



Phase 2

Epping Forest Local Plan Main Modifications Consultation Statement

On Behalf of

Greenacres Real Estate Ltd

September 2021

Our Ref: C21109

Phase 2 PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT LIMITED

270 Avenue West | Skyline 120 | Great Notley | Braintree | Essex | CM77 7AA | 01376 329059 | www.phase2planning.co.uk

Quality Assurance

Site Name: Greenacres, Ivy Chimney Road, Epping, Essex, CM16 4EL

Client Name: Greenacres Real Estate Ltd

Type of Report: Main Modifications Representations

Author	Initials	Date
Michael Calder BSc Hons Dip TP MRTPI Director	MC	22.09.21

Reviewed	Initials	Date
Matthew Wood BSc Hons Dip TP MRTPI Associate Director	MW	23.09.21

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Comments on Main Modifications relating to EPP.R1.....	2

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Site Location

Appendix 2 – Proposed Access Scheme

1. Introduction

- 1.1 These representations are made by Phase 2 Planning on behalf of Greenacres Real Estate Ltd (GREL) who are developers and promoters of land at Greenacres, Ivy Chimney Road, Epping, Essex, CM16 4EL, which is part of allocation EPP.R1, and hereafter referred to as 'Greenacres'. The land in question is identified in Appendix 1 for clarity.
- 1.2 GREL and their predecessors, have promoted the land through the Local Plan process and support the allocation of EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 for residential development, and removal of the site from the Green Belt. GREL acknowledge the policy requirements for their site set out as the South Epping Masterplan Area and intend to positively collaborate in the preparation of a Strategic Masterplan for the site, and subsequently develop the land for housing upon the grant of planning permission.
- 1.3 This submission relates principally to Main Modification (MM) MM17, MM77 and MM78, which proposes a number of modifications to Policy EPP.R1 and EPP.R2. This submission also includes a response to supporting document EB1421 (South Epping Masterplan Capacity Analysis March 2020) that forms part of the supporting evidence base.
- 1.4 GREL broadly supports the modifications proposed within these MM but is seeking clarification regarding the Masterplan led delivery of site EPP.R1 in light of evidence contained within EB1421.

2. Comments on Main Modifications relating to EPP.R1

- MM77 – Policy EPP.R1 and EPP.R2

2.1 GREL supports the modification set out in MM77 to require due consideration of ‘Sustainable Transport Choices’ within the policy. There are significant opportunities to optimise sustainable transport choice within sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 due to their location close to the Epping town centre, London underground station and bus services.

2.2 Our comments expressed in relation to MM78 highlights that the access proposals depicted within the Council’s evidence base (Document EB1421) are not in their optimum form and by consequence conflict with the aspiration of optimising bus travel for the development and walking/cycling. This is addressed later within this submission.

- MM78 – Policy EPP.R1 and EPP.R2

- Supporting document EB1421 (South Epping Masterplan Capacity Analysis)

- Evidence base document ED133 (Response to Inspectors Actions)

Amend Policy P1 Part B

2.3 GREL acknowledges the reduced approximation of the number of homes anticipated to be delivered by EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 to 450 homes. However, we are concerned with the silence regarding intended phasing of these dwellings.

2.4 The context of this reduced approximation is explained within evidence base document ED133 which states:

“The proposed approximate capacity of 450 new dwellings is predicated on the current assessment of constraints for plan-making purposes. However, the Council recognises that there may be the potential for the SEMPA to deliver an increased number of dwellings to the 450 proposed for allocation and this is reflected in the wording of Policy P1 which proposes an approximate number of new dwellings across the site.[..]...”

Any increase in capacity beyond that identified in the Local Plan, would need to be justified through the submission of a robust Appropriate Assessment to demonstrate, amongst other things, that there would be no adverse impact on the integrity of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). This would include a delay on the delivery of any dwellings until after the results of additional traffic modelling on roads within 200m of the Epping Forest SAC which will be undertaken in 2024/25 in accordance with the adopted Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy. The Council proposes that the timescales for delivery of the site is managed through MMs to Policy P1. Other technical matters would also need to be addressed if any increase in capacity beyond that identified in the Local Plan was sought, including noise impact, air quality impact on human health and landscape sensitivity.”

- 2.5 ED133 is clear that the approximate number of dwellings within the policy, as amended through MM78, is not a ceiling or maximum. GREL submits that the supporting text to Policy P1 should clarify this fact to avoid potential for any future ambiguity in this respect.
- 2.6 ED133 further explains that the Council envisages the delivery of housing from 2028/29 but this phasing is not translated into policy. It continues to explain that delivery of any dwellings will be delayed until further modelling of traffic impact on roads within 200m of the Epping Forest SAC is undertaken in 2024/25. This trigger for phasing has significant implications on the delivery of dwellings from sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2. GREL and its promotional partners will require more certainty of phasing within the Plan in order to give confidence that they can commit the appropriate resources towards the planning process and delivery at the appropriate time. This is essential if the Council is to achieve its housing trajectory and align infrastructure with the delivery of new homes.
- 2.7 Accordingly, it is necessary for Policy P1, and DM2 and DM22, to commit to undertaking the additional modelling of the traffic impacts related to the Epping Forest SAC by no later than 2025. This is to give confidence to the development partners and infrastructure providers that this site is deliverable in accordance with the Council's housing delivery trajectory.
- 2.8 Notwithstanding, there may be evidence that supports an early phase of development that delivers key infrastructure and can contribute to housing supply earlier in the Plan period ahead of 2024/25. Document ED127 explains that no account has been made for 10% lapse rate of existing planning permissions and the removal of uses already contributing vehicle traffic which once developed for housing will result in a net reduction of emissions.
- 2.9 Accordingly, flexibility or further clarification is required within the policy so as not to unnecessarily delay otherwise suitable development.

New Part C

- 2.10 As set out in response to MM77, GREL supports the modification to require due consideration of 'Sustainable Transport Choices' within the policy. There are significant opportunities to optimise sustainable transport choice within sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 due to their location but we remain concerned that the access proposals depicted within the Council's evidence base (Document ED133) are not in their optimum form and by consequence conflict with the aspiration of optimising bus travel for the development and walking/cycling.

Amend Part D

- 2.11 GREL broadly supports the modifications to part D and the principle that development proposals will deliver/contribute proportionately towards infrastructure items required.

Amend Part G and Part H

- 2.12 GREL supports the clarity added to this policy. GREL refers to its comments in relation to Part

B made out above. It is entirely possible that phases of development at EPP.R1 could be delivered ahead of the proposed review in 2024/25 subject to satisfaction of Policy DM2 and DM22. Accordingly, the Council should ensure that there is consistency among its policies in this regard and avoid any ambiguity between conflicting statements or policies.

Amend Part J

- 2.13 GREL broadly supports the modification of Part J, which requires that future proposals are in general conformity with a Strategic Masterplan for the South Epping Masterplan Area, opposed to an inflexible full compliance. The latter could frustrate delivery of the site and therefore this modification will provide flexibility and enable the Council, promoters and developers of the allocation to be responsive to any changes in circumstances. This is important given that the site comprises multiple ownerships and the phasing of this site is later in the Plan period.
- 2.14 The modifications to Part J include a requirement that the South Epping Masterplan is to be formally endorsed by the Council prior to the determination of any applications. GREL supports the inclusion of this policy wording, which will ensure that a comprehensively planned approach to the planning, phasing and delivery of the site is undertaken. This will require joint working between the respective promoters and the Council. GREL intends to positively collaborate in the preparation of the Strategic Masterplan for the South Epping Masterplan Area and awaits contact from the Council in this regard.
- 2.15 However, GREL is concerned that MM78 does not go far enough and requires further modification in order for the policy, and by consequence the Plan, to be Sound.
- 2.16 Action 19 of the Inspections advice after hearings dated August 2019 (ED98) required the Council to review the site capacity work for EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, consider the need for delivery of a road bridge, review the number of dwellings for the site and projected timing of its delivery.
- 2.17 Document ED133 provides the Council's response to Action 19. The Council's response to Action 19 states that:
- "Council Officers have engaged positively and proactively with the site promoters of the South Epping Masterplan Area (SEMPA) in order to address the matters the Inspector raised. In March 2020, the promoters of EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 submitted a joint piece of work to the Council which related to the potential revised capacity of the SEMPA. The capacity study included an analysis on the matters raised by the Inspector."*
- 2.18 In the interest of clarification, the Council has engaged with only 2 of the 5 landowners/promoters of EPP.R1 and EPP.R2. The 'South Epping Masterplan Capacity Analysis' document (EB1421) is clear that its contributions are from only 2 landowners. The resulting Concept Plan and underlying analysis work does not relate to the full extent of the land proposed for removal from the Green Belt and allocated for housing under policy EPP.R1.

- 2.19 It is critical that GREL are involved in future capacity analysis/masterplanning of EPP.R1 to ensure that a comprehensive masterplanning process involving all promotional partners with interest in policy EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 is undertaken and key decisions set out within 'Capacity Analysis' document (EB1421) are not predetermined at this Plan making stage. Recognition is required that allocation EPP.R1 is within multiple ownership and requires all parties to deliver a comprehensive proposal.
- 2.20 Whilst GREL broadly support the indication from the capacity analysis work undertaken that the allocation is capable of delivering in excess of the revised approximation of 450 dwellings for both EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, there are deficiencies within the evidence, most notably the Concept Plan provided within EB1421, which illustrates that the capacity analysis undertaken is not in its optimum form and does not give confidence that the allocation can be delivered as indicated.
- 2.21 For example, GREL is concerned that the current access proposal identified as the primary vehicle access and movement framework for land parcel EPP.R1 within document EB1421 is deficient. GREL transport engineers (Ardent Consulting Engineers) have reviewed the access proposals presented in the Concept Plan (EB1421), which are not in their optimum form.
- 2.22 The suggested access position for EPP.R1 within the Concept Plan (EB1421) requires the demolition of two homes. The resulting access would have consequential impact on neighbouring dwellings adjoining the illustrative access for the entire length of their property boundary. Further, access at this point would create a crossroads junction with Centre Drive, which would be an inappropriate main point of access for such a development. The Essex Design Guide does not favour crossroad arrangements. This access is not therefore appropriate for primary access but could provide a potential emergency vehicle access point from the position shown on the Concept Plan (EB 1421) access. This would help to serve the development quantum without jeopardising the local highway network.
- 2.23 By comparison, the land within GREL control is capable of providing access to both immediate residential development, as well as providing a suitable access point into the wider EPP.R1 land. The proposed access point is at a suitable position on the Ivy Chimneys Road to achieve visibility splays in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance for a 30 mph road, and appropriate junction spacing from the adjacent development known as Meadow View to the immediate east. The access road has been designed in order to achieve the minimum requirements of a Type D Feeder Road (serving up to 700 units) whilst allowing for the potential for a bus service to run through the development should it be required. This access point is shown on Drawing 2105990-001 contained within **Appendix 2**.
- 2.24 The foregoing highlights the need for alternative access using other land within the policy allocation. GREL submit that the optimum access solution for EPP.R1 would require land at Greenacres, which accounts for 5.53% of the allocation. Access through this land is deliverable and would address the shortfalls of the current arrangement set about within EB1421.
- 2.25 This highlights that the current capacity analysis falls short of the necessary information to

give confidence that the full quantum of homes required by the policy are deliverable as shown.

- 2.26 The shortfalls within evidence base document (EB1421) can be resolved through the inclusion of all landowners/promoters in a more collaborative and comprehensive approach to the preparation of the South Epping Masterplan. It is recommended that this is required by policy to give certainty and confidence that a comprehensive Masterplan is prepared. Further clarification should therefore be added within the main modifications and we would suggest the following additions:

Amend Part J as follows:

“J. Development proposals in relation to sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 must ~~comply~~ be in general conformity with a Strategic Masterplan for the South Epping Masterplan Area, which has been prepared **collaboratively with the multiple owners of the site** and formally endorsed by the Council prior to the determination of any planning applications.” (Our suggested additions)

Part K

- 2.27 Modification of part (vi) is broadly supported. As set out in response to Part J above, GREL supports the requirement for all landowners with interest within EPP.R1 to work collaboratively towards the policy objectives of criteria (vi), among others, to provide the optimum access solution for the site. The current access strategy illustrated within the EB1421 capacity study is not consistent with this criteria, for example because of the potential impacts on living conditions of residents adjoining the access road. An alternative optimum access solution would prioritise access through the land at Greenacres as advocated by this submission.
- 2.28 In addition, recognition is also required that allocation EPP.R1 is within multiple ownership and requires all parties to deliver a comprehensive proposal. It is critical that GREL are involved in future capacity analysis/masterplanning of EPP.R1 to ensure that a comprehensive masterplanning process involving all promotional partners with interest in policy EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 is undertaken and key decisions set out within ‘Capacity Analysis’ document (EB1421) are not predetermined at this Plan making stage.
- 2.29 GREL therefore recommends the inclusion of an additional criteria which requires collaboration towards the objective of preparing an inclusive and comprehensive site masterplan. Our suggested additions is as follows:

“Prior to commencing work on a masterplan, developers or landowners should seek a meeting with planning officers to agree the form, content, level of detail and timetable for the preparation of the masterplan. Where sites are in multiple ownerships one owner may lead the process with the written agreement of all other owners.”

Part L

- 2.30 GREL supports the need to ensure that private car use is minimised and has confirmed in these representations that it looks forward to working collaboratively with its promotional partners to secure the optimal access and transportation solution to this site. This will require joint working and a masterplan that prioritises permeability and integrated walking and cycling strategies. Certainty is required to work towards this outcome and suitable wording is sought within the final policy drafting.
- 2.31 GREL is principally concerned with the restriction placed on the grant of any consent from these allocations because it is intrinsically linked to the Council's ability to resource and complete an air quality monitoring update within the range of 2024/25.
- 2.32 GREL is seeking more certainty within the Plan in order to give confidence that they can commit the appropriate resources towards the planning process and delivery at the appropriate time. This is essential if the Council is to achieve its housing trajectory and align infrastructure with the delivery of new homes.
- 2.33 Accordingly, it is necessary for other policies within this Plan, most notably Policy P1, DM2 and DM22, to commit to undertaking the additional modelling of impacts related to the Epping Forest SAC by no later than 2025.
- 2.34 Notwithstanding, the current wording would prevent or delay the prospect of an early or limited phase of development, which delivers key infrastructure and can contribute to boosting housing supply earlier in the Plan period. Document ED127 supports the view that there may be additional capacity ahead of 2024/25 in light of the fact that the Council's modelling has made no account for a lapse rate of existing planning permissions and the impact of ceasing uses already contributing vehicle traffic which once developed for housing.
- 2.35 Accordingly, MM78 Part L final sentence it is unnecessarily prohibitive to prevent the positive determination of a limited phase of development prior to the availability of the additional monitoring. Therefore flexibility or further clarification is required within the policy so as not to unnecessarily delay otherwise suitable development.

- **MM17 – Policy SP3**

- 2.36 As set out in the foregoing, GREL is seeking recognition that allocation EPP.R1 is within multiple ownership and requires all parties to deliver a comprehensive proposal. It is critical that all parties are involved in future capacity analysis/masterplanning of EPP.R1 to ensure that a comprehensive masterplanning process.
- 2.37 GREL therefore recommends the inclusion of an additional criteria which requires collaboration towards the objective of preparing an inclusive and comprehensive site masterplan. Our suggested additions is as follows:

"Prior to commencing work on a masterplan, developers or landowners should seek a meeting with planning officers to agree the form, content, level of detail and timetable for the

preparation of the masterplan. Where sites are in multiple ownerships one owner may lead the process with the written agreement of all other owners."

Site Description

The s locaed Greenacres, Ivy Chimney Road, Epping, Essex, CM16 4EL.

The site currently accommodates 1 No dwelling, several shed structures and the rest of the last is used for agriculture.

Immediately to the south of the site is the M25 motorway, with a deep row af trees separating the site boundary and the road.

Beyond the M25 to the South is Epping Forrest.

Epping Station is located just under 1 mile away to the North East of the site.



Appendix 2



Phase 2

PLANNING &
DEVELOPMENT
LIMITED