society	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01247	R Julia Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01248	Rebecca Elais Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01249	Wallace Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01250	James Cain Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01251	M Amobih Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01252	Amaan Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01253	James Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01254	A Fernando Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01255	G Mahikies Bealonians Football Club	36	Para 3.7.5, Policies LP34, LP35 Policies Map Opp Site 135	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10

R01256/01	Sophie Donaldson LB Newham	16	Section 2	Generally supportive of the vision and priorities laid out, in particular those pertaining to the delivery of new homes for London.	No change sought.	Support noted.	No further change required. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly between the LB Newham and Redbridge. There are no outstanding items.
R01256/02	Sophie Donaldson LB Newham	22	LP1A	LB Newham is satisfied that the plans for the Ilford Investment and Growth Area which neighbours LBN will not have a negative impact on its vision and priorities and that there are no cross-boundary issues.	No change sought.	Support noted.	No further change required.
R01256/03	Sophie Donaldson LB Newham	23	Figure 7	There is a need to clearly define the borough boundary on the Plan's inset maps. In Figure 7, it is difficult to differentiate between the borough boundary and that of the Ilford Investment and Growth Area.	Amend Figure 7.	Noted. Figure 7 to be amended.	Amend Figure 7 to differentiate between the borough boundary and the Ilford Investment and Growth Area.
R01257/01	Kyra Hanson	36	Para 3.6.5	As comments R1085/01-10	As comments R1085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10	See responses to R01085/01-10
R01258/01	LB Barking and Dagenham	17	Section 2	The Key Diagram illustrates the location of the Investment & Growth Areas and it indicates that two of these go over the LB Redbridge boundary into Barking & Dagenham – Marks Gate and Chadwell Heath.	In order to reduce confusion, LBBD request that the extent of the Investment & Growth Areas do not extend beyond Redbridge into Barking & Dagenham. London Riverside, as a key growth area in LBBD and an area to meet Redbridge's unmet need, should be included on the Key Diagram.	Agree to amend Key Diagram to remove boundary of Investment & Growth Area going into Chadwell Heath & Marks Gate. Include 'London Riverside' on Key Diagram.	Amend Key Diagram to remove boundary of Investment & Growth Area going into Chadwell Heath & Marks Gate. Include 'London Riverside' on Key Diagram.
R01258/02	LB Barking and Dagenham	26	LP1B	Billet Road Development Opportunity site will have a significant impact on Marks Gate in LBBD with regard to social infrastructure and transport provision. We are pleased that LP1B refers to joint working with LBBD to ensure Billet Road complements Marks Gate in terms of design principles and sharing of community infrastructure. Note the commitment to undertake a masterplan. Are all social infrastructure impacts accounted for? it would be good to understand the impact on social infrastructure more fully.	Request that detail of the masterplan process is set out in the Billet Road policy box, to include an understanding the quantitative need of social infrastructure and how it will be provided. Planning gain monies and planning obligations procedures should be set out to understand how monies will be allocated to LBBD where there is considered to be a material impact (e.g. health care, primary & secondary schools).	Agree that the policy box for Billet Road should explicitly state the exact requirements for social and community infrastructure. It is not necessary to include detail on planning obligation procedures in the policy. The planning application process will assess whether there will be a need to increase capacity in health care and education to meet the need in Barking & Dagenham. Mechanisms to delivery and costs associated with this will be dealt with by the planning application process.	Insert new criteria in Billet Road policy box as follows: <u>"On site provision of a new secondary school"</u>
R01258/03	LB Barking and Dagenham	26	LP1B	The Masterplan should assess possible impacts on the road network. Traffic is likely to go through Marks Gate to access the A12 and the wider road network (junction at Whalebone Lane).		Noted. A detailed Masterplan will assess possible impacts on the road network. It will also ensure that site access(es) facilitate direct and convenient links for travel by foot and cycle, to form connections with existing pedestrian and cycle networks, including links with bus stops.	No further change required.
R01258/04	LB Barking and Dagenham	52	LP9	Loxford Garage Site is designated a Retail Parade. It is not considered that this site fulfils such a designation given that it is simply a petrol garage with ancillary convenience store function. How will policy LP10 (c) be applied as the site does not have a retail use but a sui-generis use.	Suggest reviewing the suitability of this designation and the need for further retail parades in this location given the proximity of the Ilford Lane Local Centre and parades on the outside of the border, namely the Triangle and Fanshawe Avenue and Barking Town Centre	The Local Plan is not proposing changes to the borough's retail parades. Any change of use will be tested against the criteria of LP10.	No further change required.
R01258/05	LB Barking and Dagenham	105	LP28	Given that the Loxford Garage Site is at a key gateway to Barking Town Centre, LBBD would prefer advertisement signage not to be placed at such an important gateway site for their borough.		Noted. Any planning applications for advertisement signage will be consulted upon in the usual way and matters in relation to design, scale, materials and impact will be considered in detail at planning application stage.	No further change required.
R01258/06	LB Barking and Dagenham	152	Appendix 1	Site 197: 330-348 Uphall Road. No comments. Site 136: Car park at Medway Close. No comments. Site 127: Rear of 561-567 Longbridge Road. No comments. Site 91: Hinds Head Public House, 2a Burnside Road & 76-80 Valance Ave. No comments Site 139: Newton Industrial Estate, Eastern Avenue. No Comments.	No change sought.	Support noted.	No further change required.