

# Redbridge Local Plan 2015-30

## PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT JULY 2016

**It is vital that anybody who cares about South Woodford comments on this draft of the Local Plan **prior to 5pm on Friday, 30th September 2016.****

Comments must be supplied in a Standard format, comments made in other formats will be disregarded.

The easiest way to respond is to go to:

<http://surveys.redbridge.gov.uk/s/localplan/>

---

Title \_\_\_\_\_ Postcode \_\_\_\_\_  
Surname \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
First name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Do you think that the Local Plan is sound?**

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

---

**Which is the soundness tests do you think that the Local Plan fails?  
(please tick all that apply)**

- Positively Prepared  
 Justified  
 Effective  
 Consistent with National Policy

**Please provide some comments to explain why you think that the Local Plan is/is not sound.**

*Please be as detailed as possible, indicating which paragraph, policy or map your comment refers to.*

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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### **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. comment refers to.*

1. Remove South Woodford's designation as an Investment and Growth Zone
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
3. Remove reference to landmark buildings in Station Estate, South Woodford
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.