

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

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

HEARING AGENDA – DAY 5 – Wednesday 14 June 2017

Barkingside Investment and Growth Area – Policy LP1E

10am at City Gates Conference Centre, 3rd Floor conference Room 25-29
Clements Road, Ilford, IG1 1BH

The hearing agenda reflects the issues and questions previously identified. However, some questions may have been omitted if there is no need for discussion based on the written statements submitted. The agenda is also subject to change and adjustment.

Issued on 30 May 2017

Issue 4a:

Are the policies for the individual Investment and Growth Area justified, consistent with national policy and will they be effective (Policies LP1A-LP1E)? Are the strategic and key sites within each of the Investment and Growth Areas justified when compared to other reasonable alternatives, deliverable within the plan period having regard to any constraints and consistent with national policy? Is the detail about the sites adequate in respect of use, form, scale, access and quantum of development?

- i) Is the strategic site at Oakfield, Forest Road justified when compared to other reasonable alternatives, deliverable within the plan period having regard to any constraints and consistent with national policy? Is the detail about the site allocation adequate in respect of use, form, scale, access and quantum of development? Could it provide the number of dwellings anticipated having regard to the concept masterplan (LBR 2.78)?
- ii) Does Oakfield meet any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in paragraph 80 of the NPPF? Do exceptional circumstances exist?
- iii) Has there been any material change in circumstances since the original designation of the Green Belt?
- iv) Having regard to paragraph 74 of the NPPF would the loss of existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location?

- v) How can it be certain that replacement provision will be equivalent or better when the Feasibility Report for Oakfield Playing Pitch Re-provision (LBR 2.44.1) has not assessed the quality of pitch provision at Oakfield?
- vi) How will the cost of re-provision and future maintenance be funded?
- vii) Has sufficient account been given to youth provision and the needs of adjoining Boroughs?
- viii) How will the transition between existing and new facilities be controlled and managed?
- ix) As Hainault Recreation Ground is within an area safeguarded for mineral extraction does it provide a suitable, long-term alternative to Oakfield?
- x) What will be the impact of the development at Oakfield in terms of traffic and air pollution?
- xi) To what extent is Oakfield in a sustainable location? How would the development of Oakfield promote sustainable patterns of development?
- xii) What implications do the designation of the site as an asset of community value and the existence of a covenant have on the allocation and delivery of Oakfield?

Participants

Mr P Scott

Mr D Whipps/Dr C Nutt/Mr H Berlin – Save Oakfield Society

Mr M Furnish – Sport England

Ms Sharma – NOISE