

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, louise@poservices.co.uk

HEARING AGENDA – WEEK 7, MATTER 15 ISSUE 2 (LOUGHTON) & MATTER 12 EMPLOYMENT

The hearing sessions for the above Matters will take place on **Tuesday 11 June 2019**.

The morning session will begin at 9.30am and the afternoon session will begin at 2pm.

Participants should be aware of my Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) (Document **ED5**) as they will provide the framework for discussion at the hearings. They should also be aware of the statements submitted in response to my MIQs by the Council and others. These are available on the website.

Some of my questions have been adequately answered in the statements so that limited discussion should be needed at the hearings themselves. Others require further discussion and the hearings will focus upon the outstanding matters on the following agendas.

In relation to the Loughton session, participants should note that it is not my role to examine the soundness of sites which might have been put forward for allocation but which the Council has not included in the plan. Therefore, as stated in paragraph 10 of my Guidance Note (Document **ED6**), such "omission sites" will not be discussed at the hearing sessions unless I have specific questions about them.

I look forward to seeing you at the hearings.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR

4 June 2019.

MATTER 15: Places and Sites (Policy P2 Loughton)

Issue 2: Are the Plan's policies for the specific places and sites within the District justified, effective and consistent with national policy; and are the specific site allocations they include justified and deliverable?

1. General Matters

- Current position concerning the effect of development proposed in Loughton on Junction 5 of the M11, including stance of Highways England.
- Proposed modifications to Policy P2 Part E so that financial contributions could potentially be sought for the expansion of primary and secondary schools and for improved pedestrian/cycle links.
- Should the Primary Shopping Areas and Primary Frontages in Loughton High Road (Map 5.4) and Loughton Broadway (Map 5.5) include the Sainsbury's stores? Implications either way.

2. Site Specific Matters

Residential Sites

- Explanation of proposed amendments to Appendix 6 for LOU.R2, R4 and R9 concerning the Roding Valley Meadows SSSI.

LOU.R1 & R2 (Underground Car Park Sites):

- Are the schemes proposed by the Plan/envisaged by the Council deliverable in light of TfL's Statement (19LAD0071), which includes the following points:
 - Viability work indicates that the number of units proposed on both sites would need to be increased, particularly in light of the need to re-provide commuter parking;
 - That podium or multi-storey parking would be required in addition to underground parking;
 - That part of R1 is not developable for operational reasons;
 - That TfL envisages buildings significantly larger than those suggested by the Council. Would such development be compatible with the character of the surrounding area?
- Has TfL raised similar issues in relation to the other station car parks proposed to be allocated for housing in the Plan?

LOU.R5 (Jessel Green Masterplan Area):

- Background to the allocation of this site. What has driven the allocation? Update on the master-planning process including likely timeframe for delivery.

- Findings of the Open Space Strategy, for amenity greenspace and other types of open space, including parks. Would alternative open spaces be easily accessible and fulfil a similar function?
- The objections: concerns regarding open space; character; other issues. Discussion of how the existing space is used and how the development proposed would affect this.

LOU.R14 – Land at Alderton Hill:

- Ref. Statement of Elysian Residences (19LAD0094) – is it necessary to revise the site area and dwelling capacity proposed in light of site availability issues?

Comments on other residential allocations **LOU.R3-R4**; or **R6-R13**; or **R15-R18**?

Employment Sites

LOU.E2 – Langston Road Industrial Estate:

- Proposed modifications to para. 5.37 and Policy P2(D) concerning the size and proposed use of the new allocation.
- Explanation of proposed Green Belt alteration no 46, including justification for removing the existing employment site and railway sidings from the Green Belt. Is this consistent with the approach to other designated employment sites within the Green Belt?

Comments on existing employment designations **LOU.E1** or **E3**?

MATTER 12: Employment

1. General Issues:

- Whether future needs for *all* types of employment generating use have been considered in reaching conclusions about how much additional land is required (such as *sui generis* uses, including construction; and retail warehousing (19LAD0122)).
- Whether the amount of land allocated for B8 use is justified relative to the amount allocated for other B-Class space; and the environmental impacts of this type of use.

2. (Issue 1) Are the requirements of Policy E1 justified, particularly in respect of financial contributions?

- Proposed modifications to clarify that Policy E1 should apply to B-Class employment uses, and to *Sui Generis* uses of an employment character.
 - Would the policy as amended allow for the change of use of a site from one type of employment type to another?
 - Explanation/discussion of consequential changes to other policies.
 - Are changes proposed in relation to the allocated use of any of the new site allocations? Are they justified?
- Explanation of proposed modification to the number of, and land area covered by, designated sites (in para. 3.50 and the deletion of WAL.E7).
- Proposal to delete part A(iii) concerning contributions to local employment training and small business growth programmes.

3. (Issue 2) Will Policy E2 be effective in protecting the vitality and viability of the District's identified centres? Does it support the role of retail warehousing, if appropriate?

- Reminder of Council's position in respect of meeting identified needs for retail development without making retail allocations.

4. (Issue 3) Will Policy E3 help to support the growth of the locally important glasshouse industry? Is the approach to this type of development consistent with that of surrounding authorities so that no disadvantage will result to operators in the District?

- Purpose/status of the Laurence Gould Partnership Report (EB604); its recommendations for the district; and the extent to which the Plan reflects these.

- Role of the Lea Valley Task Force; its aims for the glasshouse industry in the district; and the extent to which the Plan aims to/will deliver them.
- Concerns of the Lea Valley Growers Association: Would growers in Epping Forest be disadvantaged by the provision of specific policy criteria with which potential applications should conform? Why are the criteria necessary?
- Why does the Council favour a criteria-based approach to glasshouse provision over an allocations-based approach? What will be the effects of the change in approach?
- Concerns about “landlocking” of Abbey View Nursery in Waltham Abbey.
- Concerns of the LVRPA.
- Discussion of proposed modifications to Part B(i), (v) and (vi).
 - Is Part B consistent with the terms of para. 55 of the NPPF, particularly in relation to the need to demonstrate the “unviability” of the business without housing?
 - Are all subclauses (i) – (vi) intended to apply to new buildings, conversions and extensions, or just subclause (i)?
 - Is subclause (v) either justified or realistic, particularly if it is intended to apply to conversions or extensions?

5. (Issue 4) Is Policy E4 justified in terms of how it relates to tourism-related development in the Green Belt; and should it include specific provisions to support the expansion of the Lee Valley White Water Centre which lies outside the District?

- Proposed modification to para. 3.70 concerning the Lee Valley White Water Centre and the Council’s position that it is neither necessary nor appropriate to designate an associated “opportunity area” at this time.
- Has a need for any specific tourism-related facilities been identified, the delivery of which would be put at risk without an allocation in the plan?

6. Close of hearings stage of the examination.

End.