

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](#)

Dear Ms Whelehan

POST HEARING ADVICE – PART 2

1. The first part of my post hearing advice about any further modifications needed or steps that should be taken to make the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (RLP) sound was given on 18 August 2017 (IED011). At that time a final response from the Council in response to Sport England's further observations (CED055) was outstanding. As this has now been received (CED056) I am able to complete this part of the examination.
2. In so doing I confirm that I have given full consideration to all the relevant representations made including the verbal contributions at the hearings. My final conclusions regarding soundness and procedural compliance will be given in the report to be produced following consultation on the proposed main modifications.
3. Further evidence may emerge and I will need to take account of any representations received via the consultation process. My views are therefore given here without prejudice to the conclusions that will appear in the report. This will also cover other main soundness issues that arose during the examination but which are not dealt with in this letter.

Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground

4. From the evidence provided I am not satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant altering the Green Belt boundary so as to allocate these sites as Opportunity Sites. As part of this finding my view is that it has not been demonstrated that playing pitch provision would meet estimated demand across the Borough in 2030 if Oakfield and Ford were developed. Overall this part of the plan would not achieve sustainable development and so is potentially unsound.
5. My advice is therefore that the Council includes main modifications to omit Oakfield and Ford Sports Ground as Opportunity Sites in the RLP.
6. In its response to Sport England the Council indicates that deletion of these sites would necessitate the release of further Green Belt to enable the Borough to meet its development needs. If the Council wishes to proceed down this route then it should carry out a separate exercise to evaluate the possible alternatives as well as undertaking public consultation.
7. It will be for the Council to consider further the implications of removing both sites. However, in terms of housing supply the figure of 17,237 given in CED056 would exceed the minimum target in Policy LP2. Some secondary school provision could be made at the other strategic sites and is required at

the end of the plan period in any event. An alternative exists for the health care provision proposed at Oakfield. Therefore if the deletion of these sites were put forward in isolation this would not necessarily render the RLP as a whole unsound.

8. As part of its considerations the Council should also review the proposed alignment of the Green Belt boundary given the findings of the Green Belt Review and Addendum. This should take into account the absence of development at Oakfield and Ford and the implications for adjoining land (Seven Kings Park and the school and playing fields (14b)).

Next steps

9. Subject to addressing the advice in this letter I now invite the Council to progress the main modifications as set out in IED011.
10. Any representations about any proposed main modifications that follow from this letter should be made as part of the consultation process and should not be submitted at this stage.

Finally

11. I should emphasise that none of the above should be taken as pre-judging the contents of the final Report which will take into account all relevant matters and representations.

David Smith

INSPECTOR

12 September 2017