

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



The Planning Policy Team
Directorate of Neighbourhoods
Epping Forest District Council
Civic Offices
323 High Street
Epping
Essex
CM16 4BZ

Direct [REDACTED]
Dial: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Our Ref: [REDACTED] Our ref: [REDACTED]

29th January 2018

Dear Planning Policy Team,

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN – SUBMISSION VERSION DECEMBER 2017
LAND AT TYLERS FARM, HIGH ROAD, NORTH WEALD – SITE REF: NWB.R2**

This letter sets out our supporting comments to our representation made in respect of the above site. The representation is made on behalf of our client, [REDACTED] who own the site.

While we consider the Submission Local Plan to be broadly sound and legally compliant, we have reservations about Policy P6 – North Weald Bassett – and its detailed requirements, specifically the need for a ‘strategic masterplan’ covering all the proposed residential site allocations, NWB.R1 to NWB.R5 inclusive.

Our specific comments in respect of Policy P6, North Weald Bassett, are set out below:

- We fully support the allocation of the land at [REDACTED], North Weald Bassett for a residential development comprising around 21 dwellings;
- We would suggest that the location of the proposed [REDACTED] is not the most appropriate location, given that it would be within, and presumably in close proximity to, [REDACTED]. A better location for such development would be within site NWB.E4, which is more remote from existing and proposed housing, and has good access onto the A414 via Merlin Way and Rayley Lane. [REDACTED] operate businesses from [REDACTED], a location within an employment site allocation also makes sense;
- Our clients land offers the ability to provide an access road onto the High Road, which could be taken through to the adjacent site (NWB.R1) and enhance the permeability of the area, subject to detailed design requirements;
- We do not believe that a ‘strategic masterplan’ is essential to cover all five residential site allocations, as the requirements set out in section ‘L’ of the policy could be more easily achieved through the normal development management process, and recognising the various site constraints. Our clients land can be readily accessed from High Road and could be developed independently of the larger residential site allocations. In our experience, the development of a strategic masterplan where there are a number of different landowners, can be counter-productive and impact upon the early delivery of housing;



- The reference within Policy P6, paragraph L (vi), acknowledges the need to mitigate any potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, however, it should be noted that the only listed building on the site at [REDACTED] longer exists (following the construction of the A414 to the north). The setting of [REDACTED] is to some extent, already marred by a number of existing modern outbuildings, which could be redeveloped to create an attractive, traditional, courtyard arrangement of sympathetic buildings;
- While there are several trees within the site that are the subject of a Preservation Order, these trees are on the southern boundary of the site and would not unduly restrict development within the site itself. The site is generally well-screened by existing boundary trees, but the central area of the site is relatively open and free from natural constraints;
- Finally, we note that the reference to our client's site in paragraph K of Policy P6 is incorrect – it should be 'NWB.R2' not 'NMB.R2'.

If you should have any queries about any of the above points, or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Sutton
Associate Partner
Strutt & Parker