Helen Oakerbee  
Assistant Director of Planning  
London Borough of Havering  
Mercury House  
Mercury Gardens  
Romford, RM1 3SL

Wednesday 15 September 2021

Dear Ms Oakerbee,

I am writing to you today to highlight the concerns that constituents have expressed regarding P1190.21 at the Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue.

I have received a number of comments opposing this proposed development both directly and via the founders of an online group, which has been joined by over a thousand individuals, many of whom will have already submitted individual comments regarding the proposal.

One of the principal objections that residents have expressed to me relates to the potential harmful impacts of this development upon local traffic within the immediate vicinity. Many residents have noted that there is frequently congestion along Whitelands Way at the junction with the A12 Colchester Road from residents of the Kings Park estate and residents of those roads accessed via Lister Avenue look to join the A12. Similarly, those same residents may also experience congestion when looking to travel in a south-easterly direction and join the A127 via Briar Avenue. It is worth noting that both the A12 and A127 in this area are both frequently subject to congestion themselves due to the proximity to both the Gallows Corner and Ardleigh Green junctions. Both residents and I are concerned about the impact that an additional 87 dwellings may have a upon congestion in the area.

These concerns for congestion are compounded when considering the number of other significant highways projects that may be commenced during the period in which the construction of this development is completed. These projects include the replacement of the fly-over at the Gallows Corner roundabout, improvement to junction 28 of the M25 and its connection to the A12 eastbound as well as the Lower Thames Crossing which will include significant works to junction 29 of the M25 and involve traffic orders along the A127. A combination of these developments taking place at the same time risk an intolerable position for residents in the vicinity of the development and I would welcome the Council undertaking further assessment of the impact of this development up on the local road network.

I am particularly concerned that the works to replace the Gallows Corner flyover will require a significant area in the vicinity to establish a site office, facilities for staff as well as a store for materials and equipment. Given the potential impact of the development upon the replacement of vital transport infrastructure in the community, I would request that this be granted further consideration with direct consultation with Transport for London.

Closely linked to the traffic concerns expressed, constituents have set out their view that is the concern that the development, as proposed, is too dense and appears to be in direct contravention of the Council’s own dwelling density range, potentially by as much as 42-53 properties for a development of this size.

Residents have also expressed a clear concern about the potential impact of this development in terms of flood risk, highlighting that recent rainfall in June caused flooding in the nearby Bartholomew Drive and Chadwick drive despite the fact that there is a balancing pond in the nearby area. I understand that a flood risk assessment report is referenced within the application, however it is not viewable on the Council's website. Constituents have therefore expressed their concern that the addition of a further 87 dwellings in the area will likely later increased risk of hydraulic overload and potentially further flooding.

Residents in Bartholomew Drive and Chadwick Drive have outlined a view the development will lead to significant overlooking and the loss of privacy. Particular concern has been expressed that existing trees providing screening will be removed and that the height of the development, coupled with its proximity to Bartholomew Drive will cause overlooking of gardens and, in some properties, kitchens and bedrooms directly. Constituents have highlighted that the applicant has defended this by arguing the development retains a common characteristic of the area with a separation of 25-31m. However, residents have pointed out that this separation currently exists between buildings of a similar nature and argue that such a large development should at least provide a greater degree of separation to reduce overlooking and a loss of privacy.

Finally, residents have expressed concern at the ability of the local community infrastructure to cope with the additional population created by the development, noting pressure upon school places in particular.

I have appended to this letter a copy of all the comments that I have received from constituents relating to this planning application and should be grateful if they could be included within the formal report that is presented to the planning committee as this application is considered. It would be greatly appreciated if you would be able to confirm receipt of this correspondence by reply.

With best wishes,

Julia Lopez MP

**Appendix A:** Letter from the founders of Facebook group opposing the development:

Dear Julia Lopez MP

We write as your constituents who have formed a campaign group to oppose the planning application of 87 flats in the Tesco carpark, Gallows Corner planning ref P1190.21.

Our campaign group has now reached 1200 members who all strongly oppose the proposal as it will have a negative impact on the local area.

The main issues are as follows:

**Dwelling density**

The proposed development very substantially exceeds the suggested dwelling density range in Havering’s Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (“The Havering Plan” - <https://www.havering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1632/core_strategy_development_control.pdf>).  
  
The Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (<https://www.havering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1634/site_specific_allocations_dpd.pdf>) details the acceptable range of dwelling density for the recently-developed King’s Park Estate at between 30 and 80 dwellings per hectare (p.25), in line with DC2’s density matrix (p.184 of The Havering Plan). (NB the density matrix does not even contain the option for “mostly flats” in a “suburban” area. Presumably, flats in King’s Park were considered acceptable since “on large development sites, development briefs may be prepared which encourage higher densities” (p.184 again). However, the proposed Weston Homes (WH) development could not be considered a large development site.)  
  
The proposed WH development is 0.57 hectares (which includes the relocated click and collect, hand car wash and recycling – the residential development area alone is smaller at 0.43 hectares). Even taking the very top of the acceptable range of dwelling density (ie of 80 dwellings per hectare), and the larger size of development (ie 0.57 hectares), then the most number of dwellings that should be built on the site is 45. WH are proposing a number of 87 dwellings, which is very nearly double this number of 45. And if the 0.43 hectares size was used (which seems a more appropriate size, since that is the size of the residential development alone) then a maximum of only 34 dwellings ought to be built.  
  
WH, in their Planning Statement describe the density matrix as “out of date and no longer consistent with the London Plan” (section 6.6 – p20). This is a rather too casual discounting of Havering’s own requirements (especially when they otherwise refer to their meeting of the Havering Plan’s requirements throughout the rest of their Planning Statement, ie it seems they refer to it when it is convenient to do so).

If Havering were only to use the London Plan, there would be no need for Havering to be creating a new Havering Plan (which is currently being produced). Havering is not the same as Central London, for example, and has a very different social feel and mix. The sprawl of urban London has been

resisted to some extent in the past, eg in the sympathetically-built King’s Park estate. WH seem to view Havering as no different to the rest of urban London.

It is noted that planners requested the design fit more into suburban character residential developments during the pre-application meeting with Weston Homes (WH) (planning statement 3.8). The residential area to the south is characterised by low 2 storey properties. The development will, therefore, dominate the landscape and does not blend in with any of the residences.

This is in inconsistent with LBH proposed urban design policy, which states proposals should ‘fully integrate with neighbouring developments’ (Viii Policy 26 urban design - Havering Local Plan 2016-2031)

WH, having discarded Havering’s DC2, then go on to quote D3 of the London Plan, which says “All development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations. Optimising site capacity means ensuring that development is of the most appropriate form and land use for the site.” (section 6.7, p. 20 of the Planning Statement, taken from p110 of The London Plan - <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/the_london_plan_2021.pdf>).   
  
WH’s proposal would create an over-densely populated area in contravention of Havering’s DC2. WH have unreasonably tried to make that seem irrelevant, but it is clearly evident that the location is not suitable for residential use. The site was granted planning permission (expiring November 2022) for a commercial auto centre. This is example of the best use of land in keeping with the commercial/industrial use of the Tesco land.

**Overlooking properties with a subsequent loss of privacy**

The London Plan 2021 (LP21) sets out that positioning of properties, including windows and balconies must be carefully considered to ensure adequate privacy for everyone (7.5.2) and that roof gardens should not be overlooking and reducing the privacy of neighbours (7.5.8). It is noted that the trees currently screening the site will be removed and due to the large size of the development, this results in windows, balconies and a roof garden all overlooking Bartholomew Drive/Chadwick Drive.

Homes located in Bartholomew Drive, have gardens which back onto Whitelands Way. It is noted that WH do not mention 30 Bartholomew Drive – in their discounting of the overlooked houses in Bartholomew Drive (section 6.48, page 27 of the Planning Statement). A resident at number 30, has acknowledged that the top two storeys of the flats overlooking Whitelands Way would presumably be able to see into their downstairs kitchen and two upstairs bedrooms. This would lead to a loss of privacy for residents.

WH justify the overlooking by saying that the “separation distance of 25-31m between habitable room windows is a common characteristic of the existing surrounding development” (section 6.48, page 27 of the Planning Statement). However, the pre-existing properties on the estate were all built at a similar time, and all buyers of those houses knew about any lack of privacy when they bought their properties.

The WH development would be a new addition, and so would be introducing new losses of privacy. This detrimental introduction should be avoided, especially when considering the other detrimental effects of the development. It is also worth pointing out that the current “common characteristic” of a “separation distance of 25-31m” relates only to buildings of a similar size to each other. The proposed new development would be substantially higher than the buildings in “the existing surrounding development”, making them far more penetrating to neighbours’ privacy, since they would be able to look down on the pre-existing homes on Bartholomew Drive.

**Traffic issues**

WH have not submitted a detailed traffic impact assessment. As a result of insufficient evidence, they have not demonstrated adherence to national and local policies.

Considering the location of the site, failure to provide a traffic impact assessment appears somewhat short sighted. Bryant Avenue can only be accessed/exited via A12 and A127, both roads suffer from congestion and form part of LBH strategic road network. Gallows Corner roundabout is also close to the site and Junction 28 of the M25 is a short drive away.

The potential knock-on effects that both the development and reduction in car park spaces will have on the wider road network have therefore not been adequately considered. WH assessment merely covered the amount of cars parked in Tesco carpark. However, Whitelands Way/Bryant Avenue are utilised not only by Tesco customers but also local residents, an industrial estate, a retail park and an extremely busy McDonald’s drive-thru restaurant. WH assertion of a negligible impact to the traffic is clearly not based on fact.

M25 Junction 28 construction is expected to commence in spring 2022, in addition to plans for the redesign of Gallows Corner being submitted in late 2021. These major infrastructure projects will also impact traffic and increase congestion on the surrounding roads. During heavy congestion on the A12 towards Gallows Corner, Whitelands Way is often used by motorists to avoid Gallows Corner.

Also, vehicular access to the site will be located in Whitelands Way. Motorists approaching from Lister Avenue or heading south on Whitelands Way, currently have to navigate a mini roundabout, then a pedestrian crossing, then another mini roundabout. Adding site access will further increase congestion and risk of accidents.  Traffic entering Tesco regularly tails back onto Whitelands Way/Bryant Avenue. This already has a significant impact on local residents, such as myself, as the only vehicular access from my road is via Lister Avenue.

Therefore, due to the large traffic volumes in Whitelands Way/Bryant Avenue not just of Tesco customers but also traffic from the large industrial site opposite and the busy McDonalds drive through, the need for a detailed traffic assessment is required.

**Parking issues**

Where a development proposal would result in a net loss of car parking spaces, the applicant is required to robustly demonstrate that there is no need for these spaces (LP21 7.5.8). The parking

survey submitted by WH has not sufficiently reflected the parking requirements of Tesco/the local area.

The loss of 189 car park spaces will have a significant impact. Cars looking for a parking bay will spend more time driving around the carpark, leading to queues. The relocation of the click and collect and hand car wash to the same section of the carpark will also result in queues along that row of parking bays.

With these potential problems to reducing the car park size, we question the thoroughness of WH’s research into the car park’s current usage. Sections 3.26 – 3.33 of WH’s Transport Statement detail their “Parking Accumulation Survey”. In it they surveyed the car park usage on only two days. Both just after Boris Johnson had announced “new restrictions in England including a return to working from home and 10pm curfew for hospitality sector” (<https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/timeline-lockdown-web.pdf>). The busiest of the two days was Sunday 27 September which wasn’t a particularly nice day for weather – “windy and largely cloudy, with some patchy light rain” (<https://www.thelondoneconomic.com/lifestyle/weather/weather-forecast-alerts-and-uvb-index-for-london-sunday-27-september-2020-203284/>).  
  
Both bad weather and increased Covid restrictions are likely to reduce the number of shopping trips people would make. So, it seems that WH haven’t been thorough enough in their survey. They ought to have measured usage on several more days, and on days that are more conducive to shopping trips. Nevertheless, even on a windy, cloudy day with some patchy light rain, five days after the Prime Minister had tightened the restrictions on the country, the car park was at 94.7% occupancy rate at midday on Sunday 27th September (section 3.29 of the Transport Statement). In which case WH’s conclusion that “the Proposed Development will not lead to a burden on Tesco Extra’s parking facilities” is not supported by strong evidence. If the WH development is built, there will be no scope for increasing the car park’s size, ie they won’t be able to regain.

Additionally, WH has not submitted a parking design and management plan for the development as required (Policy T6J LP21).

LBH Residential Car Parking Standards Report (RCPS 2017) draws together a range of evidence to help inform the car parking standards for Havering. The report demonstrates that a significant proportion of the borough has a PTAL of 0-2, reflecting the lack access to rail or underground stations. Havering also has one of the highest levels of car ownership which is above the average for outer London boroughs (10.2.5). The site is based in an area with a PTAL of 1b.

Whilst parking will be provided within private areas, it should be recognised that people will wish to park where they consider convenient and this is often on the existing street. This should be taken into consideration (RCPS 2017 10.2.10). The neighbouring roads already suffer from parking issues, hence a controlled parking zone had to be introduced to protect the needs of residents.

**Flood risk  
  
On 25th June there were heavy rains in Harold Wood. This resulted in the end of Bartholomew Drive nearest the proposed WH development, being flooded. The owner of 21 Bartholomew Drive, had water enter the house, and had to carry out salvage work. 25th June was not the first time**

**that the end of the road has become flooded. It is a recurring problem, but it was particularly bad that night.   
  
According to the local councillors the flooding “was due to hydraulic overload (sewer overloading due to the amount of rainfall, or flows, passing through it).” (The Bulletin, Harold Wood, Hill Park Residents’ Association, August 21, page 1). There is a history on this road of overloaded sewers. Without being able to see WH’s Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS report, it is not clear how WH’s claim to have taken this into consideration. Therefore, it seems only logical that a further 87 dwellings in the close vicinity of Bartholomew Drive will only increase the burden on its sewers and increase the likelihood of future flooding.**

The flood warning information service ([www.flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk](http://www.flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk)) confirms that the site has a high-low surface water flood risk.

Rainfall in the UK is increasing due to climate change. 2020 was the 5th wettest year since records began (State of the UK Climate - Royal Meteorological Society 2020). The two balancing ponds close to the site, Bartholomew and Chadwick Drive have a history of flooding. Despite this, there is a lack of mitigation or assessment from WH.

**Air Quality**

Since 2006 the whole of Havering has been designated an Air Quality Management Area and has an Air Quality Management Plan for Nitrogen Dioxide. Nitrogen Dioxide is primarily produced by road traffic, but other contributions include construction.

In line with London Plan policy 12.5.3, where there is a risk of any negative air quality impacts associated with development proposals, an assessment and, if appropriate, mitigation measures will be required, to ensure that air quality has been adequately considered and any negative impacts are minimised. WH has not included mitigation or assessment for air quality. There is no local traffic modelling of the local road network and Gallows Corner. Weston Homes assessment of negligible impact to air quality is concerning without any evidence.

If additional traffic is forecast to use the boroughs strategic roads, in particular A127 and Gallows Corner, already a pollution ‘hotspot’ this is highly likely to have a negative impact on air quality.

**Wider impact on community**

WH assessment of local health services is notably inaccurate. Research undertaken by residents confirm that none of the local dentists are accepting NHS patients. The local area also suffers from long GP waiting times. WH dismissal that this is not a concern, as Havering as a whole has a poor G.P to patient ratio, shows a lack of consideration for social infrastructure of the area. Havering local plan (A.3.15) shows one of the main issues affecting quality of life in Havering is access to local doctors and medical services, and this is governed mainly by lengthy GP lists.

Also, Havering’s Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) shows the largest increase in population growth 0-17 years is projected up until 2033. There are two primary schools within reasonable walking distance of the site (1km). Although Ardleigh Green Infants has 5 spaces, Ardleigh Green Juniors is heavily oversubscribed meaning the distance from school becomes an admissions factor. The proposed development is outside this distance.

The other school (Broadford) has no capacity in reception and only 9 places in all other years. Havering commissioning plan for Education states that the Harold Hill area is currently operating at -4% capacity, expected to rise to -8% capacity by 2023/4.

There are two further schools within 2km, (Hilldene) is oversubscribed, meaning the distance from the school becomes an admissions factor. The proposed site is outside this distance. The other school (Harold Wood) has no capacity in reception, and 26 places across other years. Those from the proposed development would most likely have to drive to this school, which has known parking issues.

There are a further five schools within 3km of the development, with two having capacity. Both of the schools would require transport to access, increasing problems with parking and travelling to school.

Other schools sited by Weston Homes, include one that is almost 4km away, and a Voluntary-aided Catholic school with religious entry requirement, neither of these options are appropriate for this analysis.

It is therefore clear that there is not sufficient capacity to accommodate primary school children within the local area to accommodate any children from the proposed development.

Secondary schools - the figures supplied by Weston Homes include The Campion School, which is an all boys’ Academy with religious entry requirements. They also include Royal Liberty, which again is an all boys’ school.

The only secondary school for all within walking reasonable walking distance is Redden Court, which is operating at 116% capacity. Havering Commissioning Plan for Education states that “Please note that both schools in the north planning area have already undergone permanent expansion; Redden Court has expanded by 2FE and Drapers Academy has expanded by 1FE having declined to expand further. Therefore, the need for places in this planning area will have to be met by places in the neighbouring Central planning area before 2024/5”.

There will be little or no additional secondary school places to accommodate any children in their proposed development.

We have also compiled a small sample of letters and comments from our campaign group to represent their views:

1. As a local resident I live down copperfields way and I get sick of having to get to my road already, this could be week nights but especially the weekend. I get forced to turn left from sunflower way when I could just go right, but I would be waiting ages as the traffic is stand still and no one let's you out.

I am already concerned about the air pollution with all the cars sitting in traffic and at Christmas it is 10 times worse and you are better off walking places. I would like to know where Tesco’s are going to park everyone as they will be loosing a lot of spaces. That concerns me as I dare say people will start parking down the side streets including mine where a lot of children play out.

I am all for homes being built but the location of this particular plot is ludicrous and make the area that is already busy unbearable. This just feels more like greed and no thought has gone into the local area or its residents.

I understand a traffic check was done but it was a bit convenient that it was done in a quiet time and during a pandemic lock down when people were to scare to go out and get shopping and more people were using click and collect.

[Name redacted], Copperfields Way

Traffic congestion will be even worse than it is now, both during construction and after. Kids will be playing in the car park. Increased traffic pollution and noise pollution while construction is taking place and afterwards. Loss of more spaces as click & collect, car wash and the Xmas tent will all take up spaces. Doctors and schools already over capacity.

[Name redacted]

Living fairly close to Tesco the traffic is horrendous already especially at the weekend the infrastructure is completely inadequate and this development will make it even worse

[Name redacted]

It’s crazy to think that more housing should be built on Tesco car park. I can’t always get a parent and child spot as those without children use them, let alone the issue of getting in and out of Tesco that is often a nightmare. The local schools are full, roads nearby I.e. Gubbins lane are often gridlocked due to the Amount of cars on them. That’s before we even think about where will the occupants of these new developments go to see a GP (when you can’t even physically see one at the moment)or NHS dentist? What about the extra demand on our already extremely busy and over-stretched hospital / NHS, police and fire services?

We all know Tesco want to make a profit, but this is preposterous!

[Name redacted]

It will be an absolute nightmare if this whole thing goes ahead. The area in & out of Tesco is already gridlocked at the weekend & will get even worse coming up to Christmas. The area can not cope with more housing especially in Tesco’s carpark. My eldest daughter is due to go Senior School in 3 years, the school we will want her to go to is already over subscribed & it will be even worse. I tried to get a GP appointment recently had to wait 4 weeks! Where will the click & collect/car wash be placed? Taking up more car parking space no doubt. I live in Copperfields Way & guessing shoppers will be parking down my road where lots of kids play. The construction period, noise pollution & road closure where the roads will get dug up during construction will effect many local residents journeys whether it be the school run or going to work. The whole idea of this proposal is absolutely ludicrous!!

[Name redacted], Copperfields Way

I disagree with this development in an already overcrowded area - the pollution will only be increased and traffic chaos will ensue. Surely there are better areas for housing. The amenities in Harold Wood I.e. doctors, dentists, hospitals, schools etc are already struggling and waiting for appointments is ridiculous and before building more housing this needs to be rectified. This area is gridlocked during the week and even worse at weekends.

[Name redacted]

The whole idea of building on an already chaotic site is absolute madness. The roads are not coping now with the amount of traffic, queues everyday, long wait times to get out of the area. The surrounding area is gridlocked most of the time and to put more people, cars will make the area even more difficult to use. To introduce constructive traffic into the mix would cause the whole area to stop and no one will be able to move in or out of a small space. This would cause noise pollution and traffic pollution. This borough is already the highest in London for pollution and to add more is ludicrous. Tesco’s itself would suffer too as people would stop coming because of the traffic. No one wants to queue to get on our get for hours to do a shop. There customers would decline. To add more people to an already over populated area and already fully stretched doctors, schools, dentists and Queens Hospital means our wait times for appointments will double. We are waiting 3 weeks + for an appointment now!! If children live there where will they be able to play, in Tesco’s car park? There are no parks nearby. This is a money making scheme and they have not thought about the impact of the people who already live here. Go and build somewhere where there is room!!!

[Name redacted]

Already we are shopping elsewhere we cannot stand the traffic queue for tesco gallows . We only live in harold Park, so now we are adding to pollution by taking the car further than needed. Tesco won't have sufficient parking if they build these properties. Totally ridiculous...cheap housing I assume who would want to live in tesco car park ! They may not be using their cars to drive to tesco but it immediately puts more vehicles in that immediate vicinity all trying to get somewhere ! Chaos!

[Name redacted]

A totally unacceptable arrogant attitude of council towards the area. Havering council is only making builders, developers, few officers happy who will get benefits from this development. It is not thinking or worrying about what bad impact it will put on the people's life who are living in this already overpopulated area and on roads users. It is so unfortunate to have this kind of corrupt system.

[Name redacted]

I honestly cannot believe that for these properties to be built, Tesco for a start are prepared to make so many peoples lives a damned misery. And for what.

Huge heavy machinery will be brought in at the start just to dig and move sewage pipes replace and put new ones in etc. which WILL block all routes in and around Tesco which will have a HUGE knock on effect at gallows corner, a12, a127, straight road & main road - EVERYONE WILL be late for work, school etc EVERY SINGLE DAY, MORNING AND EVENING.

People living on the Kings Park Estate, Lister Avenue and all roads off it WILL be affected, they are ONLY able to get out of the estate if they’re driving as there’s a “bus only” pass through to Harold Wood on St Clements Avenue.

Are you really prepared to cause this absolute chaos and misery for properties that REALLY CANNOT be built on the proposed site.

GOOD LUCK to any Police, Fire Engines Ambulances trying to get to an emergency

[Name redacted]

The level of congestion around gallows corner tesco is already a NIGHTMARE if you were to go on a Saturday expect to wait at least 20mins to get out from any direction its a joke. Tesco is always busy most days and you want too add more homes, cars, people it's a absolute joke, it's all money no one is thinking of the area and the people who already live here. The doctors, dentist, school's are already full and yet you still want too add more people. I don't understand why you have to take

every bit of land every bit of outside space there maybe and build build build just leave it be go and build somewhere that needs building on.

[Name redacted]

The infrastructure in the area, can NOT support this. In addition, the traffic and congestion in this area (Ardleigh Green, Harold wood) A127/A12 etc) in particular is having a detrimental effect on my quality of my quality of life. It often takes longer to get out of this area than it does to get to my destination.

Adding more homes and therefore residents to this, can not happen.

This is not to mention, what it’s like getting in and out of Tesco, currently, especially around busy times like Christmas. And where is everyone going to park around there if they are loosing those parking spaces!!!

This can not happen. Havering is already becoming over developed.

[Name redacted]

Last Sunday 5th sept took me 20mins to get from Whitmore Avenue to the lights on A12 this is not a one off , it’s always like this . When I got to A12 the Queue to come down to Tesco’s was queueing back to the gallows corner roundabout I just find this unbelievable that you want to add more homes to this congestion and also cutting down on the car parking spaces in Tesco’s were are they going to go to parking up once tescos is full possibly my turnIng Whitmore Aenue bloody nightmare don’t get me started on doctors dentist schools and what ever else more people need and that’s without the inconvenience of the construction that up evil it seems we get over one thing and another comes along just finished the rail bridge how long was it we could not use Bryant Avenue before that the flyover was close for months all Causing absolute chaos to get onto the A12 I think I can go on forever so I’m gonna stop now. [Name redacted], Whitmore Avenue

Infrastructure can't cope, as in respect to palms hotel being stopped as a refugee housing as said by local MPs the infrastructure couldn't cope with 200 so I'm sure 300+ would Definitely impact these more, the traffic would be incomprehensible on busy shopping days rush hours during the week and Christmas there would be no point going anywhere near gallows corner unless you like sitting in an hour's traffic to do half a mile, the pollution would go way above the government's own limits while the building work is done, not to mention the health of everyone around that area would suffer greatly from the extra fumes and dusts, I'm all for progress and building more homes for people that need them but this for the already established residents wouldn't be the right place, if this project goes ahead it will just show greed is more important than local residents and Tesco should be also listening to us because they did ok during the lockdowns and have done so before and will after on local residents in this area

[Name redacted], St Clements Avenue

The level of congestion already is unacceptable

The level of noise pollution is also is unacceptable

We can’t get appointments at our doctors because of the density off the localised population

We can’t get the council to repair our roads and other things .

This is just a few of the obvious reasons why this proposal is ludicrous.

Who in their right mind thought this was a good idea !!!!

[Name redacted], Lister Avenue

Traffic chaos is always bad getting into Tesco Also If each dwelling has one carparking space as stated. Most houses have at least two cars which will cause more parking problems in the rest of Tesco car park. One unworkable project

[Name redacted]

I think we all understand the need to build more homes, but in a car park of a supermarket is beyond ludicrous. It’s reached a point here now that you cannot do a journey from the surrounding roads without sitting in traffic for ages. So that adds to poor quality air from all the congestion. Also these flats will house children, besides not being able to get into the already heaving schools in the area, where will they play, in the car park of Tesco? an accident waiting to happen. The list is truly endless. I cannot see any plus points to building these flats at-all!!!!!!

[Name redacted]

It’s crazy now, whatever time of day you need to get to or from Tesco and the surrounding area.

Leave well alone, or throw money at improving the problems that we have now.

[Name redacted]

Traffic on A127 always bad now, also no beds in Queens Hospital and extreme shortage of health and dental services for locals already. Bank holiday parking bad already causing a lot of traffic congestion locally, with current parking bays impossible to get wheelchair parking space now at weekends, this will get worse with less spaces.

[Name redacted]

The area proposed for the new development is not fit for purpose given the already congested nature of the access roads round the area in question especially at rush hour times - roads like Whiteland Way leading to the A12 and road leading out to A127 by McDonalds are often tail backed involving Queues that enforce additional times to journeys not to mention additional levels of pollution. These traffic levels are further increased on Sunday’s and holiday time periods.

Other objections to this development include - increased levels of pollution including noise pollution during construction phase, reduction in privacy for homes that back on to site (across the road).

[Name redacted], Bartholomew Drive

Local services are already grossly inadequate and traffic congestion will be totally gridlocked more often than it currently is. Building in this area will increase pollution and noise. This is no place for housing and would not be a healthy place to live in surrounded by traffic and businesses. Loss of car park spaces. The people do not want this development period. No corporation should be allowed to profit from this proposed development whilst all the living men and women that reside in the area, will have no way of avoiding the detrimental consequences. The people should be the ones who make the final decision not councillors who can profit from such deals.

[Name redacted]

Being a local resident it’s already a nightmare with traffic due to Tesco’s and McDonald’s. Both driving the pollution in the area up. The local levels of noise can be ridiculous at the weekends.

Other concerns are the fact many local dentist are not even taking on new nhs patients and there is already a huge strain on other local health services.

It is not sensible or practical to even consider this new development when we are already densely over populated in the area. The money would be far better spent investing in local roads and healthcare services.

[Name redacted], Ewan Road

I totally agree cannot get an nhs dentist and not everyone can afford to pay private. Also doctors and hospitals are struggling. I’m in rise park but shop at tescos and think it’s madness they can even think of doing this as the traffic around that area is already bad.

[Name redacted]

I've given up going to Tesco. The last time I went, it took me 2 hours there and back without actual shopping time. An hour of this time was just getting out of their car park. I live the other side of the A12 and can see Tesco from my house.

[Name redacted]

The increase in congestion on surrounding roads, especially Whitelands Way and the A12. Currently at weekends, in particular, it is an issue driving in and out of our estate as Whitelands Way is at a standstill and Whitelands Way and Bryant Avenue are the only available roads to exit Lister Avenue. There is no access from Lister Avenue through to Gubbins Lane. Additional cars in the area due to the proposed development would only increase the issue and increase traffic fumes, adding to further air pollution in an already polluted area.

Not only is a large part of Tesco car parking being removed due to the proposed development, additional parking spaces will also be lost due to the relocation of the Tesco Click and Collect service and the car wash facilities.

Furthermore, there will be additional pressure during the Christmas period and on other occasions, when Tesco erect a large marquee along the Bryant Avenue side of the site, removing even more parking bays.

Tesco car park is extremely busy during those periods and the loss of even more parking bays will only cause more congestion for the surrounding roads as shoppers attempt to find a place to park.

We note that 87 parking spaces will be available for 87 homes on the development, but this does not take into account many households have more than one vehicle, nor does it allow space for visitors.

The likelihood is these additional vehicles will either park in the Tesco car park or in the surrounding residential roads, reducing the amount of available parking for Tesco shoppers, causing more congestion and inconveniencing/annoying local residents.

The developers wish to encourage people to make journeys by walking, cycling and public transport, but as can be seen by the nearby Kings Park development, who are even closer to the station and the buses this does not happen.

The proposed building work would greatly inconvenience local residents due to noise, movement in and out of large construction vehicles, digging up roads etc for laying pipes, additional road congestion.

The 5 and 4 storey buildings are not in keeping with the local area and would look completely out of place. Residents of Whitelands Way will lose their privacy as they will be overlooked by the new homes.

The traffic surveys were not placed in the most congested areas, I.e between the junction of Sunflower Way and the A12, so any data I’d not a true reflection of the traffic using the roads around Tesco. Also there were reduced car journeys when the survey was carried out due to Covid.

[Name redacted], Lister Avenue

I am writing to you to put across my objections to the planning applications P1190.21 and P1401.21. These relate to the phased redevelopment of some of the land at the Tesco Extra on Bryant Avenue in Romford, (RM30LL) and the construction of a temporary access off Whitelands Way, for construction traffic and temporary change of use of supermarket car park, at the same location.

Please find my objection reasons as follows:

**Unacceptable levels of traffic, pollution, ease ofaccess for emergency vehicles, enough parking**

As you will be aware, the London Borough of Havering was designated an **AQMA (Air Quality Management Area)** in 2006, which means that air pollution levels are already above those **legally required** for health reasons. **Havering Borough Council’s Air Quality Action Plan of 2018**, cites that **Gallows Corner** (the area where the proposed development is planned for), is an **air pollution ‘hot spot’**. The council’s own website also states that **road traffic emissions and construction are the main contributors to air pollution in Havering**.

With this in mind, it is surely obvious that **the construction of this proposed development alone**would bring further pollution to an area which is already a ‘**hot spot’**, which in turn could have a **detrimental impact on the local communities health.**

In addition to this, 87 dwellings will increase the population in this **already densely populated area** and bring more pollution due to tenants’ own vehicle movements, not to forget to mention any visitors of tenants whom this may **also bring to the area**.

With extra vehicle numbers in the area, this adds to **already high traffic levels**. In turn this will increase the amount of emissions caused by any moving traffic as well as engine idling at the exit junctions and traffic lights within the nearby vicinity, of which I will add, there are only 3 exits for all traffic!

The **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**talks about the need to reduce air pollution and emissions to improve air quality and public health. (Quote: ‘**Preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability**. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality…’. The **Developer’s Air Quality Report** suggests that the development will add 234 AADT (annual average daily traffic) units which they say, will have a negligible effect on air quality. This to me does not seem to reflect the impact that even a small increase in traffic volume (extra traffic and engine idling) will have during peak periods. For example, the average weekly customer count in Tesco on Bryant [Avenue is 60](x-apple-data-detectors://4),000 people (as per Tesco management’s figures), but this raises to 120,000 during the Christmas period alone (so this means an increase of 8500 people per day compared to a normal day), without mentioning any other public holidays! The report also indicates that the development will have increased traffic (measured by AADT) in all but three measured locations. Negatively impacted areas include the A12, A127 and A118 Main Road. Again, this does not reflect impact of this increase during busy periods. If as suggested, the car park is under utilised, it cannot be argued that the residential development will reduce traffic on and around the site!

I would like to add the point, that any extra flow in traffic could potentially cause issues for the emergency services reaching someone in need. Queues of idling traffic on narrow roads, with only 3 exits onto the surrounding major roads, will cause further delay to anyone needing to urgently reach a hospital. **Overflow of** **parking** by excess vehicles onto the streets in the nearby vicinity, caused by reduced parking spaces in the Tesco car park and visitors of

the potential development’s tenants, could also cause hinderance toemergency access in the nearby residential streets.

**Strain on local amenities**

I currently have one child, so lack of school spaces is a big concern of mine.

**Primary Schools**

As per local researchers’ findings…There are two primary schools which are within reasonable walking distance of the school (1.6KM/ 1 mile.) One of these schools only has 5 spaces (Ardleigh Green Infants/ Juniors) with the furthest pupil space being offered at 0.81km. The proposed development site is further than this distance. The other school (Broadford) has no capacity in reception and only 9 other spaces in all other year groups. Havering Commissioning Plan for Education states that Harold Hill Area is currently operating at -4% capacity and this is expected to rise to -8% capacity by 2023/4.

There are two primary schools slightly further from the site, at a 2KM walking distance. One of these schools is heavily over subscribed meaning that distance from the school becomes an admission factor. The proposed Tesco development is outwith this distance. The Harold Wood school has no capacity in reception and 26 places across other years. Those from the proposed development would likely have to drive to this school, of which already has known parking issues.

There are 5 other schools within 3KM, 2 of which have capacity but all of which would require transportation to. This increases problems with parking locally and also pollution levels nearby the proposed development, due to engine idling through increased traffic.

The two other schools which Weston Homes cites include one which is nearly 4KM away and one which is a voluntary aided catholic school with religious entry requirements.

From the above information, it is clear that there is not sufficient capacity at nearby primary schools to accommodate any children from the development.

**Secondary Schools**

As per local researchers’ findings…The figures supplied by Weston Homes for Secondary Schools includes two (The Royal Liberty and The Campion School) with single sex entry requirements of which one, also has religious entry requirements. (The Campion School).

There is only one secondary school for all within a reasonable walking distance, this is Redden Court which is currently operating at 116% capacity.

The Havering Commissioning Plan for Education states that; ‘Please note that both schools in the North Planning area have already undergone permanent expansion. Redden Court has expanded by 2FE and Draper’s academy has expanded by 1FE having declined to expand further. Therefore, the need for places in this planning area will have to be met by available places in the neighbouring central planning area.’

There are no plans for extra secondary school provision in Central area before 2024/2025. This means that there will be little or no additional secondary school places to accommodate any children in this proposed development.

**Loss of privacy**

The proposed dwelling will overlook the gardens of even number properties 38-48 on Bartholomew drive, which will mean loss of privacy to local residents and could mean some loss of light.

[Name redacted], Juniper Way

I strongly object to the housing development at Gallows Corner Tesco.

We all ready have a issue with flooding adding further homes will increase this problem. The traffic won’t bear thinking about either.

[Name redacted]

Flooding is a big problem around here, how can we make sure that the drains are going to handle more homes. How can we be sure our homes will be safe? This will make living here a nightmare

[Name redacted], Buttercup Close

The traffic is a nightmare around Tesco and Gallows corner already, adding more homes will only increase this, I am very worried.

[Name redacted], Chadwick Drive

The doctors waiting list are long and can’t cope and hospital referral times are crazy Mandy Sainsbury. There are no NHS dentist in the area taking on new patients Kelly-Ann May

There’s a huge amount of congestion and the development will make it much worse

[Name redacted]

There are a number of issues that concern me :

1. P1492.19 which was change of use of 54 parking bays for Auto Windscreens Automotive glass repair and replacement in the car park of Tesco. When the planning officer attended site he went on a Wednesday afternoon. I would have thought that a Saturday afternoon when they are queuing down Whitelands Way would have been more appropriate, but maybe Wednesday afternoon suited Tesco more.

2. P1190.21 (the current application) refers to relocating the car wash, click & collect and the recycling centre. There is no reference to the “marquee” which is set up on busy times like Christmas on the far side closest to Bryant Avenue. I would be interested to know how many parking spaces these would take up. Has anyone tried to find a parking space on a Saturday afternoon?

3. At the time of the original planning application for the Tesco store way back in the 1980/90’s when it was constructed, I assume that the number of parking spaces would be relevant to the square footage of the store. The store has been extended since that time but I’m not aware of any additional parking spaces that have been created. I was also under the impression that the terms of this planning application required Tesco to invest in the local infrastructure - they decided to create an entrance/exit in Bryant Avenue a few years ago. In view of the fact that planning has changed over the years, how many spaces are required now in comparison to the size of the store?

4. With the creation of the various housing estates over the years, this area is now saturated with housing and the highways and supporting services are not fit for purpose. Try going to Harold Wood during the school run.

5. When staff members have queried the planning with Tesco they were told that they would have to park in the surrounding roads. Whilst there are certain parking regulations in place in the surrounding areas, they are aimed at commuters because of the timings, not Tesco staff who work shifts and will result in a whole new set of parking issues.

6. Tesco are trying to set a precedent, how did they get on in Chadwell Heath?

The number of car parking spaces are being reduced from 777 to 515 plus the 73 in the construction zone, taking it to 588 in total. The traffic survey says that 25/27 June 2021 is comparable to survey carried out in September 2020. It also states that the southern section was

cordoned off for use by Click & Collect and not available for parking. Slight exaggeration. I understand they have to submit this but the information included is questionable.

[Name redacted]

With all the extra vehicles that will need to park whilst the work is being done and the extra on the roads after how will the emergency vehicles be able to get through the blocked roads

[Name redacted]

I am against this development as a local resident is completely without substance. [Name redacted]

I am against this and will go as far as to say if I do not see Tesco objecting to this I will vote with my feet and shop at Asda Romford or Sainsbury’s Hornchurch instead.

[Name redacted]

Everyday we hear about global warming and climate change. Surely building more properties and all that goes with it, is just going to add to the problem.

[Name redacted]

This absolutely ludicrous!!! Can you imagine how congested the surrounding area is going to be? The roads cannot take anymore cars down those two small roads. Think if the pollution!!! This cannot go ahead. Imagine Tesco’s at Christmas. Good luck with that!!! The surrounding area is already jammed packed!!! The building is too tall and doesn’t blend in with what’s already there. Where are the extra people going to go for doctors, dentists, schools etc? They already stretched to the max!!! Are they going to make the roads wider then? From the picture it looks like the road is wider than it actually is!!

[Name redacted]

There is already a shortage of GP/Dental facilities and school places . This is apart from the congestion etc.

[Name redacted]

The proposed development on the site of Tesco gallows corner will cause more congestion in an already busy area. Resources locally are already stretched to breaking point. To get a telephone Drs appointment we already have to wait between 2/3 weeks which’s unacceptable and this will only get worse with more coming into the area. I shop at Tesco and the area which is to be developed is regularly used by many because parking nearer to the store is full. The proposal is not in the best interest of anyone in the local area and is being driven by greed alone. Schools, Doctors and all other local amenities will suffer greatly

[Name redacted]

I’m disabled my husband drives me to Tesco’s but we rarely get a disabled bay, as everyone parks there, so I’ve stopped going for a long time now, but thought I’d chance it on Saturday boy the traffic was bad, we found 1 bay at the end, my husband had to get a trolley for me to be able to walk. The pollution with heavy traffic is horrendous as it is what will it be like if this Development goes ahead ? I’m dreading it. I most probably won’t be able to go shopping there no more.

[Name redacted]

the lack of doctors and dentists in area is already stretching them to the max...(been waiting 3 years on dentist list to get my son and dentist) the schools no matter what the local gov figures say are already at capacity the fact that the plans to make palms temp accommodation for refugees has been said that the areas infrastructure can't cope with 200 so I don't know how 300+ can be acceptable....unless it's about the money not the local residents...and finally the environmental impact in an already over used small area because of a12 and a127 used to pass through along with local residents trying to go about their daily lives....it's about time local

councils and governments actually listened to there people and what problems thing will cause Instead of how much money they will gain from it

[Name redacted], Ormond Close

**Conclusion**

This application has a number of problems which demonstrate that the site is unsuitable for residential development. 1200 local residents opposing the proposals and many more Tesco shoppers also horrified to learn of the loss of parking and increased disruption. As a result, planning permission should not be granted, as this would have significant adverse impacts to the local residents and wider community, which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

**Appendix B:** Comments provided directly by constituents

Good Morning Julia,  
  
I’m very concerned about the redevelopment of Tesco Car park Gallows Corner, I am a resident in Chadwick Drive Harold Wood and would like to know your thoughts on the matter? I feel this development will be incredibly bad for the area as we are already in a poor air quality zone due to having the A12, A127 and gallows corner on each side of us. I have sent in my objections to the planning committee but feel that as our MP it would really help if we had your backing on this matter. I noticed that you helped stop the use of Palms hotel due to the lack of services that we have in the area, although the development is different the principal is the same we will not have enough infrastructure for and additional 300+ people that will move into the flats. Could you let me know that if we are unsuccessful in stopping the development will the infrastructure of the area be improved?  
I will look forward to your response in due course  
  
Many thanks  
[Name redacted]

Good Morning  
  
I am writing to you in the hope that you are aware of people objections regarding the development on the Tesco carpark  
  
I live down Juniper Way and have done for 14 years. The traffic is horrendous trying to get out of Sunflower Way at the best of times let alone having the thought of another housing estate a stones throw away. The A12 and A127 are already very busy roads and people use Whiteland Way and Bryant Avenue as a cut through.  
  
This is going to cause so much more pressure around the surrounding areas. Trying to get out of my road can sometimes take 10 minutes and then you either have a choice of which way you then want to sit in more traffic. We on that estate feel very trapped and this will just magnify the problem. We are hoping you are against this too and will help us fight this.  
  
Many Thanks  
  
[Name redacted]

Good afternoon  
  
As a local resident, I am objecting to the planning application to build 87 homes at Tesco Gallows Corner. I also help run a facebook group set up to oppose the plan, we have over 1100 members so far. I believe you have been in contact with the founder, [Name redacted] (cc’d into this email).  
  
This development would greatly impact local residents. The traffic in neighbouring roads is already unacceptably high, but the developers have not done a traffic impact assessment. There is also the planned work to M25 Junction 28, the Lower Thames crossing and Gallows Corner improvements to consider.  
  
The pollution levels monitored at Gallows Corner have exceeded recommended levels on numerous occasions. Idling traffic due to reduced parking spaces in Tesco will inevitably have an increased impact. In addition, to the construction itself.  
  
The issue of flood risk has also not been adequately addressed. My road has a balancing pond, but despite this, it flooded in June.  
  
There are already issues with local infrastructure. I personally, have to now wait 1 month to get a GP appointment and have been unable to secure a NHS dentist.  
  
Group members have also raised difficulty securing childcare and school places.  
  
We are keen to have as many supporters as possible. We have managed to arrange for local media to cover the story and have the support of local Councillors. Some group members have written to Andrew Rosindell, who has contacted the Head of Planning on their behalf. We would appreciate your support and any guidance you can provide.  
  
Whilst I agree there is a need for new housing within Havering, this should not be at the detriment of existing residents and without vast improvements to infrastructure.  
  
Kind regards  
  
[Name redacted]