

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL: Examination of the District Local Plan, 2011 – 2033.

Inspector: Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

Programme Officer: Louise St John Howe, email: louise@poservices.co.uk

HEARING AGENDA – WEEK 3, MATTER 5

The hearing session concerning Matter 5, Site Selection and Viability, will take place on **Tuesday 19 March 2019**. In light of the number of participants, the session will be split so that the same agenda will be discussed in the morning and again in the afternoon. Participants in the afternoon session are welcome to observe the morning session, and *vice versa*. This might need to be from the Council Chamber.

- **The morning session will begin at 9.30am and end by 1.15pm.**
- **The afternoon session will begin at 2pm and end by 5.45pm.**

In the interests of fairness to all parties, the timings will be strictly adhered to. Consequently, I intend to run the sessions slightly differently to those already held.

Taking each main issue in turn, I will ask the Council to address all of the sub-issues/questions on the attached agenda. Other participants will then be invited to address whichever of the sub-issues/questions they wish. If there is time, participants will be able to make supplementary points, but they will only be guaranteed one opportunity to speak per main issue.

To provide a fair opportunity to all, participants will need to make their points clearly and succinctly. I might need to intervene if anyone speaks for a disproportionate length of time or repeats points already made. In this respect, I note that participants' statements raise similar issues of principle and it is about these that I mainly need to hear. Whilst I recognise that participants might wish to refer to omission sites to illustrate particular points, I will not be able to hear a detailed critique of the Council's assessment of any individual omission site.

I look forward to seeing you next week.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR

12 March 2019.

DAY 6: TUESDAY 19 MARCH 2019

MORNING SESSION (9.30AM) & AFTERNOON SESSION (2PM)

MATTER 5: Site Selection & Viability

Issue 1 and Issue 3: Have the Plan's housing and new employment allocations been chosen on the basis of a robust assessment process?

- The site selection/sifting process:
 - Justification for Settlement Buffer Zones as a "major policy constraint" at Stage 1.
 - Role/transparency of Officer and Member workshops in identifying preferred strategic options and sites within those options at Stage 3 (and stage 4).
 - Were site assessed individually or as part of larger parcels as in the Green Belt Review?
 - Was information submitted by site promoters taken into account – e.g. evidence to show how flood risk could be mitigated?
 - Were errors reported through Regulation 18 consultation or otherwise checked (e.g. Statement 19LAD0061/5 in relation to Marden Ash; and suggestions such as that a site covered in hardstanding was discounted for being BMV agricultural land)?
 - Do any errors/comments reported in response to Tranche 2 sites (or potentially Tranche 1 sites) through the Regulation 19/20 process necessitate amendments to the submitted plan?
 - Relationship between SSR and SA/HRA (at Stage 5). Integrated or separate processes? If the latter, were amendments made as a result of Stage 5? Were likely effects on Epping Forest SAC taken into account?

- The Historic Environment:
 - Status of the SoCG with Historic England?
 - Proposed MMs: largely relevant for other sessions (Matters 8, 15 and 16).
 - Absence of Heritage Impact Assessments – is there a significant risk that the effect of any allocation (within the Garden Town or elsewhere) could not be avoided or mitigated to the extent that it could not be developed in the form proposed?

- Utilising the Capacity of Suitable Sites:
 - Para. 2.76 and Table 2.7 of the SSR indicate that the capacity of sites potentially suitable for residential development far exceeded the residual requirement outside Harlow. How was the list reduced? Why could more sites not be allocated?

- Proposed MM to delete sequential approach to the allocation of housing sites within Policy SP2(A).
- Justification for the allocation of station car parks (**EPP.R3; LOU.R1, LOU.R2; BUCK.R2; THYB.R2**) and other car parks (**EPP.R6, EPP.R7**) for housing:
 - Evidence that sufficient parking for commuters and residents can be provided on LOU.R1, BUCK.R2 and THYB.R2?
 - What form of development is envisaged on LOU.R1 and R2 to achieve the requisite density? Is this compatible with the surrounding area?
 - Does/should the relevant policy wording for each site require existing commuter parking to be re-provided along with sufficient residential parking? Is it necessary to specify the number of spaces?
 - Proposed MM re. short term disruption of commuter parking.

Issue 2: Have the Plan’s allocations for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople been chosen on the basis of a robust assessment process?

- Justification for allocations within Strategic Masterplan sites within the Garden Town, North Weald Bassett and Waltham Abbey.
- Were existing sites for redevelopment/expansion assessed against the site selection criteria in the TSSM in the same way as potential new sites?
- The sequential approach to site selection in Policy SP2(D):
 - Prioritising new Traveller sites in the Green Belt (SP2(D)(iv)) over provision as part of allocated sites (SP2(D)(v)).
 - Is the sequential approach in SP2(D) required now that the allocation process is complete?

Issue 4: At the broad strategic level, are the Plan’s allocations financially viable?

- Developer Contributions:
 - What level of financial contributions does the evidence support? Is this realistic? Has this informed the scale of the funding gaps identified in the IDP?
 - Is the level of contributions allowed for at the Garden Town sites and the Plan’s other strategic allocations sufficient in light of the infrastructure requirements they generate?
 - What are the implications of paragraph 57 of the NPPF, February 2019, for the approach to viability taken within this Plan?

End.