

Redbridge Local Plan: 2015-2030

Statement of Common Ground between the London Borough of Redbridge, Bidwells (on behalf of Barking, Havering, Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust), and Ingleton Wood (on behalf of North East London NHS Foundation Trust)

June 2017

Introduction

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly between the London Borough of Redbridge ("the Council"), Bidwells (on behalf of Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, "BHRUT"), and Ingleton Wood (on behalf of North East London NHS Foundation Trust, "NELFT").

The purpose of this Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is to assist the Examination of the Redbridge Local Plan, by informing the Inspector and other parties of areas of agreement between the Council, Bidwells, and Ingleton Wood, in response to the Inspectors Issues and Questions (IED004).

Each party's full position on each Inspector matter is set out in more detail in their respective hearing statements.

Background

Land at King George and Goodmayes Hospitals is located adjacent to each other, but fall under separate ownership. King George Hospital is owned by Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, whilst Goodmayes Hospital is owned by North East London NHS Foundation Trust. Both contain surplus land no longer needed for operational requirements, and have been proposed for release from the Green Belt through the Redbridge Local Plan. This is on the basis that neither site meet any NPPF Green Belt tests (as demonstrated through the Council's Green Belt Assessment Addendum 2017 – LBR2.41.1), and they offer a sustainable location that can make a valuable contribution towards the borough's housing and infrastructure needs.

Both landowners provided detailed comments in response to the Regulation 19 Consultation on the Local Plan, which were largely along similar themes. Subsequent shared meetings have been held between all parties with the intention of agreeing some common ground prior to the examination hearings taking place. Many of the issues raised in the original representations have been overcome through engagement and discussion between the parties.

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared to identify areas of agreement between all parties in response to the issues raised in IED004: Inspectors Issues and Questions.

Issue 4 – Investment and Growth Areas

Inspector Question (ii) – Will the infrastructure required for the Investment and Growth Areas be delivered in a timely fashion to keep pace with development? How is it to be funded? Does the Infrastructure

Delivery Plan (LBR2.21) provide sufficient clarity? How and when will the infrastructure be triggered?

As set out in respective hearing statements, both the Council and BHRUT are now in agreement that a new health and community hub should be provided as part of the King George Hospital Development, to meet infrastructure needs identified through the Clinical Commissioning Group's Primary Care Infrastructure Capacity Plan (LBR2.22).

Issue 4a – The Crossrail Corridor

Inspector Question (ii) - Are the strategic sites 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 allocations adequate in respect of use, form, scale, access and quantum of development? Could they provide the number of dwellings anticipated having regard to the concept masterplans (LBR 2.78)?

As set out in respective hearing statements, all parties agree that the Strategic Sites of King George and Goodmayes Hospitals are justified compared to other reasonable alternatives, as set out through the evidence base supporting the Local Plan – including the Green Belt Addendum (LBR2.41.1) and the Sustainability Appraisal (LBR1.11.2)

All parties also agree that the sites are deliverable within the plan period, having regard to site constraints, which has been demonstrated through representations in response to Regulation 19 Consultation, and subsequent responses to the Inspectors Questions.

All parties agree that the detail provided through Policy LP1, Revised Appendix 1 (LBR2.06.1), and the Concept Masterplans Green Belt Release Sites (LBR2.78) is sufficient for Local Plan purposes, and to set out any further detail in such documents would be too prescriptive for the allocation of strategic sites. BHRUT and NELFT have made comments about the content of the aforementioned documents which will be discussed at the hearing.

Inspector Question (iii) - How would the development of the strategic sites promote sustainable patterns of development?

As set out in respective hearing statements, all parties agree that King George and Goodmayes Hospitals can contribute to a sustainable pattern of development in the borough, on the basis of matters such as:

- the sites including large areas of previously developed land;
- the opportunities offered for enhanced permeability as set out in The Concept Masterplan Green Belt Release Sites (LBR2.78)
- the existing provision of nearby amenities and bus routes;
- the enhanced connectivity resulting from ongoing investment in Crossrail

- the proposed provision of new school on site.

Inspector Question (iv) - Do the strategic sites meet any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in paragraph 80 of the NPPF?

As set out in respective hearing statements, all parties agree that neither King George or Goodmayes Hospital meet any of the 5 Green Belt tests as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF – as demonstrated through the Green Belt Addendum (LBR2.41.1)

Inspector Question (xi) - Is the expectation of a decentralised energy network at King George and Goodmayes Hospitals justified?

As set out in respective hearing statements, all parties now support the principle of providing a decentralised energy network at King George and Goodmayes Hospitals is justified by evidence, and that policy wording should make reference to "viability", as proposed in modification 20 of the Schedule of Modifications (LBR1.01.2). BHRUT and NELFT contend that 'feasibility' should also be referenced, in case there are practical reasons preventing provision, as well as financial.

Signed on behalf of the London Borough of Redbridge		
Name & position	Signature	Date
C. ACA WHELETTAN PLANNING POLICY MANAGER	[REDACTED]	9.6.17

Signed on behalf of the Bidwells and Ingleton Wood		
Name & position	Signature	Date
SKIM METSON, BIDWELLS ON BEHALF OF BHRUT	[REDACTED]	8.6.17
IAIN HILL, INGLETON WOOD ON BEHALF OF NELFT	[REDACTED]	8.6.17