

# Lea Bridge Community Engagement Event

## Engagement Report

### Background

Residents from the Lea Bridge area requested an opportunity to meet with senior councillors, officers and representatives from partner organisations to discuss the regeneration of the Lea Bridge area and in particular the impact on social infrastructure.

The Council agreed to facilitate such an appropriate workshop event.

### Key Themes Raised

- Provision of adequate school places
- Provision of adequate health care facilities
- Provision of transport infrastructure
- Height and density of homes on regeneration sites
- Proportion of affordable housing
- Impact on green open space
- Flood risks
- Water and sewage capacity

## 1 Lea Bridge Community Engagement Event Tuesday 3 March 2020

- 1.1 On Tuesday 3 March 2020, a community engagement event was held from 6pm to 8.30pm at Emmanuel Parish Church, 149 Hitcham Road, Walthamstow, E17 8HL. The purpose of the event was to update the local community on the new Waltham Forest Local Plan, including infrastructure planning, and on emerging planning applications and development proposals in the Lea Bridge area.
- 1.2 78 people attended the event. Due to the capacity of the venue, there was a limit of 80 attendees and people were asked to register in advance via Eventbrite. Including officers, external stakeholders representatives and residents who attended on the evening without pre-booking around 120 people were present at the workshops.
- 1.3 The evening was facilitated by Councillor Simon Miler, Portfolio Lead Member for Economic Growth and Housing Development, supported by Officers from the Council's Planning and Regeneration Teams. Officers representing the Council's Enjoy Waltham Forest, Education, Highways, and Flood Management teams also attended to answer questions about their areas of expertise, along with representatives from Thames Water, the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Barts NHS Trust. Representatives from Transport for London, and Council Drainage, Libraries, and Waste teams were also invited but couldn't attend.

## 2 Structure of the evening

- 2.1 The evening began with an introduction from Cllr Miller and a Ben Copsey, of Love Lea Bridge, Community before Construction and the Clementina Estate Residents' Association. Attendees were then asked to join one of eight tables for workshop discussions about the Lea Bridge area. The table discussions were not themed and covered all topics. Experts 'floated' around the room to answer any questions. Notes were

taken of the discussion in each table and have been collated below. At the end of the evening, a representative from each table was asked to summarise their table's discussion and some questions from the floor were taken. Cllr Miller and Ben Copsey of Love Lea Bridge, Community before Construction and the Clementina Estate Residents' Association closed the evening and thanked attendees for coming.

### 3 Background

- 3.1 From Monday 22 July 2019 to Monday 30 September 2019, Waltham Forest Council carried out an 'Issues and Options' (Regulation 18) consultation on its emerging new Local Plan. Over the course of this engagement residents, landowners/ developers and other public sector stakeholders all commented that the plan should include more detail on specific sites where development could come forward, and what form this development should take. Taking on board these comments, Waltham Forest Council decided to start work on a Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Once adopted this will form part of the Local Plan. It will be subject to the same statutory consultation process.
- 3.2 The commitment to work on a Site Allocations Development Plan Document has been approved by the full Council via an amendment to the Local Development Scheme on Thursday 30 January 2020. During January and February 2020, pre-preparation community engagement workshops were held with representatives of community groups in the Southern, Central and Northern parts of the borough.

### 4 Table Discussions

- 4.1 A summary of the discussions held at each table is set out below. It should be noted that residents at the pre engagement community engagement workshops mentioned above, raised concerns that the maps discussed should not be published at this time. As a result, they are not reproduced here.
- 4.2 All comments and issues raised will be taken forward for further consideration and consultation throughout the Local Plan and planning application processes.

Table Number	Points raised
1	Residents called for investment in public transport, particularly in light of 48 bus route being cut. Discussion around role of Council to both lobby TfL, but also being a partner to help with delivery.
	Residents debates how cycle lanes can be designed in with streets, particularly concerns that segregated cycle lanes can act as a physical barrier to pedestrians.
	Residents raised concern around flood risk and impact of new developments on existing dwellings. This was especially in context of removal of trees from Site 2 (pocket park) and seeking assurance about rainwater retention of new developments and SUDs.
	Residents raised concerns about sewer capacity in local area, which Thames Water offered some good clarification on.

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents raised concerns about site contamination (particularly gasworks) – residents wanted assurance and confidence that contamination reports will be robustly assessed by Council, and that de-commissioning has indeed taken place.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about the methods of engagement by Council – shouldn't just depend on on-line engagement, but should make efforts to catch people on street, at supermarket, schools etc. Offer translation service for non-English speakers.</p> <p>Residents felt empty homes/commercial units should be brought back into use, and what mechanisms does the Council have for this.</p> <p>Residents asked how the retail offer in area can be improved, by both planning policy and intervention by Council as landlord/owner of development sites?</p> <p>Residents asked how open spaces and links to open spaces can be enhanced by developments?</p> <p>Residents raised general concerns about the principle of developing high rise buildings.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about air quality and how to improve this.</p> <p>Residents wanted more information about construction management plans, and how noise and dust will be minimised/mitigated during construction.</p> <p>Residents wanted more information about construction management plans, and how noise and dust will be minimised/mitigated during construction.</p> <p>Residents asked how Lea Bridge can become an exemplar in terms of sustainability/response to climate emergency?</p> <p>Residents wanted assurance that the Council will have a long term implementation and monitoring plan for the area to co-ordinate development impacts and community benefits.</p> <p>Residents wanted to see an extension to CPZ times.</p>
2	<p>Residents stated that they need 10 new GPs, and that existing infrastructure is not fit for purpose. They asked how to get more doctors? The NHS representative queried where the figure of 10 new GPS came from and confirmed that, whilst the CCG are not looking to commission new GPs, they do recognise the need to provide better facilities in more accessible locations.</p> <p>Residents questioned what number of GPs are needed per head of population. It was confirmed that the NHS do not have a set number of GP's per head of population, but as a guide, one consulting room can accommodate 1200 patients.</p> <p>Residents commented that, given the scale of the plans, there needs to be a genuine demographic assessment of impact that includes population growth.</p> <p>Residents asked about the numbers of children expected with the new development in the area. They estimated, using the GLA yield calculator, that there would be approximately 3,000 extra children. Officers explained that assessment of recently completed developments in the Borough shows that number are likely to be much smaller and that local evidence shows no demand for new schools in the area. It was also noted that oversupply of school places would undermine the financial sustainability of free schools and academies.</p> <p>Residents commented that The Motion scheme was advertised to foreign investors, which may be why child yield is low.</p> <p>Officers explained that the Thames Water/Lion Academy proposals for a school were turned down as the applicants couldn't demonstrate a need for new schools in this location.</p>

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents asked why so many private homes are approved when there is a locally identified need for affordable housing? (Specific reference was made to The Motion development). Officers explained that Planning Policy in relation to affordable housing has been strengthened. The new policy requires 35% Affordable Housing, with 50% on public land. It was also explained that viability is also an issue – if, for example, we want to deliver a GP facility, there may have to be a balance/playoff with affordable housing as part of wider negotiation.</p> <p>It was noted that the Gasholder site, being in public ownership, would also have a policy expectation of 50% Affordable Housing.</p>
	<p>Residents asked who delivers housing when a commuted sum is paid in place of Affordable Housing being on site. Officers explained that Affordable Housing funds secured via Section 106 are allocated to the Housing department to support wider delivery.</p>
	<p>Residents asked about the definition of affordable housing.</p>
	<p>Residents asked whether the land at Whipps Cross was being sold off. Officers confirmed that part of the land will be sold to help generate capital receipt. The site is the size of 25 football pitches, and it is not all needed. Resident and other services on the site could be better accommodated in the community. some services will be moved into the GP and community setting so that care can be given closer to home.</p>
	<p>Residents asked about what a health hub is and when one would be introduced in the area. Officers confirmed that the Council is working with the CCG to rehome facilities in the area that are not fit for purpose. Delivery is expected in 2023/24.</p>
	<p>Residents asked which developments the new health hub would provide for. Officers confirmed it would accommodate permissions not yet completed, identified sites and small sites likely to be developed.</p>
	<p>Residents commented that The Motion scheme had a gym and some empty retail units.</p>
	<p>Residents commented that the pitch behind the Hare &amp; Hounds is a community facility.</p>
	<p>Residents commented that there is a shortfall of good local services to meet the needs of local people and they are concerned about crime on streets. They expressed concerns that the football ground has been “crumbling for 10 years” and is used as a car park. They expressed particular concern for young people, specifically aged 14-19.</p>
	<p>Residents commented that they were not aware of the Connecting Communities project.</p>
	<p>Residents asked how the Council knows how many homes are needed. What are the numbers based on?</p>
	<p>Residents commented that they had objected to The Motion as they considered it too high, too close and in the MOL. They also commented that the local community do not benefit from this scheme and do not consider it is helping solve the local housing crisis. They also noted that it is being actively advertised to Chinese and Russian investors and asked how the council can stop those practices.</p>
	<p>Residents asked whether development will be evenly spread across the Borough? Officers confirmed the Local Plan targets of 15,000 new homes in the south of the borough, 8,000 in central and 4,000 in north.</p>
	<p>Residents asked about the future of the Argall Estate. Officers confirmed it is designated as strategic industrial land, and we are currently undertaking a</p>

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>borough-wide employment audit. Residents commented that there were job losses in Blackhorse – will the same happen here? Officers noted that part of the designated industrial land in the Blackhorse area was de-designated. Residents asked What will be done about the drag racing that goes on in Argall?</p> <p>Residents asked how trains will cope with additional pressures? Officers explained that a Strategic Transport Review is underway.</p> <p>Residents asked for decent shopfronts at Markhouse Corner.</p> <p>Residents also raised concerns about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bookies/betting shops</li> <li>• takeaways</li> <li>• using pocket park as construction compound</li> <li>• empty commercial spaces</li> <li>• are percentages set? Is anything definite?</li> <li>• Open space linkages – where will improvements be made?</li> <li>• Long term implementation and monitoring</li> <li>• CPZ – need longer hours of enforcement</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents asked whether development proposals should be supported by Community Impact Assessments?</p>
3	<p>Residents raised the question: why does this amount of development need to happen in this area? Residents stated that the area is relatively poor compared to other parts of the borough but is expected to accommodate significant development.</p> <p>Residents asked whether there can be a referendum on the Local Plan and how residents can reject the Plan?</p> <p>Residents suggested there should be a civic approach to planning, providing what local communities need.</p> <p>Residents asked why the Council is maintaining a 27,000-home target in the Local Plan when the Mayor of London has accepted the Inspector’s position on reduced housing numbers?</p> <p>Residents highlighted the amount of new people that would move into the area with the number of new homes being proposed and the impact this would have on local services.</p> <p>Residents were clear that new development needs to be integrated with the existing community to avoid a “them and us” situation.</p> <p>There was discussion on the Council’s statutory duty to prepare a Local Plan for the borough, how residents could comment on and influence this and how this differed from opportunities to comment on individual planning applications which, given their scale, would both be considered at the Council’s planning committee and likely be referred to the Mayor of London as well.</p> <p>There was discussion about the ownership of potential development sites, with recognition that most of the sites in the area – except for the Council’s three sites at Lea Bridge Station – were privately-owned.</p> <p>There was discussion on local demand and need for new homes as a consideration for the Council in preparing its Local Plan and housing targets alongside the supply and capacity of potential sites.</p> <p>There was discussion about the time it will take for all the potential developments to be built and for new people to move into the area.</p> <p>Residents raised concern about the actual affordability of new homes with discussion on the different levels of rent and examples of what constitutes “social rent”.</p> <p>Residents highlighted that income levels in the area were lower than the borough average, including for local people on zero hours contracts. There</p>

Table Number	Points raised
	was discussion about the average household income in the area – which is around £30,000 – with recognition that there will be some households on lower incomes.
	Residents raised concern about sale of property to overseas investors, stating that some homes in The Motion scheme are being marketed by agent JLL overseas. There was discussion on what measures can be put in place to restrict overseas sales, both through land agreements (where the Council owns the site) and through the planning process.
	Concerns were also raised by residents about increases in short-term lets in the area e.g. through Airbnb and about properties being used for criminal activity such as prostitution.
	Residents raised concerns about empty ground floor commercial space in new developments, suggesting these spaces should be made available to local businesses – perhaps on preferential terms – and essential services, such as health facilities.
	There was discussion about what the Council can do when it owns the space, can directly invest in it and set the terms/curate the uses (e.g. Central Parade, Blackhorse Workshop, the proposed space in the Lea Bridge Station development) as well as measures that can be taken through the planning process to encourage private developers to also be more creative.
	Residents gave positive feedback on some of the spaces such as Central Parade but emphasised that they feel spaces need to be economically inclusive i.e. affordable and accessible to everyone. They gave examples of the café in Leyton Jubilee Park and the Clocktower café in Markhouse Corner, which has benefited from the Enjoy Waltham Forest public realm works outside.
	Residents highlighted the value of green space in the area, including Leyton Jubilee Park and the marshes/Lea Valley. They suggested that signage and other improvements could be made to improve the connections to these spaces.
	However, they also emphasised the importance of having public open space on the doorstep and were concerned about the loss of the pocket park at Lea Bridge Station development, including the loss of the existing trees.
	Residents raised concern about access, provision and quality of local services, especially doctor's surgeries.
	There was discussion about the different models of local healthcare provision now being developed and the examples where the Council is working with the NHS/CCG to provide new facilities in its developments, such as at the Score and in St James.
	There was discussion about the amount of floorspace required to deliver these larger facilities, why they would not necessarily fit in some of the currently available commercial space in the area, the time it takes to build new space and agree terms for health centres to occupy them. Residents highlighted their own experience and understanding of changes to health provision in the borough, including that many GPs are reaching retirement, that it is hard to recruit new GPs and the model is moving towards provision for all kinds of healthcare professionals under one roof.
	Residents also took the opportunity to suggest other facilities the area could benefit from, such as a lido, swimming pool, youth club and further investment in libraries.
	Residents were also keen to understand how CIL and s106 is being used and what has been done over and above the delivery of Lea Bridge Station.

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents raised concern with local bus capacity, particularly during peak hours, following TfL's withdrawal of the 48 bus route. Residents believe TfL miscalculated capacity, for instance not accounting for the number of school children using buses in the morning peak.</p> <p>There was discussion about the potential for an extension of an existing bus route to provide north-south connectivity, including along Orient Way. There was discussion about how s.106 contributions can be secured from new developments (with the example of the contribution from the Bywaters planning permission) to help fund additional buses or improvements to routes.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns with the design and proximity of tall buildings, suggesting that there will be a wind tunnel effect in the area around the station/crossroads and that this needs to be assessed.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns with air quality in the area, including for new developments and residents where they are sited on or close to the main roads.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns with the amount of development, the length of time it will take to build the proposed schemes and the impact of construction traffic.</p> <p>This was particularly a concern for residents in the vicinity of the gasworks site who highlighted that they live on quiet, narrow residential streets and access for construction vehicles would be disruptive and impact safety, particularly for children.</p> <p>They wanted assurance that all construction traffic would be routed via Orient Way, reporting that developer St William had not reassured them at public consultation events.</p> <p>There was discussion about the current pre-application status of the developer's plans and that the Council would require submission of a Construction Logistics Plan as part of the planning application, which would require approval by the Council.</p>
4	<p>Residents considered that the potential loss of jobs (particularly blue-collar jobs) should be assessed through the proposed masterplan for the industrial area nearby</p> <p>Residents thought there should be a Community Impact Assessment commissioned on new development and potential or planned development carried out by the Council, with full involvement of community representatives. Decisions on approving new developments and granting planning permission should not be made until this has been done and its implications considered.</p> <p>Residents considered it essential to forecast the waste requirements of all the new developments in the Lea Bridge area together, and not just on a site by site basis, and how these will be managed in the most sustainable way</p> <p>Residents considered a new health centre with additional GPs to be a top priority. They noted that the CCG representative said they are look at several sites and actively discussing these with the Director of Planning. These sites include the former Leyton FC Site. Residents pointed out that once a site is selected it may take 3-5 years to have the development built and operational. Residents were unhappy that it has taken so long for the Council and CCG to progress this.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns that S106 cannot fund all the infrastructure requirements. They considered that other funding will be needed.</p> <p>Residents considered that Dagenham Brook and its potential should be included in development proposals, as well as its role in managing flood risk.</p> <p>Residents asked about the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. They consider that it is needed now, and shouldn't it be part of the Local Plan.</p>

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents asked whether there would be an extension of the Overground to Liverpool Street. They noted that this has been promised previously during consultation on The Motion scheme, and it is urgently needed, especially after the cutting of the no. 48 bus service.</p> <p>Residents stated that the Council, with the community, should plan a liveable neighbourhood – what’s needed in an area and assess the capacity in an area then stick to it. They raised concern that the area will buckle without the services needed.</p> <p>Residents considered that the Council must demand and implement proper phasing of development to manage road closures and disruptions. Concerns were raised about delays to emergency service vehicles.</p> <p>Residents wanted the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit to be undertaken on the new Enjoy Waltham Forest works for Lea Bridge Road to be published. Officers explained that there has been a reduction in accidents, which some residents challenged.</p> <p>Residents reported that residents and businesses opposite Motion are now suffering from reduced sunlight.</p> <p>Residents requested more crossing points on Lea Bridge Road</p> <p>Residents commented that there are some industrial uses on Saffa Road, that are incompatible with residential development.</p> <p>Residents asked whether there will be sufficient capacity on trains, given that many are full in the rush hour already. They also asked about what impact Meridian Water will have on public transport capacity.</p> <p>Residents asked who will get new Council homes and will they be owned by the Council, the Council’s company or Housing Associations? They also asked who the affordable rented homes in Motion have been allocated to - are they from the Housing Register or homeless?</p> <p>Residents asked about the income levels need for shared ownership homes and noted that they seem unaffordable.</p> <p>Residents asked whether the Council can provide a list of all actual and potential developments in the Lea Bridge area or nearby</p>
5	<p>Residents asked how are we ensuring that we reach all corners of the community, including non-English speaking individuals and those without access to the internet? Some felt strongly that concerns are not being heard.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns that the impact of development is being considered individually and not collectively. They asked why is the work on site allocations being progressed after the Local Plan has been drafted and what power the council has to limit building heights?</p> <p>Residents asked whether the number of developments already approved in the area fill the housing quota requirement?</p> <p>Residents asked why development so heavily focused in Lea Bridge - one of the most densely populated and polluted areas of the borough?</p> <p>Residents asked where the provision for family homes is? They raised concerns that new units are taken up by those commuting into the city, and not by those who will build a community, and help the local economy</p> <p>Residents thought local schools were oversubscribed.</p> <p>Residents commented that street drains are constantly blocked, and water pressure has reduced considerably over the last few years.</p> <p>Residents requested S106 monies to be more effectively allocated to community wants and needs.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns regarding the loss of the Pocket Park – and asked how this provision will be replaced?</p>



Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents asked where the local Air Quality monitors placed? And how frequently are measurements taken?</p> <p>Residents noted that Motion were unable to fill the retail units on the ground floor – the shop was there closed after six months. They also noted that Motion has a high number of flats listed on AirBnB, and the units are publicised for sale overseas. They asked how is this helping with the housing crisis?</p> <p>Residents were concerned by parking on the pavement outside Motion. They asked how will the increased traffic generated by deliveries and visitors be managed? How can a no parking policy be enforced more effectively?</p> <p>Residents noted that there are not enough GP Surgeries, or that they are oversubscribed.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns that there is no provision for teenagers in the area – how can this be fixed? They also noted that there is very little provision for the elderly in the area causing issues of isolation. How can this be rectified?</p> <p>Residents noted conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on cycle lanes and felt there needs to be better signage</p>
	<p>Residents noted provision for cyclists on the road network, but that usage is low.</p>
6	<p>Residents expressed the need for more GPs and dentists. The location of a potential new health hub was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the football ground (centre of development); could there be youth facilities here?</li> <li>• Markhouse Corner</li> <li>• Lea Bridge station sites may not be the best location for a health hub</li> </ul> <p>Residents asked questions about Affordable Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are new developments affordable for residents of the borough?</li> <li>• There needs to be more social rent properties</li> </ul> <p>Residents asked about the Climate Emergency and environmental concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the emergency informing new developments?</li> <li>• How is the climate emergency informing protection of existing trees and greenspace?</li> <li>• What are the real impacts of building in flood zones?</li> <li>• Have the risks been fully considered, given the floods across the country</li> <li>• Can environmental impact / flood risk reports be produced independently (i.e. not just commissioned by the LA as this raised concerns about impartiality)</li> <li>• Ecologists should be employed as part of the council planning department</li> <li>• Is there effective mitigation of harm to newt and bird habitats?</li> </ul> <p>Residents asked about forthcoming development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are the housing targets so high?</li> <li>• Why is the council building when there are empty properties in the borough including in new developments?</li> <li>• What are the contributions from developments, and do they really benefit residents?</li> <li>• Developments have resulted in rail improvements at Lea Bridge, but were these improvements made to attract more developers rather than to benefit residents?</li> </ul>

Table Number	Points raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the quality of new developments – are they really designed to last?</li> <li>• Concerns about the cumulative impact of development</li> <li>• Impact of development on existing homes, e.g. Gasworks development on Clementina Estate</li> <li>• What are the checks and balances in place for building on contaminated land?</li> <li>• Is the pollution that results from development taken into consideration</li> </ul>
7	<p>Residents felt that the Motion scheme should have a nursery and GP. They expressed concern that it did not deliver any social infrastructure.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about poor engagement with hard to reach groups such as Elderly and those using different languages.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about a lack of joint up thinking</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about the cancellation of the no. 48 bus service and reduced bus services in general.</p> <p>Residents described Mini-Holland/ Enjoy Waltham Forest as “rubbish”</p> <p>Parking raised concerns about not being able to park after 18:30</p> <p>Residents expressed concerns that there are not playgroups in the Lea Bridge Area. The Emmanuel Church nursery has now closed. They said that there is now increased need to travel out of the borough, even as far as Clapham for early years childcare. Others noted that there are now facilities at St Saviours</p> <p>Residents expressed concerns that there is already a shortage of 10 GPs in the area and that if the population goes up this will get worse. They also felt that introducing more people to a small area would have impacts on health.</p> <p>Residents felt that there is a lack of spaces in local schools, but the education representative was able to explain that there is a surplus of primary school spaces in the borough and the phasing strategy for school expansion.</p> <p>Residents complained that advertising for the meeting was poor. They felt that lots of groups (including marginalised, elderly and disabled) find it hard to attend even though they would like to. They also complained that information is not produced for residents with English as a second language.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns that the Pocket Park will be developed on.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns over flooding / drainage / drainage capacity for waste water networks and river lee / lee navigation capacity. Residents raised concerns that expansion will put strain on a largely Victorian drainage system. They complained of smells coming from sewerage system. They explained that Thames Water are called out consistently to fix problems with water supply – low water pressures and water cuts are a common occurrence.</p> <p>Residents felt that the Council does not pay attention to residents.</p> <p>Residents felt that air quality is a big issue.</p> <p>Residents asked why so many trees on Lea Bridge Road have been felled.</p> <p>Residents raised concerns about contamination on the Gasworks Site. They said that residents had been told not to grow food in their gardens.</p> <p>Residents felt that building heights are too high and were concerned about the wind conditions that this creates. They also felt that building heights are out of character with the area.</p> <p>Residents felt that there has been a lot of development in an area, and this is putting strain on resources. .</p> <p>Residents explained that, due to phasing of building work, the borough has been a building site for too long.</p>

Table Number	Points raised
	Residents raised concerns that the population would increase by 47%. They wanted this to be documented and correct infrastructure provided.
8	<p>Residents raised the following issues about Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low % of affordable (council owned) properties</li> <li>• Requirement for more social rent properties</li> <li>• Transparency over the proportion of social housing and private rent</li> <li>• Planning applications are submitted before consultation on the Local Plan</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• High density</li> <li>• Sewage &amp; drains (existing issue – hasn't been dealt with)</li> <li>• Viability of the scheme</li> <li>• Lack of parking facilities</li> </ul> <p>Residents asked the following questions about Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is Council planning to be transparent and communicate to the community the split between social/affordable and private housing?</li> <li>• How is Council going to ensure that other developments bring the affordable-social housing?</li> <li>• Is 9 storey (tower) building the best design?</li> <li>• How is the traffic going to be resolved?</li> <li>• Can the Local Plan be published before the submission of planning applications?</li> <li>• How do you ensure the size of the individual units is suitable for needs of real people?</li> <li>• Why do so few of these flats make provision for families?</li> <li>• At what point and who decides the tenure of a building is going to change – e.g. the 97 Motion building is now 57% “affordable” vs 28% as planned (due to lack of sales)</li> <li>• How do these flats help people on housing list? How long is the list and what is the average waiting time?</li> <li>• What is the Council plan to increase social housing?</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents raised the following issues about health and well-being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient GP provision in the area</li> <li>• Lack of health care services</li> <li>• Loss of lights (some properties have lost 35% of light – high rise building)</li> <li>• Lack of pharmacy and dental care facilities</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents asked the following issues about health and well-being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the plan for health services in the area if any?</li> <li>• What are the Council &amp; CCG plans to ensure that the current residents don't have to continue to wait average 3 weeks for GP appointment?</li> <li>• How is the local hospital is being prepared to deal with the increased demands of new residents?</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents raised the following issues about climate change/ environmental concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor air quality and air pollution issue</li> <li>• Existing gas work and soil contamination (already an issue)</li> <li>• Protection of Birds and Environment</li> <li>• Lack of pre impact examination on the soil contamination</li> <li>• Lack of Environmental Assessment</li> </ul>

Table Number	Points raised
	<p>Residents asked the following questions about climate change/ environmental concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the Gas Work's impact going to be captured?</li> <li>• Where does the Council stands in negotiation with developers? What is the strategy?</li> <li>• How is the Council going to compensate for loss of green spaces?</li> <li>• How the new block of flats (towers) will be substantially better than the demolished one (Baker Arms towers demolition 7 years ago)</li> <li>• Are the developments fit for human life?</li> <li>• What is the Council Climate Policy?</li> <li>• How does the Council's climate policy allow the council to continue removing mature trees and build on the floodplains?</li> <li>• Does the council have an ecologist on a contract?</li> <li>• What plans does the Council have to protect birds and other wildlife from continued removal of their natural habitat?</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents raised the following issues about community cohesion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents voices are not being heard – lack of consultation and impact assessment</li> <li>• Lack of Community engagement ( the meeting was organised by residents' groups)</li> <li>• Where and how in the new developments will a community hub be physically included and financially supported on regular basis?</li> <li>• No consultation with communities at pre planning application stage</li> <li>• Lack of facilities for young people and childcare provision</li> <li>• Social exclusion</li> <li>• Insufficient transport</li> </ul>
	<p>Residents asked the following questions about community cohesion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the retail/commercial offer for the local community?</li> <li>• Why the community impact assessment have not been done?</li> <li>• At what point the community can reject the Local Plan? Is that even possible?</li> <li>• What new facilities will be created? How will they be funded?</li> <li>• What is the Council provision for out – of – school services in the area?</li> <li>• What plans are in place to stem the likelihood of social isolation among disabled and elderly people due to overcrowding on buses and trains?</li> </ul>