

Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	1979	Name	Phillip Wright	CALA Homes (NHC) Limited
----------------	------	------	----------------	-----------------------------

Method	Survey
--------	--------

Date	
------	--

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

We support the overall vision that the Draft Local Plan sets out for Epping Forest District Council. We support the recognition that new homes of an appropriate mix of sizes, types and tenures to meet local needs have to be provided and the need to ensure well integrated communicated are created.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	1979	Name	Phillip Wright
----------------	------	------	----------------

4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Yes

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

We support the recognition in the Local Plan, that new housing is needed Chipping Ongar not only to meet local needs but to contribute to the wider, district-level housing target. Furthermore, we support the identification of exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release around Chipping Ongar. The Council's

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

evidence base identifies the scale of housing need, the lack of sufficient non-Green Belt sites to meet this need and the implications of not reviewing the Green Belt in terms of achieving sustainable development. It is clear that Green Belt sites are required in Epping Forest and it is also clear that, Chipping Ongar must make a contribution to housing need. The Council's plan for approximately 600 homes in Chipping Ongar over the Plan period should be a minimum rather than a maximum housing target.

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.
-

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?

Draft Policy P 4 Chipping Ongar A vii)

We support the proposed allocation of site SR-0390 (Greensted Road). We broadly agree with the findings of the Council's assessment of the site in the SHLAA and Green Belt review. While supporting the allocation, the dwelling estimate is subject to generating a suitable layout design and housing mix that conforms to District Plan policies. The Council's Report on Site Selection (September 2016) assessed the Greensted Road Ongar site as follows: "There are outstanding uncertainties over the ownership of part of the site, but most has been identified as available and there are no identified restrictions/constraints that would impact upon its deliverability. The site should be allocated." The only items of interest here is the Green Belt designation of the site. While the assessment highlighted outstanding uncertainties in ownership relating to part of the site, we wanted to clarify this position. The site area is now confirmed at 3.316 hectares (8.19 acres) and excludes the existing properties of Greensted Croft and the Rectory to the north. The attached site plan shows the consolidated land parcel which falls under one ownership. We can confirm the site is suitable, available and deliverable for residential development. Green belt review: The Council has undertaken a Stage 1 and Stage 2 Green Belt review in Epping Forest at both the strategic and local level. In line with the NPPF, the Green Belt is not judged to perform a function in preventing the coalescence of North Weald Bassett (to the west) with Chipping Ongar. At the local level for site SR-0390, the Council's review found: 1st Green Belt purpose -No Contribution 2nd Green Belt purpose - Weak 3rd Green Belt purpose -Moderate 4th Green Belt purpose -Relatively Strong 5th Green Belt purpose -Not Assessed We support the Council's assessment that the site is remote from a large built up areas and therefore contributes little to this purpose. We support the Council's assessment that the parcel has a limited contribution to maintaining separation between the towns of North Weald Bassett and Chipping Ongar. The site can assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment by ensuring the outer boundaries which are strongly defined by dense trees and mature hedgerows are retained. In addition, the removal of land west of Greenstead Road which was originally assessed as being more remote from the settlement edge, does not form part of the consolidated 3.316 hectare site. Based upon the revised site area and consideration that existing vegetation around the site boundaries can be retained, it is considered that residential development can assist in safeguarding the countryside from future encroachment. The site is close to the historic town of Chipping Ongar, however the existing Fairfield Road development does limit views from the High Street to the countryside within the parcel. The development will include landscaping and public open space in conformity with District wide policies which will help mitigate views from the town onto the open countryside. The retention of dense trees and hedgerow boundaries will also contribute towards screening future development. District wide design policies, in particular emerging policy DM 9, seeks to ensure development proposals relate positively to their locality. It is therefore considered that high quality development can contribute to preserving the setting and special character Chipping Ongar. In conclusion, we support the Council's conclusion. While the site is within the Green Belt, it could be developed without causing harm to the fundamental principles of Green Belt designation
