

LONDON BOROUGH OF REDBRIDGE
Examination of Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030

Inspector: David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

Programme Officer: Andrea Copsey

Tel: 07842 643988

Email: copseyandrea@gmail.com

Address: Examination Office, Longcroft Cottage, Bentley Road, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex CO16 9BX

Webpage: [Redbridge - Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030](#)

INSPECTOR'S ISSUES AND QUESTIONS – ISSUES 7-12

This note contains the questions I have in relation to Issues 7-12 as identified in my first note of 6 April 2017 (IED004). These issues will form the basis of the hearing sessions to be held in Week 3. Furthermore, the questions posed can be addressed in any hearing statements for Issues 7 to 12. The statements should be produced in accordance with the timescale and other advice in my guidance note of 6 April 2017 (IED005). This indicates that any hearing statements for Issues 7-12 must be received by the Programme Officer **by noon on Friday 23 June 2017**.

Issue 7:

Are the policies relating to town centres and employment (Policies LP9, LP10, LP11 and LP14), and the other policies relating to promoting and managing growth in Section 3 justified, consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

Town centres and employment

- i) Has adequate provision been made to meet the needs of economic and town centre development?
- ii) How will the aims of Policy LP9 regarding the provision of new retail floorspace be achieved and will the policy be effective in concentrating such development in Ilford Metropolitan Centre?
- iii) Are the targets of a minimum of 23,911 sq m of new comparison floorspace and 8,562 sq m of convenience floorspace justified and based on adequate evidence?
- iv) In Policy LP10 on managing town centres and retail uses what is the rationale for the thresholds of 70% of retail units in primary areas and 50% in secondary areas? Are any of the town centres boundaries or other designations proposed to be changed compared to the existing development plan? Should the status of the Loxford Garage site be reviewed (R1258/04)? What is the rationale for modification 59 (LBR 1.01.2) and how does it respond to R01101/02 which seeks a different policy approach for the Exchange Centre in Ilford?
- v) In Policy LP11 what is the evidence justifying the restrictions in criteria (a) – (c) for hot food takeaways, criterion (c) for betting/gambling shops and money lenders and criterion (b) for shisha bars? Is it reasonable to expect all proposals for betting/gambling shops and money lenders and shisha bars to be located in town centres and to demonstrate how they will promote the health and well-being of borough residents? Why should shisha bars be expected to demonstrate through a planning policy that they will comply with other legislation (criterion (d))?

- vi) Are the proposed allocations of the Hainault Business Park and the Southend Road Business Park in criterion (b) of Policy LP14 justified?
- vii) The Employment Land Review (LBR 2.33) refers to the managed loss of up to a total of 14.45 hectares of employment land. Is criterion (d) of Policy LP14 adequate for this to be achieved and where will this occur?
- viii) How is the aim for a minimum of over 21,000 sq m of new business accommodation to be achieved in line with Policy LP14(e) without additional allocations of land? Is sufficient monitoring in place to ensure that this is realised over the plan period and within the different Investment and Growth Areas?
- ix) Does Policy LP14 adequately address live/work units?

Other policies relating to promoting and managing growth

- i) In Policy LP4 what is the definition of Specialist Accommodation? Is it the same as Specialist Housing in the Glossary of Terms in Appendix 9?
- ii) Is Policy LP4 unsound due to the absence of reference to student accommodation? Would this be rectified by modification 50 (LBR 1.01.2)?
- iii) Is the preferred housing mix set out in Table 4 justified? Does it give sufficient emphasis to providing for family housing? Will Policy LP5 be effective having regard to modifications 52 and 53 (LBR 1.01.2)? Should the policy be more prescriptive in requiring the achievement of the preferred housing mix on greenfield opportunity sites? Why is modification 54 required to achieve soundness? How will site by site assessments be made and with regard to what factors?
- iv) In Policy LP6 what is the justification for specifying floor areas of 130 sq m and 150 sq m? How is an over concentration of conversions in one street in criterion 1(b) to be assessed? Should the policy be worded more positively and are sections 1 and 2 superfluous as a result? What is the justification for criteria 3(a) and 4(c)?
- v) How is the stated intention in paragraph 3.12.7 to introduce limits on the proliferation of rebuild flats on small infill sites in areas of established family housing to take effect? Is it justified? Is it consistent with modification 39 (LBR 1.01.2) regarding infill development on previously-developed land?
- vi) Other than paragraph 3.13.6 what is the justification for the first sentence of Policy LP7 regarding domestic outbuildings? Paragraph 53 of the NPPF refers to policies to resist inappropriate development of rear gardens with regard to harm caused to the local area. Is such a restriction in the second sentence of Policy LP7 justified given the provisions of Policy LP26?
- x) Is there suitable provision for gypsy and traveller accommodation having regard to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)? Are the criteria in section 2 of Policy LP8 fair and would they facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community in line with paragraph 11 of the PPTS?
- xi) In Policy LP13 how is an over concentration of hotels, boarding and/or guest houses in criterion 2(c) to be assessed? Is this policy consistent with Policy LP6 which seeks to prevent the sub-division and change of use of large houses?
- xii) How are the aspirations in criterion 4 of Policy LP15 on managed workspace to be achieved?
- xiii) Will Policies LP17 and LP18 be effective in delivering and funding community infrastructure particularly facilities for education, health and well-being? What is the definition of community infrastructure?

- xiv) Does the Local Plan make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on *Local Plans* (ID 12-018-20140306)?
- xv) Under criterion (g) of Policy LP17 is it justifiable to require the re-provision of facilities elsewhere in the borough if there is no longer a need for the existing use within the local community? Will criteria i – iv be effective?
- xvi) What is the justification for requiring major developments to include health impact assessments in Policy LP18? What evidence is there that such developments are expected to lead to significant impacts are referred to in the PPG on *Health and well-being* (ID 53-004-20140306)?

Issue 8:

Are the policies relating to promoting sustainable transport and cycle and car parking (Policies LP22 & LP23) and the other policies relating to promoting a green environment in Section 4 justified, consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

- i) Do the policies in the Local Plan adequately address climate change issues having regard to section 19(1A) of the 2004 Act?
- ii) In Policy LP19 is reference to the energy hierarchy in criterion (a) sufficiently clear? Is it reasonable to apply this provision to “all development”? In what circumstances will criterion (b) apply?
- iii) In paragraph 4.3.7 there is reference to the potential for large scale renewable energy in the north-east corner of the borough. Having regard to the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 and paragraph 97 of the NPPF is the Council intending to identify any sites as suitable for wind energy in the Local Plan?
- iv) Has potential flood risk been adequately addressed by Policy LP21? Has the Local Plan been prepared in accordance with Diagrams 2 and 3 of the PPG on *Flood Risk and Coastal Change*?
- v) In promoting sustainable transport has the Local Plan made adequate allowance for the likely impact of Crossrail?
- vi) Does the Local Plan adequately address the impact on vehicular transport? The Transport Assessment (LBR 2.50) forecasts in section 5.7 that 7 junctions and 3 links will experience a net increase in traffic of over 20%. Will this have a significant effect in terms of delays and/or queuing and, if so, what mitigation measures might realistically be undertaken?
- vii) In modification 97 (LBR 1.01.2) to Policy LP22 is the reference to a “construction logistics plan” in criteria k) correct?
- viii) In modification 108 (LBR 1.01.2) why are London Plan parking standards not to be used in all PTAL areas? Which section of The London Plan justifies the use of minimum parking standards in outer London boroughs? Is modification 109 to criterion 7 regarding the dimensions of disabled parking bays correct? Should it be 6m by 3.6m in accordance with R1213/26a?
- ix) The Air Quality Report (LBR 2.51) indicates that the overall impact of the proposed development sites is likely to be negligible. In view of this would Policy LP24 be effective when assessing individual proposals?
- x) Modification 119 (LBR 1.01.2) refers to digital infrastructure but should its provisions relate to all new development proposals? How should

development be designed to facilitate delivery? How will a planning policy deliver “ultrafast” connections?

Issue 9:

Are the policies relating to achieving quality design and to tall buildings in Section 5 (Policies LP26-LP33) justified, consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

- i) In Policy LP26 is it reasonable to expect development to *improve* the character and quality of an area and the way it functions? Does the policy sufficiently allow for innovation, originality or initiative or are criteria (d) and (g) overly prescriptive? Is criterion (j) clear or necessary? Are the provisions of criterion (m) justified or are its requirements excessive bearing in mind that Policy LP30(f) seeks to avoid adverse impacts and Policy LP30(i) refers to respecting privacy for household extensions?
- ii) What is the justification for modifications 124 and 125 (LBR 1.01.2)? Where is Figure 21? Have the recommendations of the Tall Buildings Study (LBR 2.77) been incorporated? Is the Tall Buildings Study adequate and robust?
- iii) Is modification 126 (LBR 1.01.2) to Policy LP28 on advertising and shopfronts consistent with the Advertisement Regulations and are its restrictions on advertisements in certain locations justified?
- iv) What is the justification and the evidence for the imposition of detailed standards for amenity space in Policy LP29 and modification 128 (LBR 1.01.2)? Is modification 128 in accordance with the Mayor of London’s Housing SPG? Paragraph 020 of the PPG on *Housing: optional technical standards* indicates that adopting the nationally described space standards should be justified in terms of need, viability and timing. In relation to internal space what evidence is there in this respect?
- v) In Policy LP30 is section 2 relating to prior approval applications justified and necessary given the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order?
- vi) What is the justification for the specific restrictions on basement development in Policy LP31 within criteria 2-5 and the requirement for a Basement Impact Assessment and Construction Management Plan?
- vii) What is the justification for the thresholds for the submission of a Sustainable Statement in criteria 3(e) of Policy LP32 regarding sustainable design and construction? Having regard to paragraphs 013-017 of the PPG on *Housing: optional technical standards* what is the clear local need for modification 132 (LBR 1.01.2)? In any event, why is the water consumption figure of 105 litres/person/day used rather than the optional Building Regulation requirement for water use of 110 litres/person/day?
- viii) The Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015 makes clear that no additional local technical standards should be set for new dwellings. In relation to modification 133 (LBR 1.01.2) to Policy LP32 as BREEAM is a technical standard it should not be applied to new housing including domestic refurbishment. Therefore should 4(a) be deleted as inconsistent with national policy? What is the rationale for seeking Excellent ratings for non-domestic buildings and why does the water efficiency category need strengthening?
- ix) With regard to paragraphs 005-012 of the PPG on *Housing: optional technical standards* are the requirements in criterion 4(c) of Policy LP32 regarding accessibility justified?

- x) In Policy LP33 on heritage should criterion (d) include reference to weighing against any public benefits to be consistent with national policy in the NPPF?

Issue 10:

Are the policies relating to managing and enhancing the Borough's assets in Section 6 (Policies LP34-40) justified, consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

- i) Given the developments proposed does Policy LP35 adequately address existing open space deficiencies? What is meant by inappropriate development in criterion (a)?
- ii) Does Policy LP36 adequately support local food growing? Is criterion (c) and modification 149 (LBR 1.01.2) consistent with paragraph 112 of the NPPF regarding the best and most versatile agricultural land?
- iii) Is the 2km buffer zone around the Epping Forest SAC appropriate for the consideration of transport-related impacts on air quality? Will Policy LP39 provide sufficient protection to the integrity of this European site?
- iv) In Policy LP40 on burial spaces is criterion (b) about an over-concentration of facilities justified?

Issue 11:

Are the other development opportunity sites in Appendix 1 justified when compared to other reasonable alternatives, deliverable within the plan period having regard to any constraints and consistent with national policy?

Issue 12:

Does the Local Plan have clear and effective mechanisms for implementation, delivery and monitoring (Policy LP41)?

- i) How will the Local Plan ensure the timely delivery of new and enhanced infrastructure needed to support the quality of life of residents and workers as indicated in paragraph 7.3.2?
- ii) Are there items of infrastructure that are essential before certain developments or a certain amount of new homes are delivered? How is this to be controlled?
- iii) Does Appendix 3 contain relevant and measurable indicators?

Other matters for the Council

Having considered the policies that are covered by Issues 7-12 I also have a few general and detailed points to make to the Council. Whilst some of these are minor and may therefore be outside the scope of soundness I nevertheless pass them on to assist. I have not attempted to highlight all of the instances where some of the matters raised apply.

- i) Where relevant the Council may wish to indicate in its hearing statement whether policy provisions are perpetuating existing development plan policies.
- ii) A number of policies refer to development having an "undue" impact (for example, Policies LP8(f) and LP11(e)). I question whether this word is sufficiently precise to convey the Council's meaning. Would "adverse" impact be clearer?
- iii) In various policies there is reference to "major development" (for example, Policies LP18, LP19, LP20, LP22 and LP24). Can the Council confirm that all of these references are as defined in Appendix 9 and whether this is sufficiently clear throughout the Plan?
- iv) Criteria based policies should read coherently in relation to the initial proposition. For example, criteria (d), (e), (f) and (h) of Policy LP10 do not. This should be checked throughout.
- v) In some places such as at Policy LP30 (m) there are criteria that require compliance with other policies of the Plan. This is unnecessary since any proposals would be assessed against the development plan as a whole. I therefore request that the Council considers whether any such criteria can be removed.
- vi) Modifications 111 and 115 appear to be identical.

David Smith

INSPECTOR

21 April 2017