

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

Stakeholder ID 1984 Name Robert Pilcher

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:

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

Agree

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 1984

Name Robert

Pilcher

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

Epping?

No opinion

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The 'potential new employment sites' in Nazeing are located proximate to existing employment uses, which we support.

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)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Draft policy P10 - Nazeing We support the proposed extension to the south of Nazeing along Middle Road. There is existing housing on the north side of this section of Middle Street, between Old House Lane and Perry Hill. This area is therefore characterised by housing and bringing forward further housing to the south of Middle Street provides a logical and appropriate extension to Lower Nazeing. To the west of Old House Lane and to the east of Perry Hill there is also housing along the south of Middle Street and therefore increasing the housing density on this section of Middle Street is supported and will help the Council to meet their sustainable development objective set out in draft policy SP2. However, we question whether the land

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

currently proposed to be allocated (SR-0300a and SR-0300b) is appropriate to provide the number of units proposed (50 units) and to be delivered within the plan period. The Council has currently proposed to allocate two plots along Middle Street in south Nazeing: - SR-0300a - this site forms agricultural land and can be accessed via Middle Street and Perry Hill. - SR-0300b - this site comprises of a residential property with a large garden, known as Ninnings. The property is Grade II Listed and fronts Middle Street. To the west of the property is a field, held in the same ownership as Ninnings. The Council has not allocated the parcel of land to the west of the above two sites. We consider that this land should be allocated as it is a suitable site for housing. This land is owned by our client,Redacted.... The plot comprises of a large field totalling 2.46 ha (labelled plot 2 on the attached plan). The site is boarded by Old House Lane to the west, Perry Hill to the south and a residential property, Shadwalkers which fronts on to Middle Street, to the north. To the east is the land current proposed to be allocated. A plan showing the extent of land owned by our client has been attached to this question. Our client also owns Shadwalkers (plot 1 on the attached plan) and therefore access to the site from Middle Street can be facilitated through land owned and controlled by our client. Access to the site from Middle Street would not impact upon or cause harm to the residential propertyRedacted...., which is Grade II Listed, or its setting. Access could alternatively be provided via Old House Lane or Perry Hall. We have previously put forward this site for residential development on behalf ofRedacted.... as part of the June 2016 'Landowner and Promoter Survey 2016'. Prior to this, the land formed part of a wider site that was identified by the Council as a potential housing allocation site in the Epping Forest Local Plan- Issues and Options (2012) and the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) prepared by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners (May 2012). We consider that the rear plot of land owned byRedacted.... is a suitable and sustainable site for residential development and should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing in the Local Plan, for the following reasons: - Our client's site is available and deliverable and our client would be willing to work with neighbouring landowners to bring the site forward. Our client questions whether the landowner of Ninnings would wish to bring forward development in the near future. - The site is accessible, located within walking distance of the services provided in Nazeing and road access can be provided to the site - Retaining the site in the Green Belt results in it becoming an island site which does not meet the purposes of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (see response to question 9) - The draft plan provides limited detail on the exact site boundary proposed to be allocated in south Nazeing but we consider that circa 2.5 ha is proposed to be allocated. A large part of the allocated land, circa 0.45 ha, comprises of Ninnings and its garden, on which there is limited opportunity for development, due to the need to protect and preserve the Grade II Listed Building, Ninnings and its setting. Further land should be allocated in order to bring forward an appropriate quantum of housing in this part of Nazeing, to meet the policy objective of SP2 which states that the Council will provide 220 new homes in Nazeing. - In order to ensure that Ninnings andRedacted.... (Grade II listed) and their setting can be preserved, and to enable the Council to deliver much needed housing in this part of Nazeing we consider that our client's land should be allocated by the Council to enable a sustainable extension to the south of Nazeing. - Our client's land provides the opportunity to bring forward a development of housing in south Nazeing at an appropriate density, that is sympathetic to the site's location on the edge of the green belt and a small village. - The land currently proposed by the Council for allocation is fairly narrow. The addition of our client's land parcel would create a larger and deeper site, opening up the opportunity for a well thought out high quality designed small community, which could provide not just houses but also open space/ child's play space to ensure sustainable development. - The allocation of our client's land would help to facilitate the Council's place shaping principles set out in draft policy SP 4, including providing high quality and imaginatively designed homes with generous gardens. Open space could be delivered as part of the development to meet the objectives of draft policy DM6 and to provide residents of Nazeing with access to usable, accessible, well connected and biodiversity rich green space provision. The site is currently privately owned and not open or accessible to the public. - This part of south Nazeing, along Middle Street and Perry Hall has the opportunity to provide high quality housing that respects the site's location on the edge of the green belt and meets the policy objectives of draft policies DM9 and DM10.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

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

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:

....Redacted....

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

No opinion

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.

No Comment

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

Draft policy SP 5 Green Belt and District Open Land

Draft policy SP 5 Green Belt and District Open Land - Policy SP 5 states that the general extent of the Green Belt is set out in Figure 3.8. Figure 3.8 shows that the proposed allocated sites SR-0300a and SR-0300b are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. Whilst we support the need for these parcels to be removed from the Green Belt, to facilitate development in Nazeing, this results in our client's site, fronting Middle Street, becoming an island green belt site. We therefore consider that the Green Belt boundary should be changed to remove the land owned by our client from the Green Belt. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries local planning authorities should "define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent". Moving the boundary of the green belt to Perry Hall and Old House Lane, which are physical features, would establish a readily recognisable and permanent boundary, which the currently proposed boundary is not. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF also requires local authorities to "ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development". In order to promote sustainable development in the borough and meet Draft policy SP2, which states that the Council will provide approximately 11,400 new homes in the plan period, including 220 in Nazeing, the Council should removeRedacted.... land from the Green Belt. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. We do not consider that the subject land parcels meets these five purposes for the reasons set out below: •to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - there is existing housing located to the north, east and west of the site and further housing is expected to come forward immediately to the east under the draft site allocations (SR-0300a and SR-0300b). There is a road to the south of the site and a residential dwelling beyond this. The site is therefore an island Green Belt site, surrounded by existing and proposed development and its Green Belt designation does not serve to prevent unrestricted sprawl of Nazeing. Perry Hill, to the south of the site, is a physical feature and permanent boundary to Nazeing and therefore the site does not meet this Green Belt purpose. - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: the site's Green Belt designation does not prevent neighbouring

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

towns merging into one another - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: the site is surrounded by residential properties and it is located within Nazeing, not the Countryside. The site does not therefore safeguard the site from encroachment. - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: the designation of this land as Green Belt does not serve to preserve the setting and character of Nazeing because of its position, surrounded by existing and proposed development. - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: the majority of Epping Forest is in the Green Belt and it is necessary for the Council to release land from the Green Belt, to meet housing requirements and other plan policies. Retaining this site in the Green Belt will not encourage the recycling of derelict or other urban land as it is already necessary for the Council to release Green Belt land. The site should be released to enable other sites that do meet the NPPF's Green Belt purposes to be protected and retained as Green Belt.

Policy P10 - Nazing

Please find attached a Call for Sites Submission, submitted on behalf of ...Redacted.... . A copy of this has also been set to the Council via email (09/12/2016)
