

## **Epping Forest District Council: Examination of the District Local Plan, 2011-2033**

### **19STAT0030 Roydon Parish Council**

Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Matter 15 Issue 2,

Policy P9 Roydon

#### *General Matters:*

1. Yes, the parish council has already noted that there is an anomaly in the 'Vision for Roydon (village)' statement – there is no glasshouse industry in the village but there is in the wider parish which encompasses areas such as Broadley Common, Dobbs Weir and Hamlet Hill. And whilst the parish council does not agree with traveller allocations RUR.T1 and T2, the plan should make it clear that these are located within Roydon parish (Hamlet Hill) and are not Rural sites.
2. No, Roydon village and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) peacefully co-exist alongside each other and the Parish Council believes that this relationship should be highlighted within the plan. The development sites are not adjacent to the park however it should be acknowledged that any overdevelopment of Roydon village would have a negative impact not only on the green belt but also on LVRPA. Other than local use, access to LVRPA is by train and by bike/on foot using existing towpaths etc. as there is no parking provision and this access should be maintained and noted within the plan.

#### *Site Specific Matters:*

3. ROYD.R1 & R2. Clarification of any site specific concerns, as highlighted by Affinity Water, should be detailed in the 'Development Requirements' for each site to ensure that these matters are dealt with. Water pressure, sewage capacity and drainage concerns have been raised by residents living nearby.
4. ROYD.R1, R2, R3, R4. The Parish Council is reluctant to support any alteration to the green belt boundary around the village, but accepts that small scale amendments may be necessary for the development of sites as proposed in the plan. However this development can only be supported if it is designed appropriately and is in keeping with a village setting. Site density, at the level proposed, rather than any higher is considered appropriate. It should also be pointed out that since 2011, 75 new dwellings have been developed within Roydon village and these (together with a total of 69 dwellings elsewhere in the parish) must be counted towards housing allocation for this area for the plan period. This is a significant amount of development for a rural area and the Parish Council could not support any further development as this would necessitate the release of green belt land, which would impact on the conservation area and LVRPA and which would increase housing

within the village and the parish (excluding the large scale Harlow extensions into Roydon parish) beyond that which would be proportionally acceptable.

## **Epping Forest District Council: Examination of the District Local Plan, 2011-2033**

### **19STAT0030 Roydon Parish Council**

Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Matter 15

Issue 2, Policies P13 - P15 Rural Sites in the East, West and South of the District

*RUR.T1 (Sons Nursery) and T2 (Ashview)*

The Parish Council has already highlighted that temporary permission for these sites was granted primarily because of the special circumstances of the occupants with the inspector acknowledging, in each case, the harm to the Green Belt. In the case of T1, the inspector determined that the site be returned to its natural condition upon expiry of the permission. The Parish Council would argue that the proposal by EFDC for the permanent allocation of sites which are currently temporary (and which have only been given permission because of special circumstances) is an unacceptably passive way of finding suitable traveller plots particularly when the conditions applicable to these temporary permissions have not been met. This would also set an unacceptable precedent for other temporary sites (as well as unauthorised sites of which there are many in the parish). The allocation of these sites for permanent traveller accommodation is therefore unjustified.