



epping forest district

planning our future

local plan



Epping Forest  
District Council

# PLANNING OUR FUTURE

---

*Community Choices*

Issues & Options for the Local  
Plan

Consultation Document  
July 2012



EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

If you would like a copy of this document in any other format, for example in large print or another language, please contact Epping Forest District Council on 01992 564517 or email [ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

You can also view this document online, and make comments, at <http://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/planningourfuture>

## Foreword

There has been a lot of change in the “planning world” over the last couple of years. Much of the previous guidance, and most of the higher level plans have been abolished, with a requirement that district councils now take responsibility for planning for their own areas.

Local Plans have been in place for the area covered by Epping Forest District since the 1980s, and have performed well in protecting the Green Belt and directing necessary development to the right places. We now find ourselves in a position where the land available for development within our existing towns and villages is running out, yet national planning policy requires that we make necessary provision for new houses and jobs. We therefore need to adopt a new Local Plan for the district which makes such provision. If we do not make some planned provision for new growth we will be in a much weaker position to protect the rest of the Green Belt.

As part of this process we will also be looking at the infrastructure that is already planned, and what should be provided to support new development.

It is important to stress that this document is not a policy document. It does not replace the existing Local Plan at this stage. We are presenting what we think are all of the current planning issues and potential options, and seeking your views on these. This is your opportunity to get involved and help shape the future of Epping Forest District – this really is all about “Community Choices”.

We realise that holding a significant consultation period during this summer, whilst so many other events are being held, is not ideal. We are therefore allowing a longer consultation period, from 6 weeks which is the statutory minimum, to just over 11 weeks. Changes to national policy mean that the existing Local Plan ceases to be in effect from April 2013. We must therefore work quickly to ensure that we can protect the district from inappropriate development.

**Councillor Richard Bassett, Portfolio Holder (PFH)  
for Planning**

July 2012



<b><u>Contents</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Foreword	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Index of Tables	v
Index of Diagrams	vi
Glossary	vii-ix
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The district in 2011 and 2033, including our vision and aims</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Green Belt and the natural and built heritage of the district</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4. Options for growth and distribution of development:</b>	<b>22</b>
a. Housing;	23
b. Economic development;	36
c. Harlow;	42
d. Distribution of growth;	49
e. Settlement analysis:	71
i) Buckhurst Hill	73
ii) Chigwell	77
iii) Chipping Ongar	85
iv) Epping	95
v) Loughton / Debden	105
vi) Lower Nazeing	117
vii) Lower Sheering	123
viii) North Weald	129
ix) North Weald Airfield	135
x) Roydon	139
xi) Theydon Bois	143
xii) Thornwood Common	147
xiii) Waltham Abbey	153
<b>5. Housing</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>6. Economic development:</b>	<b>171</b>
a. Town centres;	171
b. Employment land;	177
c. Rural economy	181
<b>7. Transport, access and movement</b>	<b>184</b>
<b>8. Infrastructure and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>9. Responding to climate change</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>10. Community facilities</b>	<b>191</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>193</b>

## Index of Tables

The numbering of the tables below reflects which chapter the table appears in, e.g. Table 4.1 appears in chapter 4.

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 4.1	Population Forecasts	24
Table 4.2	Housing Target Options	34
Table 4.3	Analysis of possible job growth by sector	37
Table 4.4	Forecast job growth to 2033 from the Employment Land Review	38
Table 4.5	Land requirements of forecast job growth from the Employment Land Review	38
Table 4.6	Estimated employment land requirement from the Employment Land Review	39
Table 4.7	Forecast retail job growth from Town Centres Study	39
Table 4.8	Total land requirement based on need / demand identified in the Employment Land Review and Town Centres Study evidence base documents	40
Table 4.9	Job growth targets	41
Table 4.10	Growth options around Harlow	44
Table 4.11	Proportionate Distribution (for information only)	50
Table 4.12	Spatial Option 1	51
Table 4.13	Spatial Option 2	55
Table 4.14	Spatial Option 3	57
Table 4.15	Spatial Option 4	59
Table 4.16	Spatial Option 5	62
Table 4.17	Spatial Option 6	65
Table 4.18	Spatial Option 7	67
Table 4.19	Potential development options for Buckhurst Hill	74
Table 4.20	Potential development options for Chigwell	78
Table 4.21	Potential development options for Chipping Ongar	86
Table 4.22	Potential development options for Epping	96
Table 4.23	Potential development options for Loughton / Debden	106
Table 4.24	Potential development options for Lower Nazeing	118
Table 4.25	Potential development options for Lower Sheering & Sheering	124
Table 4.26	Potential development options for North Weald	130
Table 4.27	Potential development options for Roydon	140
Table 4.28	Potential development options for Theydon Bois	144
Table 4.29	Potential development options for Thornwood Common	148
Table 4.30	Potential development options for Waltham Abbey	154

## Index of Diagrams

The numbering of the diagrams below reflects which chapter the diagram appears in, e.g. Diagram 2.1 appears in chapter 2.

<u>Diagram</u>	<u>Page</u>	
Diagram 2.1	Population Key Facts	3
Diagram 2.2	Internal migration into and out of EFDC in 2010	4
Diagram 2.3	Migration into and out of EFDC over time	5
Diagram 2.4	International Migration into and out of EFDC over time	5
Diagram 2.5	Households Key Facts	6
Diagram 3.1	Potential Strategic Green Belt gaps	18
Diagram 4.1	Options for development distribution around Harlow	43
Diagram 4.2	Spatial Option 1: Proportionate Distribution	53
Diagram 4.3	Spatial Option 2: Transport Focus – Proportionate Distribution	56
Diagram 4.4	Spatial Option 3: Transport Focus – Equal Distribution	58
Diagram 4.5	Spatial Option 4: Development away from the Central Line – Proportionate Distribution	61
Diagram 4.6	Spatial Option 5: Development away from the Central Line – Equal Distribution	63
Diagram 4.7	Spatial Option 6: Large Settlements – Proportionate Distribution	66
Diagram 4.8	Spatial Option 7: Large Settlements – Equal Distribution	68
Diagram 4.9	Potential development options for Buckhurst Hill	73
Diagram 4.10	Potential development options for Chigwell	77
Diagram 4.11	Potential development options for Chipping Ongar	85
Diagram 4.12	Potential development options for Epping	95
Diagram 4.13	Potential development options for Loughton / Debden	105
Diagram 4.14	Potential development options for Lower Nazeing	117
Diagram 4.15	Potential development options for Lower Sheering & Sheering	123
Diagram 4.16	Potential development options for North Weald	129
Diagram 4.17	Potential development options for North Weald Airfield	135
Diagram 4.18	Potential development options for Roydon	139
Diagram 4.19	Potential development options for Theydon Bois	143
Diagram 4.20	Potential development options for Thornwood Common	147
Diagram 4.21	Potential development options for Waltham Abbey	153
Diagram 5.1	15 dwellings per hectare: The Crescent, Loughton	167
Diagram 5.2	36 dwellings per hectare: Theydon Grove, Epping	167
Diagram 5.3	42 dwellings per hectare: Meadow Road, Loughton	168
Diagram 5.4	73 dwellings per hectare: Kendall / Harrison Road, off Meridian Way, Waltham Abbey	168

**Glossary**

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
Baseline	A measurement used as a basis for comparison
BREEAM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
CA	Conservation Area
CC	County Council
CFMP	Catchment Flood Management Plan
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CLG	(Department of) Communities and Local Government
Comparison retail shops	Selling goods not normally bought on a day-to-day basis, and where the purchase may be the result of visits to a number of shops to 'compare' prices, eg clothing, footwear, furniture, furnishings and household equipment
Convenience retail shops	Selling items purchased on a daily basis, eg food, drinks (alcoholic and non-alcoholic), tobacco, newspapers, magazines, small household goods and materials
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide. The phrase 'Carbon emissions' refers to Carbon Dioxide, which acts as a Greenhouse Gas
CPZ	Controlled Parking Zone
CSH	Code for Sustainable Homes
DC	District Council
dph	Dwellings per hectare
EA	Environment Agency
East of England	Region including the six counties of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk & Suffolk
ECC	Essex County Council
EEFM	East of England Forecasting Model

EEP	East of England Plan (also known as Regional Spatial Strategy)
EERA	East of England Regional Assembly
EFDC	Epping Forest District Council
ELR	Employment Land Review
EMG	Ethnic Minority Group
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
Hectare (ha)	Area of 10,000 square metres, equivalent to 2.47 acres (conversely 1 acre is 0.4 ha)
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
IMD	Index (Indices) of Multiple Deprivation
KSI	Killed or Seriously Injured
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment
LDF	Local Development Framework
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
LGV	Light Goods Vehicle
LIP	Local Investment Plan
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LoWS	Local Wildlife Site
LP	Local Plan
LTP	Local Transport Plan
LU	London Underground
LVRP(A)	Lee Valley Regional Park (Authority)
LVWWC	Lee Valley White Water Centre
MGB	Metropolitan Green Belt
NHS	National Health Service
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework



NWA	North Weald Airfield
ONS	Office of National Statistics
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PFH	Portfolio Holder
PLASC	Pupil Level Annual School Census
Plot ratio	Ratio of building's <u>total</u> floor area (ie including all storeys) to area of parcel of land it is built on
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance (Note)
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PTAL	Public Transport Accessibility Level
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SEA	Sustainable Environmental Assessment
SELSS	Settlement Edge Landscape Sensitivity Study
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SLAA	Strategic Land Availability Assessment
SNPP	Sub-National Population Projection
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage System(s)
TCS	Town Centres Study
TfL	Transport for London
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
WW2	Second World War

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document includes information on the current knowledge and thinking on the future development of the area. This is not a policy document, and you should not assume that all areas identified here will end up being designated as development sites in the final version of the Local Plan. This is the first opportunity for you to tell us whether we have identified all the significant issues for the future planning of the district, and to give us your views on the options we have included. Have we missed anything – please let us know. This is an early stage of plan making and we don't have all the answers yet. Where there are significant gaps in our knowledge at present, we highlight this and ask for views on how we can fill these gaps.
- 1.2 The Evidence Base documents that the Council has used to help draft this consultation document are available to view on the website here:  
<http://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/index.php/home/file-store/category/105-evidence-base>

### What is the Local Plan and what does it cover?

- 1.3 Previous regulations required each local authority to produce a Local Development Framework (LDF) which would have comprised a series of documents covering different matters. The recent changes in regulations mean the Council must now prepare a full Local Plan (LP).
- 1.4 This Local Plan will set out the planning policies and land allocations that will guide development in Epping Forest District over the next 20 years. The LP will use the views of the local community and a robust evidence base to establish a vision for how the district will develop along with more detailed planning policies and land allocations to deliver:
- conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape;
  - the homes and jobs needed in the area;
  - the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
  - the provision of infrastructure for transport, energy (including heat), telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater and flood risk management;
  - the provision of health, security, community and cultural services and other local facilities; and
  - climate change mitigation and adaptation.

### How is the Local Plan prepared?

- 1.5 The LP will bring together the evidence we have collated, and the views of residents and businesses, to adopt the most appropriate planning policies for the district for the next 20 years. There are a number of stages of preparation, and the information below gives the current anticipated timetable:

Community Visioning & research	Winter 2010/2011
<b>Community Choices (Issues &amp; Options)</b>	<b>30 July to 15 October (12 noon) 2012</b>
Draft Local Plan (Preferred Options)	May 2013
Submission Local Plan	Autumn 2013
Examination in Public	Winter 2013/14
Local Plan adopted	Spring 2014

- 1.6 A robust evidence base has been gathered which includes the findings of a number of studies on housing, employment, the natural environment and other strategic issues. The evidence base also contains the views of the local community following feedback from the “*Community Visioning*” exercise which was carried out between November 2010 and January 2011.

#### **What about the East of England Plan?**

- 1.7 The East of England Plan (EEP) is the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England, of which Epping Forest District is part. It was published in May 2008, and set housing and employment growth targets for each local authority area. The Government has made clear its intention to abolish all RSSs, but this has not yet formally occurred. No timetable has been published for the proposed abolition of the EEP, but it is anticipated that this will occur before the Local Plan can be adopted. EFDC is therefore considering both the requirements of the EEP, and other locally assessed growth targets at this stage.

#### **What is “Community Choices” about? How can I get involved?**

- 1.8 The Council wants the people who live, work and invest in Epping Forest District to understand more about the choices available to the Council as local planning authority. We also want to know your opinions about those choices, as well as telling us if you think we have missed an important issue at this stage – something that the Local Plan should address but has not been identified in this document.
- 1.9 Please get involved – attend exhibitions, look at information on our website, complete and return the questionnaire online or by post.

#### **How does it fit with the new Neighbourhood Plans?**

- 1.10 The Government has introduced Neighbourhood Plans as a way for town and parish councils in Epping Forest District to have a positive impact on how their area will change over time. These Neighbourhood Plans must be prepared in accordance with the adopted Local Plan, and are drafted and funded primarily by town and parish councils.
- 1.11 Epping Forest District Council will support the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans where possible. Our focus at this stage, however, is to prepare a new Local Plan for the whole district. The full implications of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be incorporated into new planning policies for the district. If this is not done quickly the Council will be in a weaker position to refuse applications for planning permission that it considers are inappropriate.
- 1.12 In due course, the Council intends to work closely with town and parish councils to help in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. In the meantime, there is information available from the Rural Community Council for Essex or the Planning Advisory Service on the preparation of these plans should any town or parish council be interested in looking into the requirements.

#### **Question 1:**

Do you consider that the change in scope of the Local Plan (section 1.3) has been clearly explained? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is unclear and needs further explanation?

## 2. The District in 2011 and 2033, including our Vision and Aims

### Population

- 2.1 The district's population has grown steadily over the last 50 years, from 108,000 people in 1961<sup>1</sup> to almost 124,700 in 2010. Population estimates and projections issued since the 2001 Census indicate that the population could continue to rise to a total of roughly 142,900 by 2033.
- 2.2 The vast majority of the population (91.2%) was White British in 2001, meaning the proportion of 'non White British' people was 8.8%. This latter group increased to an estimated 17.7% in 2009. A more diverse population is likely to require different forms of housing, which will affect how the Council plans for housing in the future. For example, people in some ethnic groups tend to form multi-generational households<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.3 2010 estimates (published 2011) suggest that the district's population is older than the average for Essex, and for England and Wales as a whole. Epping Forest District has less people in the 20 to 39 age bracket (23.5%, compared to 24.2% in Essex and 26.8% in England and Wales). Conversely, the district has more people within the 40 to 59 bracket (28.6%, compared to 27.4% in Essex and 26.8% in England and Wales).
- 2.4 Projections suggest that this situation will become more pronounced in the next 20 years, as the larger, already 'older' population ages further, leading to a higher 'average age' for the district. This is particularly apparent in the 75 to 90+ age bracket. These trends could significantly affect the need for future healthcare provision and for different types of housing.
- 2.5 Life expectancy in Epping Forest District is higher than the national average, and is rising steadily, following the national trend. However, it does vary significantly in different areas of the district. Fertility rates have, on average, risen in the last ten years, suggesting that women in the district are giving birth more frequently than their predecessors. Mortality rates are steadily decreasing year on year, in line with the national trend. The result of these trends is a fairly small (approximately 200) net gain of population most years, purely from the district's existing residents.
- 2.6 A large part of the population in the district (39.4%) lives within the more urban areas of Loughton, Grange Hill,

#### Diagram 2.1 POPULATION KEY FACTS

##### Total population

1961	107,700
1971	115,029
1981	116,548
1991	116,434
2001	120,896
2010*	124,700
2031*	141,200
2033*	142,900

##### Ethnicity split:

###### in 2001

% White British	91.2%
% Non White British	8.8%

###### In 2009\* (difference from 2001)

% White British	-9.0%
% Non White British	+9.0%

##### Age split:

###### in 2010\*

% aged <20	23.3%
% aged 20-39	23.5%
% aged 40-59	28.6%
% aged 60-74	15.8%
% aged 75-90+	8.6%

###### In 2033\* (difference from 2010)

% aged <20	-1.0%
% aged 20-39	-2.0%
% aged 40-59	-2.5%
% aged 60-74	+1.8%
% aged 75-90+	+3.7%

##### Average life expectancy (born 2000-09)

Epping Forest*	80.0
Essex*	79.2

\* estimates / projections

<sup>1</sup> Epping Forest District became an administrative area in 1974. The population for the district area before this date is taken as the sum of the populations of each constituent parish.


<sup>2</sup> 'Findings': Ethnic minority families – Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1998

and Buckhurst Hill. The market towns of Epping, Chipping Ongar and Waltham Abbey have 29.9%, and the rural areas (including the larger villages such as North Weald, Theydon Bois and Nazeing) account for the remaining 30.7%<sup>3</sup>.

**Internal Migration (within the UK)**

- 2.7 In terms of internal migration, the trend in recent years is for people to leave London to come to this district, and for local residents to leave the district to go to other areas in the East of England<sup>4</sup>.
- 2.8 In 2010 the district had a net gain of approximately 1,830 people from London, and a net loss of approximately 1,260 to other areas within the East of England region (comprising the counties of Essex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk). Within the region, the main exchange of population takes place between the district and other Essex districts. The net effect of all of these exchanges was a net gain of approximately 270 people in 2010.

Diagram 2.2 – Internal migration into and out of EFDC in 2010




- 2.9 The chart below shows migration over the period 2001 to 2010. There has been an average net gain of just over 300 people a year.

<sup>3</sup> According to ward-level estimates for 2010

<sup>4</sup> Data from 'Moves within England and Wales: Migration Statistics' (ONS 2010)


Diagram 2.3 - Migration into and out of EFDC over time



**International Migration (to/from the UK)**

2.10 Over the last few years there have generally been slightly more people emigrating from the district to countries outside the UK, than there have been immigrating into the district<sup>5</sup>. This means that there has generally been a net loss of people through international migration. However, the figures for 2009-10 show a small net gain for the first time in the last 7 years. The chart below shows international migration over the period 2003-04 to 2009-10. There has been an average net loss of roughly 340 people a year.

Diagram 2.4 – International Migration into and out of EFDC over time



<sup>5</sup> Local Area Migration Indicators Tool – figures are to the nearest 100 people (2012)

## Education

- 2.11 The number of children in state primary and secondary schools in the district has varied slightly since 2001. Overall, the total number of primary pupils in schools in 2011 was 8,337 (down 476 since 2001), but the number of secondary school pupils in 2011 was 5,807 (up 235 since 2001)<sup>6</sup>. In 2011, there were an additional 2,102 students attending Epping Forest College, the only further education college within the district.
- 2.12 There are a total of 38 state primary schools in the district, with a further six independent primary schools and three special schools which take primary age pupils. There are six state secondary schools in the district, of which only Davenant Foundation and West Hatch High Schools have sixth forms. Epping Forest College is the only other state facility for pupils from 16-19 years. There are a further three independent private schools in the district, two of which (Chigwell School and Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College (also in Chigwell)) have sixth forms.
- 2.13 A significant proportion of pupils studying in the district's schools live outside Epping Forest (16.4%)<sup>7</sup>. These pupils are most commonly from Redbridge (8.6%), Harlow (4.7%) or Waltham Forest (1.2%). In contrast, some 9.5% of pupils who live in Epping Forest study elsewhere<sup>8</sup>, most regularly in Brentwood (6.0%), Harlow (1.8%), and Chelmsford (1.0%). A much smaller number study in Uttlesford, Basildon, Braintree, Maldon, Redbridge or Waltham Forest.

## Deprivation

- 2.14 The population of the district is on average fairly affluent, but there are particular pockets of deprivation generally in the larger towns and urban areas, e.g. Waltham Abbey, Loughton Broadway and Grange Hill. This information comes from the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010 which combines a number of indicators, such as economic, social and housing issues.

## Households

- 2.15 The number of households (i.e. families and people either living alone or together in a dwelling) has risen steadily in the past 40 years, from 38,000 in the early 1970s to roughly 54,000 in 2011. This figure is projected to increase to approximately 64,000 by 2033, in line with an increase in population. Estimates and projections show that the rise in the number of households is slightly lower than the Essex average.

### Diagram 2.5 HOUSEHOLDS KEY FACTS

#### *Total households*

1971	38,304
1981	42,309
1991	46,685
2001	50,590
2011*	54,000
2033*	64,000

#### *One person households*

2001	29.1%
2008*	32.7%
2033*	41.5%

#### *Households without children*

2001	60.1%
2008*	72.6%
2033*	75.7%

\* estimates / projections

<sup>6</sup> Essex Schools Organisational Plan 2011-16. NB these data do not include independent (private) schools. Private school data are often not collected in the same way and so cannot be analysed here.

<sup>7</sup> Data from the 2010 Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC), but this does not include private schools or home schooling.

<sup>8</sup> Data on pupils studying outside the district are only available for the rest of Essex, as they are sourced from Essex County Council.

- 2.16 Projections also suggest that, by 2033, the average age of the main householder (usually the eldest male) will be higher, which ties in with the earlier predictions for an 'older' population. This will have implications for the types of housing required in the district, e.g. 'Lifetime Homes' which can be adapted for those with disabilities, and sheltered or extra-care accommodation.
- 2.17 By 2033 there will be as many households consisting of one person living alone as there will be of couples living together - a significant increase in single person households. Data also show that in future, more households will have no dependent children, i.e. more people will choose to live as couples, or alone, without children.

### **Employment**

- 2.18 The most dominant sectors for employment in the district are (i) distribution, hotels and restaurants (25.5%); (ii) banking and finance (23.9%); and (iii) public services (20.7%). Growth in employment has been strong in the construction industry (5.4% per annum) and the transport and communications sector (7.4% per annum). Business structure is dominated (90.7%) by micro businesses of 1 to 10 employees. Micro and small businesses (11 to 49 employees) combined make up a total of 60.4% of employment<sup>9</sup>.
- 2.19 As might be expected due to the availability of transport links, there is a strong commuting pattern into London.
- 2.20 Over roughly the next 20 year period, predictions<sup>10</sup> are that more traditional employment sectors such as manufacturing will decline sharply, and most business services such as real estate and research and development will experience a small increase. Labour recruitment, security and cleaning are predicted to rise significantly. Construction is predicted to continue to rise steadily, and retail and catering jobs are also predicted to rise. Other employment sectors predicted to increase are transport and public sector jobs such as health and education. The finance sector is expected to fall slightly.

### **Natural and built heritage**

- 2.21 The district is approximately 83,450 acres (or approximately 33,785 hectares) in area, 92.4% of which is Metropolitan Green Belt, the highest proportion of any district within the East of England region. It contains one Special Area of Conservation (part of Epping Forest), part of a Special Protection Area/Ramsar site within the Lea Valley for the conservation of birds, and seven main Sites of Special Scientific Interest. There are 25 conservation areas, 36 scheduled monuments and over 1,300 listed buildings. The district also benefits from nine Local Nature Reserves and a total of 222 Local Wildlife Sites.

### **What are the key features of the main towns & villages in the district?**

- 2.22 Epping Forest District abuts Greater London yet is dominated by open countryside. Over half of the approximately 124,700 residents live in the areas of Loughton, Buckhurst Hill, Chigwell and Waltham Abbey, which account for only 5% of the area of the district.

<sup>9</sup> Data from the Employment Land Review 2010

<sup>10</sup> East of England Forecasting Model (run dated May 2011), which projects job changes up to 2031 only



## Loughton/Debden

- 2.23 Loughton is a town of approximately 30,000 residents in the southern part of the district. The town's growth in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was spurred by the opening of a railway line which is now part of the Central Line, with stations at Debden and Loughton. This provides excellent transport links into London but despite a good level of parking provision, there is an identified problem with commuter parking at both stations. The town also benefits from numerous bus services and a south facing slip entry road onto the M11. Congestion within the town at peak travel times is an issue.
- 2.24 The town centre in Loughton is ranked first of the 6 main centres in the district, according to a UK-wide survey<sup>11</sup> of major retail centres, but it has fallen slightly in the national ranking since 2000. There is a high representation of multiple retailers with demand from others. In terms of UK town centre averages there is a higher level of convenience, restaurant and café floorspace and a lower than average amount of comparison floorspace. There are two main business areas, Langston Road and Oakwood Hill, in the Debden area at the eastern edge of the town.
- 2.25 The town has three conservation areas as well as many nationally and locally listed buildings. There are also three state secondary schools in the area; Davenant Foundation, Debden Park High and Roding Valley High. There is also a state special school; Oak View.
- 2.26 Growth of Loughton/Debden is wholly restricted by (i) Epping Forest along the north-western edge; (ii) the River Roding floodplain on the south-eastern boundary, the latter also containing the Roding Valley Meadows Local Nature Reserve (LNR), part of which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); and (iii) the narrow but important Green Belt gaps between (a) north-east Debden and Theydon Bois, and (b) south-west Loughton and north-east Buckhurst Hill.
- 2.27 Debden (which includes The Broadway town centre) is mostly made up of 1950/60s residential estates which were built to re-house displaced east Londoners. They include several open spaces and greens, which with the significant number of mature trees, contribute significantly to the character of the area.
- 2.28 The Broadway has a range of shops and services, including a Sainsbury's supermarket on Torrington Drive, and there is a small but limited evening economy. The Broadway is ranked third of the 6 main centres in the district<sup>12</sup>, but it has also fallen in the national ranking since 2000.
- 2.29 Significant town centre enhancement works to the public realm on The Broadway have been undertaken in the last 5 years. Additionally, the Winston Churchill pub, Sainsbury's supermarket, the petrol filling station, the rear of Vere Road, and the area adjacent to the station could be potential 'development opportunity sites'. These are the main areas covered by the Loughton Broadway Development Brief.
- 2.30 Areas of Loughton Broadway are some of the most deprived in the district according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, on issues such as education, income, employment, health and crime.
- 2.31 Epping Forest College is located in this area, the only further education facility in the district.

<sup>11</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

<sup>12</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

### **Buckhurst Hill**

- 2.32 Buckhurst Hill saw rapid expansion in the late Victorian period and early 20th century as a result of the opening of Buckhurst Hill Station in 1856. The small town centre at the eastern end of Queens Road is anchored by a Waitrose supermarket, and includes many high quality clothes shops and several restaurants. Buckhurst Hill is a fairly affluent area of the district and property prices are very high.
- 2.33 The centre is ranked 6th out of the 6 main centres<sup>13</sup> within the district. There is only one multiple retailer (Waitrose), but the centre has an 'upper middle market' position indicating a high quality retail offer. There is a further area of shops etc. at the western end of Queen's Road but this is not considered part of the main town centre as it is separated by a significant length of housing development. The shops are generally small and there are no data on demand from other multiple retailers.
- 2.34 The area is well served by public transport, including two underground stations, but it also suffers from congestion and parking problems. There is one independent secondary school in Buckhurst Hill; Braeside School.
- 2.35 As with Loughton, growth is almost wholly constrained by Epping Forest and the Roding floodplain.

### **Chipping Ongar**

- 2.36 Chipping Ongar is a historic market town with a population of approximately 6,000 people. The centre, which is a conservation area with numerous listed buildings, is anchored by a Sainsbury's store, and has a variety of other shops, restaurants and financial services. Its vacancy rates are slightly lower than the national average. There are also some business units and small workshops. It is ranked 5th of the 6 main centres<sup>14</sup> in the district with only 2 multiple retailers. This is mainly due to the size of the shop units and historic nature of the centre which limit the potential for change. A small market still occurs on a weekly basis.
- 2.37 The town sits close to the A414, which is the main east/west route linking St Albans to the Essex coast. Public transport links are fairly limited. The Central Line used to extend to Ongar but was closed in 1994. The remaining track is now used by the Epping Ongar Railway as a tourist attraction.
- 2.38 A new GP surgery/community hospital has recently been built but there has been no secondary school since the 1980s.
- 2.39 Potential development is restricted by flood zones on the east and west side of the town.

### **Epping**

- 2.40 Epping is also a historic market town with a population of about 12,000. The town is located at the end of the Central Line, which provides good transport links but gives rise to significant commuter parking issues. The town also suffers from traffic congestion.

<sup>13</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

<sup>14</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

- 2.41 Epping High Street is ranked 2nd of the 6 main centres in the district<sup>15</sup> – but has fallen slightly in national ranking since 2000. There is a wide range of shops and a sizeable evening economy. The centre is anchored by a Tesco supermarket towards the southern end, and the Council offices at the northern end. A key potential development opportunity exists around the former St John's Junior School site, which also includes land owned by Essex County Council, Epping Town Council and Epping Forest District Council. Consultation on a range of redevelopment options was carried out in March and April 2012.
- 2.42 When compared to other centres in the district, Epping has a higher representation of multiple retailers, e.g. Tesco, Boots and Next, but a lack of larger shop units limits scope to encourage other similar operators who are interested in the town. There is a regular weekly market, and other specific occasional markets.
- 2.43 Epping has two conservation areas and several nationally and locally listed buildings. There is one state secondary school, St John's Church of England Voluntary Controlled School, which is being redeveloped (May 2012) to provide an improved educational and community facility.

### **Waltham Abbey**

- 2.44 Waltham Abbey is another historic market town of about 20,000 people in the west of the district. The town centre is another conservation area with many listed buildings and is ranked 4<sup>th</sup> of the 6 main centres in the district<sup>16</sup>. It has struggled in recent years to maintain its vitality and viability, although it is dominated by a Tesco supermarket – the largest in the district, with another multiple retailer (Lidl) recently built just south of the centre. With most development since the 1950s extending the town significantly to the east, this means that a lot of the population now live quite far away from the town centre and may therefore be less likely to use it. The area around the centre has been identified as one of general deprivation, particularly relating to income, health, education, skills and training, barriers to housing and services, crime, living environment, and employment.
- 2.45 There are opportunities to pursue some development/regeneration projects in the town, to try to alleviate some of these problems. However these would need to respect the historical context of the centre, and be accommodated around existing environmental and other constraints. Waltham Abbey has significant potential for tourism, through the presence of the Abbey, the award winning Abbey Gardens, and the adjoining Lee Valley Regional Park. The new Olympic Lee Valley White Water Centre, for rafting, canoeing and kayaking is also within reach, just across the district border in Broxbourne Borough.
- 2.46 There is a charter market every Tuesday, and a regular market every Saturday. Waltham Abbey has one state secondary school; King Harold Business and Enterprise Academy.
- 2.47 Public transport accessibility from bus routes is limited. There is a railway station at Waltham Cross but it is approximately 20-30 minutes walk away from Waltham Abbey town centre.

<sup>15</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

<sup>16</sup> The Management Horizons index, 2008

### **Chigwell**

- 2.48 Chigwell has a population of approximately 12,500 people and includes the original village in the north which is a conservation area with several significant listed buildings. The southern part of the settlement is more suburban in character and its growth was originally prompted by the development of the Central Line with stations at Chigwell and Grange Hill.
- 2.49 Property prices are very high. The two stations offer good transport connections to London. A number of bus services are also available. Despite the good level of public transport accessibility, parking and congestion are on-going problems.
- 2.50 There are three secondary schools; West Hatch High School (state), the Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College (independent) and the historic Chigwell School (independent). There are also two special schools; Wells Park Primary School (state) and St John's RC Secondary School (independent). A parade of shops on the High Road immediately north of the Central Line is the main concentration of retail uses in the settlement. The village hall is quite close to Chigwell station.

### **North Weald Bassett**

- 2.51 North Weald Bassett, more commonly referred to as North Weald, is a village of approximately 6,000 people located 3 miles east of Epping. It is a linear settlement stretching along the B181 with a small shopping centre, library, village hall, and one primary school. The Central Line station has been closed since 1994, but is now part of the Heritage Rail tourist attraction mentioned in paragraph 2.37.
- 2.52 North Weald Airfield was founded in 1916 and was sold by the Ministry of Defence to the Council in 1979. It was a key base during the WWII Battle of Britain and is still actively used for private aviation, shows, fairs, and a regular weekly (and Bank Holiday) market. Part of the south of the site is used for warehouse type employment.
- 2.53 Thornwood Common, a small village on the B1393 in North Weald parish, is approximately 1.5 miles north of Epping. The village has few services but there may be an opportunity for relocation of the employment area in the centre of the village.

### **Roydon**

- 2.54 Roydon is a village of approximately 3,000 residents in the north-west of the district and is very close to the Pinnacles industrial estate in Harlow. The centre is a conservation area with a few small shops and primary school but no GP surgery. The village has the only mainline rail station in the district which is on the Liverpool Street to Stansted/Cambridge line. The operation of the level crossing can lead to localised traffic congestion, and HGV traffic on unsuitable rural roads and lanes can also be a problem. Proximity to Harlow, the Lea Valley glasshouse industry, and other commercial uses of redundant farm buildings are the likely causes of many of the HGV movements.

### **Nazeing**

- 2.55 Nazeing is a parish of approximately 4,000 people with the older village of Nazeing separated by open farmland from the larger Lower Nazeing to the west. The latter has a small village centre including a new GP surgery and a primary school, but no secondary school. The parish is located at the western edge of the district, very close to Broxbourne and Hoddesdon in Hertfordshire.

- 2.56 HGV traffic is again a problem for similar reasons to Roydon although it is likely that some traffic is generated by Hoddesdon Business Park adjacent to the district boundary, and it is also likely that local roads are used as a “rat-run” to gain access to the M25 at Waltham Abbey.

### **Theydon Bois**

- 2.57 Theydon Bois is a village of approximately 4,000 people located about 1.4 miles south of Epping and 1 mile northeast of Loughton. It abuts the Forest on its western side and is bordered by the Central Line on the east.
- 2.58 It has a small number of shops, a village hall and one primary school. In the centre of the settlement there is a large village green (Epping Forest land) which contains a historic avenue of trees. The Central Line station provides links to London, but also causes commuter parking issues.

### **Vision and Aims of the Local Plan**

2.59 The vision has emerged from consideration of the responses to the Community Visioning exercise, and from the Sustainable Community Strategy (prepared by the Local Strategic Partnership):

**To protect and enhance green spaces whilst encouraging appropriate levels of growth to provide for the housing, employment and social needs of the district.**

2.60 The aims to work towards this vision are:

- 1. To protect and enhance the Green Belt and the natural and built heritage of the district;**
- 2. To manage sustainable growth in the district;**
- 3. To deliver the right number of houses in the right places;**
- 4. To support and enhance the economy of the district;**
- 5. To improve access and movement within and around the district; and**
- 6. To maintain safe, healthy and inclusive communities.**

2.61 More detailed objectives to meet these aims will be developed as the Local Plan is progressed, and these will be influenced by the replies received to the public consultations.

#### **Question 2:**

Do you think the vision and aims are the right ones for Epping Forest District (paragraphs 2.59 and 2.60)? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think should be removed or added?

### **3. Green Belt and the natural and built heritage of the district**

#### **The character of the district**

- 3.1 Epping Forest is a largely rural district (over 92% Green Belt), with individually distinct towns and villages set in generally attractive countryside. A Landscape Character Assessment (part of the evidence base for the Local Plan) has identified seven landscape character types which have in turn been divided into 33 landscape character areas. The countryside is gently undulating and is dissected by two river valleys, the floodplains of both being generally flat and wide.
- 3.2 The River Lea forms most of the western boundary to the district. The River Roding runs north-east to south-west, forming part of the district's eastern boundary between Ongar and Passingford Bridge then running between Loughton and Chigwell. Both these rivers, which ultimately feed into the Thames in London, have tributaries in the district. The River Stort joins the Lea at Roydon, and Cobbins Brook runs south-west from Thornwood Common to join the Lea at Waltham Abbey. Cripsey Brook rises in Hastingwood and runs gradually south-east through Moreton to join the Roding at Ongar. Flooding has been quite a serious issue for parts of the district and, in recent years, the Council and Environment Agency have constructed a number of flood alleviation schemes to address the problem.
- 3.3 The key natural feature is Epping Forest itself, which runs along the north-west boundary of Buckhurst Hill and Loughton to the southern end of Epping. This part of the Forest (which extends south to Wanstead in London) is designated as a Special Area of Conservation, an acknowledgement of its international importance for nature conservation. A separate area (the Lower Forest) abuts Epping at its north-east edge, and this is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – a national designation. The Forest is owned and managed by the City of London Corporation.
- 3.4 There are several other ancient woods in the district, including part of the remnants of Hainault Forest. Woodland and hedgerow tree pollards are a key landscape feature - the character of much of the countryside derives from many remaining hedgerows and field boundaries, a remarkable number of veteran trees, and several "green" (ie unmetalled) lanes.
- 3.5 The district has a total of eight SSSIs although some of these straddle the boundary with other authorities. There are nine local nature reserves (LNRs) and over 220 local wildlife sites (LoWS).
- 3.6 Agriculture is mainly arable, particularly in the north-east of the district. There is a significant amount of horse keeping in parts of the south, and glasshouse horticulture is a prominent land use in parts of the Lea Valley, especially in Roydon and Nazeing.
- 3.7 The district also includes a considerable part of the Lee Valley Regional Park, with Waltham Abbey effectively acting as the point where the Park moves out of the built up area of London into the countryside north to Ware in Hertfordshire. Parts of the Lea Valley in this area are also designated as a Special Protection Area and/or a Ramsar site for their international importance for wetland birdlife.
- 3.8 Waltham Abbey, Epping and Chipping Ongar are market towns of medieval origin, and the centres of several of the villages are also designated as conservation areas. The district currently has over 1,300 listed buildings, 34 scheduled monuments, five registered parks and gardens (one of which straddles the Uttlesford boundary), with another two directly on its boundary. The Council has designated 25 conservation

areas and identified over 300 locally listed buildings – the built heritage is also very important for the character of the district.

- 3.9 The development of the Central Line in the mid to late 19th century led to huge expansion of Buckhurst Hill and Loughton and these two settlements now comprise the largest urban area in the district. Chigwell, Theydon Bois and Epping have also grown as a result of the Central Line.
- 3.10 There was much 20th century residential development in Epping, Loughton/Debden, Ongar and Waltham Abbey – the post-WW2 London overspill estates being particularly significant in Debden and Waltham Abbey.
- 3.11 The larger industrial estates are generally concentrated in Debden, Epping, Nazeing, North Weald (including the Airfield) and Waltham Abbey.
- 3.12 The M25 runs east-west almost through the middle of the district, with a local road interchange at Waltham Abbey. The M11 runs north-south, with a full interchange at Hastingwood, just south of Harlow, and a northward-off/southward-on interchange at Loughton. There is also a motorway only interchange south-east of Epping. The A414 is a key east-west route in the county, and this crosses the district from Harlow to Ongar on the way to Chelmsford and the Essex coast.

### 3.13 “Community Visioning” consultation results:

- Protection and enhancement of green spaces was the top priority for residents of Buckhurst Hill, Chigwell, Epping, Loughton, Nazeing, Theydon Bois and Waltham Abbey;
- It was the second priority (behind job opportunities) for Ongar residents;
- There was general agreement at workshops that there was a need to (i) protect the Green Belt but to consider alterations around settlements where appropriate; and (ii) retain green spaces within urban areas.

### 3.14 What are the main issues?

- Current Green Belt boundaries were effectively established in the 1980s in the Council’s first three Local Plans. The 1998 Local Plan only introduced very minor changes. There will have to be release of some Green Belt land adjoining settlements to meet the needs for housing and employment growth in the period up to 2033;
- Settlement edge development will change local landscape character. A Settlement Edge Landscape Sensitivity Study (SELSS), prepared by the same consultants who produced the Landscape Character Assessment, will form part of the evidence base as an aid to the selection of appropriate sites;
- The Green Belt serves five purposes (paragraph 80 of the NPPF) :
  - to check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas (in the context of this district, the Council assumes this refers particularly to Harlow and London);
  - to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
  - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - to preserve the setting and character of historic towns; and
  - to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land;
- Potential pressure for development of urban green spaces to protect the Green Belt;



- Gradual loss of mature trees within urban areas and villages for a variety of reasons including disease, potential damage to existing buildings and new development pressures;
- The NPPF advises (paragraph 113) that, in relation to wildlife sites, “distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status.” In reality, this means that local wildlife sites cannot receive much protection under the planning system;
- The NPPF also advises (paragraph 117) that planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale;
- In a similar vein and in relation to built heritage, the NPPF distinguishes between “designated” and “non-designated” heritage assets. With the latter, the advice is (paragraph 135) that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account – a balanced judgement will be required “having regard to the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset.”;
- The advice about the designation of new conservation areas is similarly cautious (paragraph 127) – “Planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.” The Council has commissioned a “heritage review” and the consultants have recommended the designation of 2 new conservation areas (Theydon Bois Green (and the southern end of Piercing Hill) and the St John’s Church area of Buckhurst Hill) but have rejected other suggestions. The conclusions of this study (which also includes recommendations for boundary alterations to a number of existing areas) will be the subject of a separate consultation exercise, as this is dealt with under related, but distinct, planning legislation.

### 3.15 What are the options?

#### Green Belt and landscape

- Release land around some settlements to accommodate identified need for population and employment growth, while maintaining the overall character and openness of the countryside;
- Identify “strategic” green belt to prevent towns and villages from merging within the district and on the boundaries with other authorities and settlements (see Diagram 3.1);
- Identify the features of the landscape of the district that are integral to local character and the openness of the countryside (including preserved and veteran trees), with proposals to assist with their retention, conservation and enhancement in association with promoting beneficial uses of the Green Belt (paragraph 81 of the NPPF);
- Investigate the potential for the relocation of extensive uses, such as schools with playing fields, to land on the edge of settlements to free up urban land for development;
- Investigate the potential for the development of some urban green spaces, or parts of them, in association with replacement of the space on the boundaries of the settlements;
- Assess the number, type, size and location of urban and rural brownfield sites and their suitability for redevelopment for housing and employment uses. Although the official definition of “previously developed land” (Annex 2 of the NPPF) specifically excludes land that has been occupied by agricultural or

forestry buildings, investigate the potential for applying this approach to some of the derelict glasshouse sites in the Lea Valley;

Diagram 3.1 – Potential Strategic Green Belt gaps



- Assess the potential for different approaches to management of urban open space in the interests of recreation, health and biodiversity with options for action where appropriate;
- Ensure adequate provision is made for the eventual replacement of mature trees on development sites;
- Review the outcomes and effectiveness of the Council's Local Community Tree Strategies, with a view to integrating them with a district-wide biodiversity, habitat improvement, landscape, tree management and access strategy (the term "green infrastructure" is increasingly being used). These would need (i) the full involvement of, and co-operation from, landowners and managers and (ii) significant external resourcing.

### Biodiversity

- Monitor the new concept of "biodiversity offsetting" (Essex is one of the pilot counties) which is intended to independently evaluate impacts upon wildlife from development and identify appropriate mitigation and compensation;
- Investigate further the concept of "living landscapes" being promoted by Essex Wildlife Trust which requires co-operation between authorities to deal with biodiversity at the landscape scale in line with NPPF guidance;
- Encourage co-operative working between the City of London Corporation and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority to help realise ambitions of creating more meaningful green space and wildlife links between these two major habitats;
- Monitor the effectiveness of policy protection for local wildlife sites in the light of NPPF advice.

### Built heritage

- Continue to prepare conservation area appraisals and monitor their implementation and effectiveness;
- Establish a regular review of conservation areas to monitor effectiveness of policy and to ensure boundaries continue to reflect the special interest of such areas;
- Try to ensure that new development respects the setting of conservation areas in terms of design, materials and layout, and acknowledges the key characteristics of the areas;
- Monitor the effectiveness of the policy protection afforded to locally listed buildings, in the light of NPPF advice;
- Establish a regular review of the locally listed buildings to ensure they retain their standards, and to update the list as necessary;
- Establish a means of monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of policies in relation to scheduled monuments.

#### **Question 3:**

Have the relevant issues for the Green Belt and landscape for the district been identified (paragraph 3.14)? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 4:**

Have the relevant options for addressing the identified issues for the Green Belt and landscape been identified (paragraph 3.15)? **Yes / No**

If no, what other options do you think we should include?

**Question 5:**

Which of the options do you prefer?

- a. **Release land around some settlements, whilst maintaining the overall character and openness of the countryside.**
- b. **Identify strategic Green Belt gaps to prevent towns and villages from merging.**
- c. **Identify the features of the landscape of the district that are integral to local character and the openness of the countryside, alongside promotion of beneficial uses in the Green Belt.**
- d. **Investigate the potential for the relocation of some uses (e.g. schools) to land on the edge of settlements to free up urban land for development.**
- e. **Investigate the potential for the development of some urban green spaces, or parts of them, in association with replacement of the space on the boundaries of settlements.**
- f. **Determine the amount of previously developed (brownfield) land within urban and rural areas that might be available for development.**
- g. **Assess the potential for different approaches to management of urban open spaces in the interests of recreation, health and biodiversity with options for action where appropriate.**
- h. **Ensure adequate provision is made for the eventual replacement of mature trees on development sites.**
- i. **Review the outcomes and effectiveness of existing Tree Strategies.**
- j. **Prepare and implement a district-wide “green infrastructure” strategy, which will include biodiversity, habitat improvement, landscape, tree management and public access.**

**Question 6:**

Proposed Strategic Green Belt Gaps have been identified across the district (see diagram 2.1).

Do you consider that these are in the right locations? **Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which you don't think are correct, or where you think additional strategic gaps should be identified.

**Question 7:**

Have the relevant issues for enhancing biodiversity in the district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 8:**

Have the relevant options for addressing the identified issues for enhancing biodiversity been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what other options do you think we should include?

**Question 9:**

Have the relevant issues for protecting and enhancing the built heritage of the district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 10:**

Have the relevant options for addressing the identified issues for protecting and enhancing built heritage been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what other options do you think we should include?

**Question 11:**

Which of the options do you prefer?

- a. **Continue to prepare conservation area appraisals, including monitoring their implementation and effectiveness.**
- b. **Try to ensure that new development respects the setting of conservation areas in terms of design, materials and layout.**
- c. **Monitor the effectiveness of policies which protect locally listed buildings.**
- d. **Establish a regular review of locally listed buildings.**
- e. **Establish a means of monitoring and reviewing the effectiveness of policies in relation to scheduled monuments.**

#### **4. Options for growth and distribution of development**

##### **4.1 “Community Visioning” consultation results**

- Encouraging local jobs and businesses is one of the highest priority issues for residents;
- There is a recognition that there is a need for more housing, including a mix of types and sizes to meet the varying needs of the community;
- There is a need for affordable housing throughout the district;
- Residents favour a growth pattern which focuses development “close to public transport links” and “around or within existing towns”.

##### **4.2 What are the main growth issues?**

- No allocations for development have been made since the adoption of the existing Local Plan in 1998, and development opportunities within existing urban boundaries are rapidly running out;
- The NPPF requires every local authority to plan for ‘objectively assessed development needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless specific policies indicate that development should be restricted’. The Council must therefore make reasonable provision for such requirements, even in a district which is over 92% Green Belt;
- The East of England Plan (and all its associated development targets) is likely to be abolished before the new Local Plan is adopted. The Council must therefore make its own assessment of the housing and employment etc needs of the district. This should take account of migration and demographic change, and different types of employment and ways of working. It will also be necessary to find the correct balance between these development needs, and the protection of the countryside and urban character including open spaces;
- All planning authorities are required by European legislation (EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC) to consider all reasonable alternatives before determining the most appropriate strategy. This applies to both overall growth targets, and the potential distribution patterns that may eventually be adopted. If the Council does not do this the Local Plan will be found unsound (ie not accepted by an independent Inspector at Examination in Public). Delayed adoption of an up-to-date Plan will put the district at additional risk from undesirable development.

## a) Housing

### 4.3 What are the main housing growth issues?

- The local authorities in Essex jointly commissioned a new set of population and household forecasts, in order to help them decide on new housing targets for their areas. NB at the time of preparation of this consultation document, only phases 1 and 2 (of 4) of the forecasting study had been published. The next two phases will be made public through the rest of 2012, so the figures being used in this consultation are likely to be superseded (and probably increase) as the preparation of the Local Plan continues;
- Nine forecasts for this district have been prepared. Some are based on past trends using information mainly from Government sources, predicting what will happen if 'business as usual' continues. Other forecasts test what would happen if a certain target were chosen, i.e. if a total housing target of x was chosen, what would be the effect on the population of the district. These mainly derive from the East of England Plan which dealt with the period 2001 to 2021, and its revision, which rolled the calculations forward to 2031;
- The nine forecasts are described in Table 4.1 below, along with their total housing target figures, an analysis of their advantages and disadvantages, and conclusions about whether they are considered to be realistic or reasonable options for growth. This initial analysis has concluded that six of the forecasts should receive no further consideration in the preparation of this plan;
- Of the three surviving forecasts (Official Population Projections; Update of Official Population Projections; and East of England Plan (EEP) including Harlow growth), the latter two have very similar housing numbers (10,261 and 9,995 respectively). It seems sensible therefore to combine these by taking the average of the two, ie 10,128 houses;
- It is considered prudent to include a replacement third option, which is based on the current official East of England Plan target for the district (7,000 new houses between 2001 and 2021- of which about half were expected to be urban extensions to Harlow). This target will be assumed instead to cover the 20-year period 2011 to 2031 with an extra 2 years' growth to take it to 2033 – this gives the additional option of 7,700 new homes;
- New Government guidance requires local planning authorities to assess local needs for traveller sites. The Local Plan should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against locally set targets.



Table 4.1 – Population Forecasts

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Official population projections</b>  <i>(This target comes from the Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) forecast)</i></p> <p>This is the baseline forecast, extracted from the official 2008 Sub-National Population Projections produced by the Government</p> <p><i>NB - new sub-national population projections (for 2010) were published in 2012. However, these were not available at the time the forecasts in "Community Choices" were prepared</i></p>	<p>11,448</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The forecast is based on trends from 2003-2008, which are now slightly old;</li> <li>• It is a 'business as usual' trend-based forecast, which does not take into account any policy changes or decisions;</li> <li>• This is the second highest of the nine options and would require release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs would have to be addressed to make this option deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the Government projection of population change based on 'business as usual'.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This should be included in the Issues and Options consultation, on the understanding that the figure will be updated (and probably increased) later this year.</p>
<p><b>Forecasts based on TRENDS</b></p>			

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Zero (overall) Migration</b> (This target comes from the Net-nil Migration forecast)</p> <p>Assumes that the number of people coming into the district, and leaving the district are the same, i.e. the total population number is the same, although the make-up of the district changes over time</p> <p><i>Forecasts based on TRENDS</i></p>	<p>3,975</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As migration (people moving into and out of the district) cannot be controlled, this target is quite unrealistic, and does not take account of the changing structure of the district's population resulting from migration as required by the NPPF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This target would meet the need resulting from changes to the current population of the district through births and deaths;</li> <li>A relatively small amount of Green Belt land would need to be released;</li> <li>This level of provision may require no infrastructure changes.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This option should not be considered further as, by discounting the existence and effects of migration, it is not a realistic forecast.</p>

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Update of official population projections</b> <i>(This target comes from the Migration-led forecast)</i></p> <p>This takes the 2008 Government Sub-National Population projections and updates them with information on migration released since 2008</p> <p><b>Forecasts based on TRENDS</b></p>	<p>10,261</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a 'business as usual' trend-based forecast which does not take into account any policy changes or decisions;</li> <li>• This is the third-highest of the nine options and would require release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs would have to be addressed to make this option deliverable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is based on the official Government projection</li> <li>• It updates the 2008 Sub-National Population Projections using population and migration trends from 2005-2010.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This should be included in the Issues and Options consultation, on the understanding that more up-to-date figures will be published later this year, which are likely to show an increase. Given the similarity of the housing figure to the next option (which is target-based), it is considered sensible to combine these two, taking an average of the totals.</p>

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>East of England Plan (including Harlow growth)</b>  <i>(This target comes from the Approved East of England Plan forecast)</i></p> <p>Uses the adopted East of England Plan target for 2001-2021 (including urban extensions to Harlow) to derive a new housing target for the period 2011 to 2033.</p> <p><b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b></p>	<p>9,995</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the fourth-highest of the options and would require release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>Infrastructure needs would have to be addressed to make this option deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the East of England Plan (EEP) and all its targets will be abolished by the Government, the Plan and its evidence base were tested at an Examination in Public, so the background data can still be considered to be accurate and robust.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This should be included in the Issues and Options consultation as it is a “roll-forward” of a target which has been tested at Examination in Public. Given the similarity of the housing figure to the previous option (which is trend-based), it is considered sensible to combine these two, taking an average of the totals.</p>

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Revised East of England Plan (including Harlow growth)</b> <i>(This target comes from the Draft Review East of England Plan forecast)</i></p> <p>Uses the draft Revised East of England Plan target for 2011-2031 (including urban extensions to Harlow) to derive a new housing target for 2033.</p>	<p>7,970</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised target was never actually adopted as the review of the East of England Plan was abandoned by the Coalition Government;</li> <li>This option would require release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>Infrastructure needs would have to be addressed to make this option deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This 'roll-forward' of the East of England Plan target for EFDC is again based on wide research and an extensive evidence base, although this has not been tested at Examination in Public.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This option should not be considered further as it has not been tested and therefore has no official standing.</p>
<p><b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b></p>			

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>East of England Plan (excluding Harlow growth)</b> <i>(This target comes from the Approved East of England Plan Pure/Realistic<sup>17</sup> forecasts)</i></p> <p>Uses the adopted East of England Plan target for 2001-2021 to derive a new housing target for Epping Forest District alone. This target is 'rolled forward' for 2011 to 2031</p> <p><b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b></p>	<p>3,600</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the target for EFDC only, i.e. not incorporating a portion of Harlow's growth, which is not what the East of England Plan actually intended;</li> <li>Other research (the Strategic Housing Market Assessment) shows that this figure would not meet the Council's existing housing need, let alone any contribution to Harlow's regeneration ambitions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited release of Green Belt land may be needed;</li> <li>Depending on location of development, there may be no infrastructure implications.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This option should not be considered further as it makes inadequate provision for this Council's housing needs, let alone Harlow growth and regeneration.</p>

<sup>17</sup> The pair of 'Pure' and 'Realistic' scenarios within this forecast reach the same final total of dwellings, but at different rates. The 'Pure' scenario assumes that an equal number of dwellings will be built each year, steadily reaching the total. The 'Realistic' scenario assumes that less dwellings will be built in the first few years of the plan, as planning applications have not yet been made or granted, and housebuilders are still affected by the recession. It also assumes that proportionately more dwellings will be built in the later years of the Plan period, to make up for this, but reaches the same final figure as the 'Pure' scenario.

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Revised East of England Plan (excluding Harlow growth)</b>  <i>(This target comes from the Draft Review East of England Plan Pure/Realistic forecasts)</i></p> <p>Uses the draft Revised East of England Plan target to derive a new housing target for Epping Forest District alone for 2011-2031</p> <p><b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b></p>	<p>3,520</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised target was never actually adopted as the review of the East of England Plan was abandoned by the Coalition Government;</li> <li>• It is the target for EFDC only, i.e. not incorporating a portion of Harlow's growth, which is not what the East of England Plan actually intended;</li> <li>• Other research (the Strategic Housing Market Assessment) shows that this figure would not meet the Council's existing housing need, let alone any contribution to Harlow growth and regeneration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited release of Green Belt land may be needed;</li> <li>• Depending on location of development, there may be no significant infrastructure implications.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This option should not be considered further as it makes inadequate provision for this Council's housing needs, let alone Harlow growth.</p>

Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Employment</b> <i>(This target comes from the Economic forecast)</i></p> <p>Uses the most recent Government projection (Nov. 2010) of employment and translates this into a change in overall population</p>	<p>14,256</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This forecast is by far the highest of the nine as it includes provision for commuters, i.e. a proportion of the population growth would be living in the district, but not working here, primarily due to the proximity of London;</li> <li>• Economic forecasts also tend to be quite aspirational (i.e. slightly skewed towards higher levels of growth);</li> <li>• This option would require the largest release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs (probably also significant) would have to be addressed to make this option deliverable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option could bring about a large increase in the amount of affordable housing;</li> <li>• Development on this scale could stimulate the local economy, help provide more jobs, and support the main town centres;</li> <li>• Depending on location of development, this could stimulate the provision of major new infrastructure to serve the district.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This option should be taken no further as (a) of the nine options, it poses the greatest threat to the Green Belt; and (b) it is artificially high in seeking to match housing provision with the size of the working age population, without taking into account the proportion of the population that commutes to London for work.</p>
<b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b>			



Forecasts	Additional homes 2011/12 to 2032/33	Disadvantages	Advantages and Conclusions
<p><b>Forecasts based on a TARGET</b></p> <p><b>Current housing permissions only</b> (This target comes from the AMR Dwelling Trajectory forecast)</p> <p>Predicts that only existing planning permissions for housing will be built, i.e. no more applications will be made in the next 20 years</p>	<p>1,882</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using this as a target would be contrary to policy and Government guidance, as it would not plan for the future beyond permissions which have already been granted;</li> <li>This means that future growth could be permitted by appeal, and could be in sensitive areas of the district not suited to large amounts of growth;</li> <li>Necessary infrastructure would not be provided as part of an overarching plan;</li> <li>Other research (the Strategic Housing Market Assessment) shows that this figure would not meet our existing housing need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option may require no further planned release of Green Belt land;</li> <li>There is also likely to be no need for planned infrastructure improvements or additions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b> This option should not be considered further as (a) it is wholly unrealistic and (b) using this as a target would be contrary to policy and Government guidance, as it would not plan for the future beyond permissions which have already been granted.</p>

If you want to read more about the forecasting project, please see our website at: <http://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/index.php/home/file-store/category/281-population-projections>

#### 4.4 Reductions to the housing targets

- In finalising the housing targets for the three options selected for consultation, it is necessary and reasonable to make allowance for the following issues, the total of which will be subtracted from the option targets:
  - the total number of houses with current permission but which have not yet been built – at April 2012 this amounted to 713;
  - the Council has an annual target of bringing 30 empty homes back into use – this has been met and exceeded in recent years. It seems reasonable to allow for the successful continuation of this project for a 5-year period, ie 150 houses. Beyond that period, the figure would need to be reviewed and future allowances adjusted accordingly;
  - “windfall” allowance – this refers to housing proposals which may come forward on small sites (less than (a) 0.2 ha, or (b) 6 units). The Strategic Land Availability Assessment concluded that an annual average of 82 homes is likely, based on past trends in this district. The NPPF advises that any such allowance should only be projected for a 5 year period, because this should then be reviewed and future calculations again adjusted accordingly. This gives a figure of 410 units;
  - the total of these three factors (ie 1,273 homes) has been subtracted from the proposed consultation options and the results are shown in Table 4.2 below (Housing Target Options).

Table 4.2 – Housing Target Options

HOUSING Option	REMAINDER HOUSING TARGET rounded to nearest 100 homes	If this was built at a density of <u>30</u> dwellings per hectare*, this would require...		If this was built at a density of <u>50</u> dwellings per hectare*, this would require...	
		...this much land (to nearest hectare):	...equivalent to a percentage of the entire area of the district (to nearest 0.1 %)	...this much land (to nearest hectare):	...equivalent to a percentage of the entire area of the district (to nearest 0.1 %)
<b>A</b> Official population projections	<b>10,200</b>	340	1.0%	204	0.6%
<b>B</b> Combined East of England Plan / Update of official population projections	<b>8,900</b>	297	0.9%	178	0.5%
<b>C</b> Original Adopted East of England Plan target transferred and adjusted to the period 2011 to 2033	<b>6,400</b>	213	0.6%	128	0.4%
<b>D</b> Suggestions for another housing target – which need to be supported by robust and up-to-date evidence	?	?	?	?	?

\* 1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>

**Question 12:**

Are the range of housing growth options the right ones for Epping Forest District? **Yes / No**

If no, what else do you think should be considered?

**Question 13:**

Should the range of potential housing targets be higher or lower than suggested?

**Question 14:**

What are your reasons for your answer to question 13?

## b) Economic Development

### 4.5 What are the main employment land issues?

- The East of England Plan (2001-2021) defined an area it called the 'Rest of Essex', which included Epping Forest District, along with Braintree, Brentwood, Chelmsford, Harlow, Maldon and Uttlesford districts. A group target of 56,000 new jobs for the period up to 2021 was allocated, but no specific figures were given for this district or any of the others;
- The draft Review of the East of England Plan (2011-2031) did suggest a specific target of 3,600 additional jobs for Epping Forest District. Although the Review has been abolished, as the Coalition Government decided not to continue preparing Regional Spatial Strategies, this target is the only one that has been set specifically for this district. It is therefore considered reasonable to consult on this target, rolled forward to 2033, as one of the options – the final figure is therefore 3,960 jobs;
- The Local Plan can only make provision for new jobs through allocating sites for commercial, retail and leisure uses and buildings. The jobs target therefore needs to be converted into an area of floorspace to be allocated in the new plan;
- The East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM) projects the growth in jobs in different sectors, like construction and manufacturing, for the period up to 2031. The Council has used the EEFM to split the job growth target of 3,960 into different sectors. It has then used detailed research from the Employment Densities Guide (2nd edition, 2010) published by the Homes and Communities Agency, to 'translate' the job growth in different sectors into development floorspace/land required;
- The proportions in Table 4.3 have been developed on the basis of the best available information and for some sectors it is not yet entirely clear what changes may occur. Further analysis will be undertaken to provide more detail as the preparation of the Local Plan continues, and as newer economic forecasts become available;

Table 4.3 – Analysis of possible job growth by sector

Broad Planning use class	For example.....	Jobs target 2011-2033 (rounded) †	Total floorspace* required (ha) †	Total land* required (ha) †
A1 - Retail	High Street shops, supermarkets	311	1.30	3.26
A2 - Financial & Professional Services	Estate agents, banks	674	1.08	2.70
A3, A4, A5 & C1 - Food/Drink & Hotels	Restaurants, pubs, takeaways and hotels	247	0.45	1.11
B1a – Offices	Offices, call centres	723	1.07	2.66
B1c - Light Industry / Business Park	Business units	10	0.05	0.11
B2 - General Industrial	Repairing vehicles, metalwork	695	2.38	5.94
B8 - Storage or distribution	Warehouses, distribution centres	482	3.20	8.01
D1 - Non-residential institutions	Health centres, schools, libraries, places of worship	647	2.21	5.53
Other	Anything else	172	0.54	1.35
<b>Totals</b>		<b>3,960</b>	<b>12.27</b>	<b>30.68</b>

\* Based on average floorspace/development size from the *Employment Densities Guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2010). Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>).

† Individual figures may not add up to the total, due to rounding.

- The Council commissioned an Employment Land Review and a Town Centres Study (both 2010) as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. Both gave targets for employment land for the period 2009-2031. In the tables that follow, this is shown as the period of the Local Plan, ie 2011-2033. It is fair to say that there are some inconsistencies or contradictions within and between the studies. More research will be carried out as the preparation of the Local Plan proceeds, to try and iron out these issues;
- The main forecast in the Employment Land Review (ELR), which uses Government economic projections, predicts that a net gain of 1,000 new jobs within Use Class B will be created over the period 2009 to 2031 (comprising some job losses in certain sectors, and some additional jobs in others). Use Class B includes “traditional” employment, ie business, general industry and storage or distribution. The ELR splits the total into different employment groups within Use Class B as shown in Table 4.4;

Table 4.4 – Forecast job growth to 2033 from the Employment Land Review

Assumed floorspace class	Sector	Total Jobs Growth to 2033 (ELR)
B1	Banking and Finance	+ 2,400
B2 / sui generis (ie “of its own kind” or “the only one of its kind”)	Construction	0
B8	Distribution & Wholesale	-100
B2	Manufacturing	-1,000
B1/B2/B8	Other Services	+ 400
B1/B2/B8	Transport and communications	-700
<b>Total net additional jobs</b>		<b>+ 1,000</b>

- The ELR further refines the figures into land requirements for different types of land use as shown in Table 4.5;

Table 4.5 – Land requirements of forecast job growth from the Employment Land Review

Broad Planning use class	Sector	Total Jobs Growth to 2033 (ELR)	Total floorspace* required (ha) †	Total land* required (ha) †
Offices: B1a & B1b	Banking and Finance	+ 2,300	4.37	+ 5.83
Factories: B1c, B2 and sui generis	Construction	- 1,100	- 3.52	- 8.80
Warehousing: B8	Distribution & Wholesale	- 200	- 1.00	- 2.00
<b>Totals</b>		<b>+ 1,000</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>-4.97</b>

\* Based on average floorspace per employee and development size quoted in the Employment Land Review. Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>).

† Individual figures may not add up to the total, due to rounding.

- Despite the growth in jobs, the ELR analysis concludes that there will be an overall reduction in floorspace and land requirements which is puzzling. Provision clearly needs to be made for the future growth in jobs. Opportunities for the re-use of any buildings or land which becomes redundant or derelict as a result of the predicted changes will need to be assessed and monitored;
- The ELR notes that although demand for new developments is primarily for B1a or B1b offices, the survey of existing businesses highlighted that some B1c (business park and light industry) and B2 (general industrial) businesses wished to expand. Some provision should therefore be made for new B1c and B2 uses.
- The ELR recommends that provision should be made for the 5.83 additional hectares of employment land for development shown in Table 4.5 above. It also recommends that another 50% is added to this figure, in order to give choice and flexibility in the delivery of good quality employment sites, to assist the market struggling in a time of recession. The overall target from 2011-2033 would therefore be 8.75ha, as shown in Table 4.6:

Table 4.6 – Estimated employment land requirement from the Employment Land Review

Broad Planning use class	ELR floorspace* required (ha)	Additional 50% means a total floorspace target of (ha)	ELR land* required (ha)	Additional 50% means a total land target of (ha) to 2033
Offices (B1a/B1b) and Industry (B1c/B2)	4.37	6.56	5.83	8.75

\* Based on average floorspace per employee and development size quoted in the Employment Land Review. Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>).

NB - figures are rounded to nearest 0.01 ha

- The Town Centres Study (TCS) identifies the significant employment in the district which arises from town centre uses, including businesses such as shops, supermarkets, banks, restaurants, bars and takeaways. The TCS identifies future need in terms of floorspace for businesses, rather than numbers of new jobs. Table 4.7 below converts these figures into job numbers and Table 4.8 combines the findings of the Employment Land Review and Town Centres Study to calculate the total development area which would be required and the potential number of new jobs this will create.

Table 4.7 – Forecast retail job growth from the Town Centres Study

Broad Planning use class	For example.....	Total (gross) floorspace area required m2 2011-2033	Total (net)* development area required ha 2011-2033 †	Jobs equivalent (using HCA data on net area per FTE) †
A1 Retail: Comparison	'Ordinary' shops	38,100	9.05	1,905
A1 Retail: Convenience large scale	Superstores or supermarkets	7,400	1.76	78
A1 Retail: Convenience small scale	Small foodstores or discount food shops	7,200	1.71	402
A1 / A2: Professional services	Hairdressers, estate agents, banks	3,800	0.90	226
A3, A4, A5: Food and drink	Restaurants, pubs, takeaways	5,800	1.38	306
<b>Totals</b>		<b>+ 62,300</b>	<b>+ 14.80</b>	<b>+ 2,917</b>

\* Based on average floorspace/development size the Employment Densities Guide (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2010). Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>).

† Individual figures may not add up to the total, due to rounding.



Table 4.8 - Total land requirement based on need / demand identified in the Employment Land Review and Town Centres Study evidence base documents

Broad Planning use class	For example.....	Total (net) * development area required ha 2011-2033 †	Total additional jobs **
Offices (B1a/B1b) and Industry (B1c/B2)	Offices, business units	8.75	1,000
A1 Retail: Comparison	'Ordinary' shops	9.05	1,905
A1 Retail: Convenience large scale	Superstores or supermarkets	1.76	78
A1 Retail: Convenience small scale	Small foodstores or discount food shops	1.71	402
A1 / A2: Professional services	Hairdressers, estate agents, banks	0.90	226
A3, A4, A5: Food and drink	Restaurants, pubs, takeaways	1.38	306
<b>Totals</b>		<b>23.55</b>	<b>3,917</b>

\* Based on average floorspace per employee and development size quoted in the Employment Land Review. Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000 m<sup>2</sup>).

\*\*TCS jobs figures are derived from the floorspace targets, using HCA data on net area per FTE (full time employment job)

† Individual figures may not add up to the total, due to rounding.

#### 4.6 Employment land options

- The Council is therefore consulting on two options for a total employment target for 2011-2033, with a third option inviting alternative targets. Existing permissions (planning permissions for employment that have been granted within the year 2011/12, as this was the first year of the period of the new Local Plan), totalling 2.23ha, have been subtracted from the basic targets. The resulting remainder targets as shown in Table 4.9 below are the subject of this consultation.

Table 4.9 – Job growth targets

EMPLOYMENT Option		Target for jobs gain 2011-2033	Remainder employment site area target rounded to nearest 0.5 hectare †	Equivalent to a percentage of the entire area of the district (%)
1	East of England Plan	3,960	28.5	0.08%
2	Need identified by Employment Land Review and Town Centres Study	3,917	21.5	0.06%
3	Suggestions for another employment target – which needs to be supported by robust and up-to-date evidence	?	?	?

\* Based on the assumptions detailed above. Land requirement is given in hectares (1 hectare = 10,000m<sup>2</sup>).

\*\* These permissions are for a mixture of different uses, e.g. A1, B2 etc.

† At this point the remainder targets have been rounded to the nearest 0.5 hectares for ease of reference. However a more detailed breakdown of targets by use class will be made available later on in the Local Plan process

**Question 15:**

Are these job growth options the right ones for Epping Forest District?

**Yes / No**

If no, what else do you think should be considered?

#### **4.7 Options for the potential distribution of development**


- It is worth repeating part of the Introduction (paragraph 1.1) at this point. This is not a policy document and the diagrams that follow are not showing land allocations – they are only options at this stage of preparation of the Local Plan. The purpose of this consultation is to present all potentially reasonable alternatives for consideration to ensure that it cannot be claimed at a later stage that other reasonable options have been overlooked.
- It is clear that there is insufficient land within the current policy designations to meet the needs of the district even if the lowest housing and employment land targets were to be chosen. This means that some changes will be necessary to existing designations, possibly both within and outside settlements.

#### **c) Area around Harlow**

#### **4.8 Harlow**

- A key strategic decision is whether potential growth at Harlow is considered appropriate and acceptable. The East of England Plan (EEP) requires that Epping Forest, Harlow and East Herts District Councils work together to deliver regeneration and growth in Harlow. Whilst the EEP is due to be abolished, it is still reasonable to consider Harlow as a location for growth. It is a key population and service centre on the boundary with Epping Forest District, and a significant proportion of residents travel to the town for work, shopping, leisure, education and hospital services. Harlow Council has also made clear its continued aspiration for regeneration within the town, and considers some additional enabling growth will be necessary to achieve this. Under the recently introduced “Duty to Co-operate” it will be necessary to work in partnership to achieve any cross boundary growth.
- A report jointly commissioned by EFDC, Harlow and East Herts Councils assessed the potential options for delivering growth and regeneration in and around Harlow (Generating and Appraising Spatial Options for the Harlow Area – Scott Wilson (Jan 2010)). It identified a “Suggested Spatial Approach” after testing a number of alternative options, and concluded that development in the range of 3,000 – 4,000 homes could be accommodated within the environmental, landscape and infrastructure limits of the area around this district’s boundary with Harlow. The potential options for delivery of growth of this order are shown in Diagram 4.1. However, in recognising that the EEP is the main driver for this suggested distribution pattern, and this is due to be abolished, additional area options are also shown.

Diagram 4.1 – Options for development distribution around Harlow



- The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) has concluded that land is broadly available for development purposes around the boundary of Harlow within this district. Table 4.10 below provides a brief summary of the main opportunities and constraints for each of these broad areas, beyond those matters addressed by the SLAA. There are significant infrastructure deficits in Harlow, and any new development in this area would need to contribute to addressing these. Further investigation on the scale of infrastructure needed and the likely timing of delivery, would be required to take forward any of these potential growth locations.

Table 4.10 – Growth options around Harlow

Harlow					
Potential growth areas	Est. area/capacity	Opportunities	Strategic Constraints	Key Infrastructure	Key partners
<b>STRATEGIC GREEN BELT GAP</b> West of Pinnacles Industrial area, east of Roydon (SLAA References – SR-0009; SR-0052; SR-0157; SR-0210; SR-0423)	We do not support any form of built development in this area	Could provide extension to “Pinnacles” employment area Assessed by the Options Appraisal as having good accessibility to employment areas and town centre within Harlow, and green areas (Lee & Stort Valleys) Not previously identified in the “Suggested Spatial Approach” of the Harlow Options Appraisal (Scott Wilson 2010)	Proposed strategic Green Belt gap between Harlow & Roydon Local road network capacity. Cumulative traffic impact on motorway network Local sewerage network capacity Potential need for new electricity sub-station	Sewerage capacity unclear – dependent on scale of additional development within/around Harlow Community facilities required by regeneration needs within Harlow	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC Landowner / developer Roydon PC
<b>HAR - A</b> West of Katherines estate, Harlow (SLAA References – SR-0086; SR-0091; SR-0105; SR-0106; SR-0215)	900-1,100 dwellings	Assist regeneration of neighbourhood renewal areas within Harlow Assessed by the Options Appraisal as having good accessibility to employment areas and town centre within Harlow, and green areas (Lee & Stort Valleys) Not previously identified in the “Suggested Spatial Approach” of the Harlow Options Appraisal (Scott Wilson 2010)	Land within Green Belt Allocated glasshouse area (E13) Local road network capacity Local sewerage network capacity	Sewerage capacity unclear – dependent on scale of additional development within/around Harlow Community facilities required by regeneration needs within Harlow	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC Landowner / developer Roydon PC

Harlow					
Potential growth areas	Est. area/capacity	Opportunities	Strategic Constraints	Key Infrastructure	Key partners
<b>HAR - B</b> West of Summers estate, Harlow (SLAA References – SR-0038; SR-0039; SR-0068; SR-0107; SR-0109)	1,100 – 1,350 dwellings	Assist regeneration of neighbourhood renewal areas within Harlow  Assessed by the Options Appraisal as having good accessibility to employment areas and town centre within Harlow, and green areas (Lee & Stort Valleys)	Land within Green Belt  Local road network capacity  Local sewerage network capacity	Sewerage capacity unclear – dependent on scale of additional development within/around Harlow  Community facilities required by regeneration needs within Harlow	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC  Landowner / developer  Roydon PC Epping Upland PC
<b>HAR - C</b> South of Harlow (SLAA References – SR-0006; SR-0046; SR-0074; SR-0092; SR-0139)	400 – 800 dwellings	Assist regeneration of neighbourhood renewal areas within Harlow	Land within Green Belt  Landscape ridge – integral and vital feature that should not be breached by development or associated infrastructure	Upgrade works to J7 of the M11  Capacity of residential roads leading to this area from Southern Way	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC  Highways Agency  Landowner / developer  Epping Upland PC North Weald PC

Harlow					
Potential growth areas	Est. area/capacity	Opportunities	Strategic Constraints	Key Infrastructure	Key partners
<b>HAR - D</b> Land between M11 and A414 (SLAA References – SR-0066; SR-0409)	7ha employment land	Gateway development to Harlow Potential employment area close to motorway access	Land within Green Belt	Upgrade works to J7 of the M11	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC Highways Agency Landowner / developer North Weald PC
<b>HAR - E</b> Land east of Harlow (SLAA References – SR-0146; SR-0403)	6,500 – 7,300 dwellings including employment & green spaces.	Significant mixed use development, including new junction 7A from M11 to serve Harlow & surrounding area. Development area largely within Harlow c140ha within EFDC	Land within Green Belt (in EFDC) Several heritage assets within or in close proximity to potential development area	Upgrade works to J7 of the M11 New junction 7A to serve Harlow east (& north?) Sewerage capacity unclear – dependent on scale of additional development within/around Harlow	EFDC Harlow DC Essex CC Highways Agency Landowner / developer Matching PC Sheering PC

**Question 16:**  
 Should growth around Harlow, within Epping Forest District be supported within the Local Plan in order to meet the growth needs of the district (section 4.8 and Table 4.10)? **Yes / No**

If no, what are your reasons for this?

**Impact on the Green Belt**  
**Impact on landscape**  
**Impact on biodiversity**  
**Traffic congestion in and around Harlow**  
**Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc.) in and around Harlow**  
**Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity etc.) in and around Harlow**  
**Flood risk**  
**Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District**  
**Impact on heritage assets**  
**Other (please specify)**

**Question 17:**  
 Have we identified the right potential development areas around Harlow? **Yes / No**

If no, please give details of other potential development options.



**Question 18:**  
Which of the options for potential development around Harlow do you prefer?

HAR – A  
HAR – B  
HAR – C  
HAR – D  
HAR – E

Please provide reasons for your preference.

#### d) Distribution of growth

##### 4.9 – Remainder of Epping Forest District

- In considering the potential for growth in the remainder of the district, eight spatial options have been investigated. The first of these (proportionate distribution) is included purely for illustrative purposes as explained below (section 4.10). Potential growth has been calculated on a ward-by-ward basis, with the figures amalgamated to give “town” areas where appropriate. In rural areas, where development is suggested for a wide area, this is intended to take place in and around existing settlements, not within the open countryside.
- The tables that follow (4.11 to 4.18) include the three net housing targets being proposed for consultation (from Table 4.2). These are further broken down into ‘Growth at Harlow’ and ‘No growth at Harlow’ totals. ‘Growth at Harlow’ assumes that development along the Harlow boundary would account for 3,500 houses in each of the three consultation targets, with consequent proportionate reductions in all the named areas of the district. In a similar vein, the net employment targets are taken from Table 4.9. The ‘Growth at Harlow’ total refers to the area potentially available as ‘HAR-D’ in diagram 4.1 and table 4.10, ie it subtracts 7.47 ha from the two consultation targets for the district. For ease of presentation, the diagrams which accompany the tables only show the percentage distribution for each spatial option, rather than the actual housing numbers or areas of employment land.

##### 4.10 – Proportionate distribution (a) with Loughton/Buckhurst Hill, and (b) with constrained Loughton/Buckhurst Hill

- (a) The Community Visioning results show that residents favour a development pattern which focuses development “close to public transport links” and “around or within existing towns”. The largest settlements will generate the greatest need for development, but should also allow better access to services by sustainable means of transport. The net growth targets have therefore initially been spread proportionately around the district, with the towns accommodating the largest level of new growth in relation to their existing size. Table 4.11 demonstrates this approach, indicating that Loughton should take 25% of the future growth of the district while areas with the smallest current population would deliver 1.5% of growth.
- The advantages of this approach are that each town would broadly accommodate its own development needs, and the best use would be made of existing infrastructure. However, it is clear from the findings of the SLAA that capacity for development is heavily constrained in Loughton and Buckhurst Hill. The distribution shown below is therefore not considered a reasonable option, and is included here for explanatory purposes only.

Table 4.11 – Proportionate Distribution (for information only)

Proportionate distribution	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)				
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base		% Distribution
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	171	113	150	91	108	49	0.479	0.354	0.361	0.236	1.7%
Buckhurst Hill	919	604	802	487	577	261	2.568	1.898	1.938	1.264	9.0%
Chigwell	1,056	694	921	559	663	300	2.951	2.177	2.226	1.453	10.4%
Epping (inc. Thornwood)	987	648	861	522	619	281	2.757	2.035	2.080	1.357	9.7%
Hastingswood, Matching & Sheering Village	169	111	148	90	106	48	0.473	0.349	0.357	0.233	1.7%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	178	117	156	94	112	51	0.498	0.368	0.376	0.245	1.7%
Lambourne	156	102	136	83	98	44	0.436	0.321	0.329	0.214	1.5%
Loughton	2,529	1,661	2,207	1,339	1,587	719	7.067	5.214	5.331	3.479	24.8%
Lower Nazeing	349	229	305	185	219	99	0.376	0.270	0.266	0.180	3.4%
Lower Sheering	177	116	154	94	111	50	0.494	0.364	0.372	0.243	1.7%
Moreton & Fyfield	189	124	165	100	118	54	0.389	0.289	0.298	0.200	1.9%
North Weald	380	250	331	201	238	108	1.061	0.783	0.801	0.522	3.7%
Ongar	529	348	462	280	332	150	1.478	1.091	1.115	0.728	5.2%
Passingford	178	117	156	94	112	51	0.498	0.368	0.376	0.245	1.7%
Roydon	175	115	153	93	110	50	0.490	0.361	0.369	0.241	1.7%
Theydon Bois	332	218	290	176	208	94	0.927	0.684	0.700	0.457	3.3%
Waltham Abbey	1,725	1,133	1,505	913	1,082	490	4.819	3.556	3.635	2.372	16.9%
	<b>10,200</b>	<b>6,700</b>	<b>8,900</b>	<b>5,400</b>	<b>6,400</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>14,030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- (b) Whilst the SLAA has identified some significant areas of land that could potentially be allocated for development in and around Loughton and Buckhurst Hill these are either within areas proposed as strategic Green Belt gaps or are currently in use as public open space. The Council would not support development in these areas. On the basis of this initial analysis, there is identified capacity in and around Loughton for 209 dwellings, and 52 dwellings in and around Buckhurst Hill. No additional land for employment purposes is identified in these areas at this stage, although redevelopment or intensification may be possible within some of the existing designated employment areas. On further detailed investigation, these figures may decrease or increase during the Plan making process, but this is the best information available at present.

- On the basis that available land is heavily constrained in Loughton and Buckhurst Hill, the proportionate distribution approach above has been further refined to take this into account (see table 4.12), and is considered to be a reasonable option for the distribution of growth.
- The potential implications of this pattern of growth could be substantial, and each area of the district would receive some planned growth over the Plan period. The levels of infrastructure required to support growth would vary in each location, but could be significant in the higher growth areas.

Table 4.12 – Spatial Option 1


Proportionate Distribution - allowing for constraint	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)				
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base	% Distribution of remainder in non-constrained wards	
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	252	164	219	131	156	67	0.724	0.534	0.546	0.356	2.5%
<b>Buckhurst Hill</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Chigwell	1,555	1,007	1,351	804	960	413	4.458	3.289	3.363	2.194	15.6%
Epping (inc Thornwood Common)	1,453	941	1,263	751	897	386	4.165	3.074	3.142	2.051	14.6%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	249	161	217	129	154	66	0.715	0.527	0.539	0.352	2.5%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	263	170	228	136	162	70	0.753	0.556	0.568	0.371	2.6%
Lambourne	229	149	199	119	142	61	0.658	0.485	0.496	0.324	2.3%
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Lower Nazeing	514	333	447	266	318	137	1.474	1.068	1.112	0.726	5.2%
Lower Sheering	260	168	226	134	161	69	0.746	0.550	0.563	0.367	2.6%
Moreton & Fyfield	278	180	242	144	172	74	0.797	0.588	0.601	0.392	2.8%
North Weald	559	362	486	289	345	148	1.603	1.183	1.210	0.789	5.6%
Ongar	779	505	677	403	481	207	2.233	1.648	1.685	1.099	7.8%
Passingford	263	170	228	136	162	70	0.753	0.555	0.568	0.371	2.6%
Roydon	258	167	224	133	159	68	0.740	0.546	0.558	0.364	2.6%
Theytton Bois	489	317	425	253	302	130	1.401	1.034	1.057	0.690	4.9%
Weltham Abbey	2,539	1,645	2,207	1,313	1,568	674	7.280	5.372	5.492	3.584	25.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,200</b>	<b>6,700</b>	<b>8,900</b>	<b>5,400</b>	<b>6,400</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>28.500</b>	<b>21.030</b>	<b>21.500</b>	<b>14.030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- Table 4.12 shows the numbers of homes and amount of employment land in hectares that would be required in each area under this scenario. There are both benefits and disadvantages to this approach. This pattern of growth would spread

planned new development around the district, with each area accommodating a share. However, at the lower levels of overall growth this may cause community and social facilities that are already nearing their current capacity to exceed those limits, whilst not providing sufficient funds from development to invest in significant improvement, upgrades or new facilities. Larger development schemes are more likely to generate higher levels of funding from development to deliver associated infrastructure.

Diagram 4.2 – Spatial Option 1: Proportionate Distribution



#### **4.11 – Transport Network Focus**

- There are four options that have been developed around the existing public transport network, which also take advantage of good access to the motorway network. As in **Spatial Option 1** the constrained capacity at Loughton and Buckhurst Hill is reflected, and influences the distribution of growth in other locations around the district.
- Locating new development where there is good access to public transport is one of the key elements in achieving sustainable development. This provides residents and workers with a reasonable opportunity to use public transport, potentially reducing private car journeys. **Spatial Options 2 and 3** therefore seek to focus development in towns and large villages where there is a rail station, or good access to a rail station by public transport. These options also take advantage of rail stations which are outside the district but reasonably close to the boundary.
- By focusing on settlements with good or reasonable access to public transport and the major road network, the rural areas of the district are specifically excluded. It is not realistic, however, to expect that no growth in housing or commercial development will occur over the Plan period in the rural areas. Based on previous housing delivery trends, 10% of the total housing target has been deducted and it is anticipated this will come forward in the rural parts of the district.
- There are two broad options using the transport network as a focus:
  - Focus development in towns/villages with good access to a rail and/or underground station:
    - Proportionate distribution – **Spatial Option 2**;
    - Equal distribution – **Spatial Option 3**
  - Focus development in large town/villages that have good access to public transport, but not those along the Central Line, recognising that the peak hour capacity of the Central Line has been reached, and no further expansion is possible:
    - Proportionate distribution – **Spatial Option 4**;
    - Equal distribution – **Spatial Option 5**

Table 4.13 – Spatial Option 2

	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)				
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population protections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base	% Distribution of remainder in non-constrained wards	
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
<b>Buckhurst Hill</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Chigwell	1,818	1,176	1,580	938	1,121	479	20.4%	5,810	4,363	2,860	20.4%
Epping (inc. Thornwood Common)	1,699	1,099	1,476	876	1,047	447	19.0%	5,429	4,006	2,672	19.0%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Lower Nazeing	601	389	522	310	371	158	6.7%	1,921	1,418	0,946	6.7%
Lower Sheering	304	197	264	157	188	80	3.4%	0,972	0,717	0,478	3.4%
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
North Weald	654	423	568	337	403	172	7.3%	2,090	1,542	1,029	7.3%
Ongar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Roydon	302	195	262	156	186	79	3.4%	0,964	0,711	0,474	3.4%
Theydon Bois	571	370	496	295	352	150	6.4%	1,826	1,347	0,899	6.4%
Waltham Abbey	2,969	1,921	2,580	1,531	1,831	782	33.3%	9,489	7,002	4,671	33.3%
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>14,030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- **Spatial Option 2** distributes development to the towns and villages with good public transport access in proportion to their existing size. This brings a particular focus for development to Waltham Abbey, Chigwell and Epping, with smaller levels of growth at North Weald, Lower Nazeing, Lower Sheering, Theydon Bois and Roydon. Significant development could bring associated infrastructure improvements and new job creation to these areas. As with all these options however, development in the Green Belt will be required.



Diagram 4.3 – Spatial Option 2: Transport Focus – Proportionate Distribution




Table 4.14 – Spatial Option 3

Transport focus - Equal Distribution - allowing for constraint	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)			% Distribution of remainder in non-constrained wards		
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base			
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow		Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
<b>Buckhurst Hill</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>	
Chigwell	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Epping (inc Thornwood Common)	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Lower Nazeing	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Lower Sheering	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
North Weald	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Ongar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Roydon	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Theydon Bois	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
Waltham Abbey	1,115	721	969	575	687	294	12.5%	3,563	2,629	2,688	1,754	12.5%
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>14,030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- **Spatial Option 3** recognises that the presence of a rail / Central Line station in or near one of the towns or villages above is key, and uses this as the main driver. This pattern could put proportionately more pressure on the smaller settlements, although conversely the higher levels of growth in such settlements could provide the critical mass to deliver new services and community facilities.

Diagram 4.4 – Spatial Option 3: Transport Focus – Equal Distribution




Table 4.15 – Spatial Option 4

Development Focus away from Central Line - Proportionate distribution	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)						
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base		% Distribution		
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	% Distribution
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%
Buckhurst Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chigwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Epping (inc Thornwood)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Loughton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lower Nazeing	961	632	839	509	603	273	10.5%	2.985	2.202	2.252	1.469	10.5%	10.5%
Lower Sheering	486	319	424	257	305	138	5.3%	1.510	1.114	1.139	0.743	5.3%	5.3%
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
North Weald	1,046	687	912	554	656	297	11.4%	3.246	2.395	2.449	1.598	11.4%	11.4%
Ongar	1,456	957	1,271	771	914	414	15.9%	4.521	3.336	3.411	2.226	15.9%	15.9%
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Roydon	482	317	421	255	303	137	5.3%	1.497	1.105	1.130	0.737	5.3%	5.3%
Theydon Bois	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Waltham Abbey	4,748	3,119	4,143	2,514	2,979	1,350	51.7%	14.740	10.877	11.120	7.256	51.7%	51.7%
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28.500</b>	<b>21.030</b>	<b>21.500</b>	<b>14.030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- Spatial options 4 and 5** recognise that the capacity of the Central Line is reaching its maximum (see also Chapter 7). London Underground has made clear that there are no significant upgrades or changes that can be made to the line or the trains to further increase capacity, and therefore these two options focus growth away from the Central Line. Whilst the district's location on the edge of London will always mean there is a high level of out commuting to the capital for work, by not permitting significant additional development in towns served by the Central Line, the capacity may not be further stretched. An unintended consequence of this distribution pattern could be that commuters choose to use public transport or drive to their nearest Central Line station, thereby worsening the existing car-parking capacity issues around these stations.

- Some additional capacity may be realised on the Central Line when the Cross Rail terminal is opened in Shenfield from 2018, but this cannot be quantified as yet.
- Option 4 shows that development could be spread proportionately between those settlements that have access to a range of services and public transport.

Diagram 4.5 – Spatial Option 4: Development away from the Central Line – Proportionate Distribution




Table 4.16 – Spatial Option 5


**Development Focus  
away from Central Line -  
Equal distribution**

	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)				
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base		% Distribution of remainder in non-constrained wards
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Buckhurst Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Chigwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Epping (inc Thornwood)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Roddings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Loughton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Lower Nazeing	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
Lower Sheering	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
North Weald	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
Ongar	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Roydon	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
Theydon Bois	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Waltham Abbey	1,530	1,005	1,335	810	960	435	16.7%	4,750	3,505	3,583	16.7%
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

- **Spatial Option 5** follows the same distribution pattern as Option 4 but would spread development equally around these key settlements. Whilst the smaller settlements would be required to accommodate proportionately more growth, this may bring opportunities for key infrastructure and facilities to be delivered as part of this growth. Local job creation could also result.

Diagram 4.6 – Spatial Option 5: Development away from the Central Line – Equal Distribution





#### **4.12- Focus only on towns/large villages with significant capacity**

- Spatial Options 6 and 7 introduce a flexible distribution pattern, and reflect the nature of the district in that there is no single key settlement, but a series of towns and large villages that could all play a role to a greater or lesser extent in accommodating the development needs of the district over the Plan period. Both options adopt the same distribution pattern, but focus only on the eight largest towns and villages in the district, again recognising the key constraint of land availability in Buckhurst Hill and Loughton.
- Although these options show development spread proportionately and equally between all of the identified settlements, this option could be much more flexible and focus land requirements on only some of these in order to meet existing infrastructure deficits. For example, Chipping Ongar no longer has a secondary school, and a significant amount of development could attract sufficient investment to deliver a new facility, along with major road improvements, flood alleviation and affordable housing. Similarly in Waltham Abbey, significant levels of development could bring a secondary town centre (i.e. to the east) to further boost the shops and job opportunities available in the town. Large areas of land allocated for business purposes in a single location could create a modern business park, which could attract high value local jobs to the district.

Table 4.17 – Spatial Option 6

**Large settlements - Proportionate Distribution allowing for constraint**

	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)					
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base	% Distribution		
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	% Distribution	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.0%	
<b>Buckhurst Hill</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>constrained</b>	
Chigwell	1,758	1,137	1,527	907	1,084	463	19.7%	5.618	4.238	2,765	19.7%	
Epping (inc Thornwood Common)	1,843	1,063	1,427	847	1,013	433	18.4%	5,249	3,873	2,584	18.4%	
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
High Ongar, Willingale & The Rodings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>constrained</b>	
Lower Nazeing	581	376	505	300	358	153	6.5%	1,858	1,371	1,402	6.5%	
Lower Sheering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
North Weald	632	409	549	326	390	167	7.1%	2,021	1,491	1,524	7.1%	
Ongar	881	570	785	454	543	232	9.9%	2,814	2,077	2,123	9.9%	
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
Roydon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%	
Theydon Bois	553	357	480	285	341	146	6.2%	1,765	1,303	1,332	6.2%	
Waltham Abbey	2,871	1,857	2,495	1,481	1,770	756	32.2%	9,175	6,770	6,921	32.2%	
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>14,030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding




Table 4.18 – Spatial Option Z

**Large settlements - Equal Distribution - allowing for constraint**

	Housing (additional homes required)						Employment (additional hectares of land required)				
	A) Official population projections		B) Combined East of England Plan / Update of population projections		C) Adopted East of England Plan		1) East of England Plan		2) Need identified by Evidence Base		% Distribution of remainder in non-constrained wards
	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	No growth at Harlow	Growth at Harlow	
Broadley Common, Epping Upland & Nazeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
<b>Buckhurst Hill</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Chigwell	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Epping (inc Thornwood Common)	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Hastingwood, Matching & Sheering Village	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
High Ongar, Willingale & The Roddings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Lambourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>constrained</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>constrained</b>
Lower Nazeing	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Lower Sheering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Moreton & Fyfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
North Weald	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Ongar	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Passingford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Roydon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.0%
Theydon Bois	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
Waltham Abbey	1,274	824	1,107	657	786	336	14.3%	4.071	3.004	3.071	14.3%
<b>10% of the total has been removed as a rural exception allowance</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>6,030</b>	<b>8,010</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>5,760</b>	<b>2,610</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>28,500</b>	<b>21,030</b>	<b>21,500</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* figures may not sum due to rounding

Diagram 4.8 – Spatial Option 7: Large Settlements – Equal Distribution



**Question 19:**

Which one of the suggested spatial options do you prefer?

**Spatial Option 1: Proportionate distribution**

**Spatial Option 2: Transport Focus – proportionate distribution**

**Spatial Option 3: Transport Focus – equal distribution**

**Spatial Option 4: Development away from the Central Line – proportionate distribution**

**Spatial Option 5: Development away from the Central Line – equal distribution**

**Spatial Option 6: Large Settlements – proportionate distribution**

**Spatial Option 7: Large Settlements – equal distribution**

Please provide reasons for your preference.

**Question 20:**

Or do you consider that a combination of two or more of these options would be more appropriate? **Yes / No**

If yes, please tell us which ones should be combined, and what you think an appropriate distribution pattern should be.

**Question 21:**

Do you think there are any other spatial distribution patterns that we should consider? **Yes / No**

If yes, please tell us what you think we should consider and why.

## e) Settlement analysis

### 4.13 – Spatial Options – Settlement Analysis

- Following consideration of reasonable distribution patterns above, the possible options for the delivery of this growth have also been identified. Recognising that the protection of the Green Belt is one of the most important issues for residents, potential “opportunity areas” have been identified within existing settlement boundaries where possible. These are where (a) there is either a known need for redevelopment or change of use; or (b) the existing use is likely to cease over the Plan period. In themselves, these opportunity areas may require a change in the existing policy designations. From this initial analysis it is clear there is insufficient land to meet the development needs of the district within the existing settlement boundaries.
- Potential areas (or directions) for growth outside the boundaries of settlements have therefore been identified, using the information available in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA). All of these potential development areas are within the Green Belt, but at this stage it is not reasonable to exclude them from consideration solely for this reason. It should also be stressed that the total area of this land (as shown in the following diagrams 4.9 to 4.21) far exceeds the amount that would be needed to meet any of the housing and employment land targets.
- Limited filtering of sites has taken place at this stage, with only the following being removed:
  - Sites that have been scored “red” by the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA);
  - Sites that are within a proposed strategic Green Belt gap;
  - Sites that are a significant distance from existing settlements, or those in rural villages that have not yet been assessed in detail.
- The level of growth that will be needed in each location will be dependent on the overall growth target, and the spatial distribution pattern that is eventually chosen. There are key choices to be made about the way in which the development needs of the district are to be met over the Plan period, and to do this all reasonable options must be identified and assessed at the first stage. This includes some areas where planning permission has previously been refused, but where it may now be reasonable to consider some of the key principles which underpinned that decision. At this stage no areas of designated urban open space have been identified as potential development areas, although depending on responses to this consultation we may need to revisit the issue.



- By inclusion in this document, the Council is not favouring any of the potential areas for growth at this stage. It is clear, however, from the information given and the detailed assessment in the SLAA, that some sites are considered more suitable for development than others.
- Area assessments have been completed for the largest towns and villages in the district, as these are most likely to receive an element of planned growth. The settlements are listed in alphabetical order, and not in any order of preference. The smaller rural villages have not been assessed in this level of detail as yet.

i) Buckhurst Hill  
Diagram 4.9 – Potential development options for Buckhurst Hill




Table 4.19 – Potential development options for Buckhurst Hill

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>BKH-1</b>	(Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) Reference – SR-0176)  St Just, 1 Powell Road	Residential garden  Roughly 85% of the site is Green Belt  Site area = 1.2ha	<p>This site is a large residential garden, which was submitted to the Call for Sites by the owners for residential development. It is just at the edge of the existing settlement, near to the shops and services in Queen's Road.</p> <p>The site backs onto the Linder's Field Local Nature Reserve (LNR). The house on the site, St Just, is a locally listed building which was designated as such due to its association with the Linder family and Beatrix Potter. Any redevelopment would need to mitigate negative impacts on the LNR.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 40 homes (just over 30 dph)</p>	Public open space, contributions to education & affordable housing	<p>Site owners</p> <p>EFDC including: Conservation Officer</p> <p>Countrycare officers (who manage the LNR)</p> <p>Buckhurst Hill Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p>
<b>BKH-2</b>	(SLAA Reference – SR-0230)  Electricity sub-station off Station Way, Roding Valley	Electricity sub-station in urban area  Site area = 0.17ha	<p>This site was submitted to the Call for Sites by the owner Transport for London (TfL) for residential development.</p> <p>It is within the existing settlement, and very close to Roding Valley underground station and the Station Way parade of shops. However, the site is subject to a TPO, and backs onto the railway line. Development would need to be carefully designed to mitigate noise issues for future residents.</p> <p>TfL suggested a capacity of 12 homes (density would be roughly 70 dwellings per hectare, but this may be acceptable in this urban environment if the site is well designed)</p>	Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education & affordable housing	<p>Transport for London (owners)</p> <p>EFDC including Landscape officers</p> <p>Buckhurst Hill Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>

Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>				
None identified				

**Question 22:**  
 Have we identified the right potential development options for Buckhurst Hill? **Yes / No**  
 If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 23:**  
 Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?:  
**BKH – 1**  
**BKH – 2**

**Question 24:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 23 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Buckhurst Hill;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Buckhurst Hill;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Buckhurst Hill;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

ii) Chigwell  
Diagram 4.10 – Potential development options for Chigwell




Table 4.20 – Potential development options for Chigwell

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>CHG-1</b>	<p>(SLAA Reference – SR-0014)</p> <p>Land adjoining 40A Hainault Road</p>	<p>Vacant plot</p> <p>Within Green Belt. Site area = 0.39ha</p>	<p>This site was suggested through the Call for Sites by owner for residential housing (10 flats).</p> <p>It is currently an empty plot, directly adjacent to housing and a community hall, within the existing settlement. It is near to shops and services, and also to Chigwell station (Central Line).</p> <p>There are some preserved trees on the border with the adjacent property (no. 40A), but any development could avoid these.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 10 homes, but planning permission was granted in 2011 for the erection of only one house on this plot.</p>	<p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owner</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Landscape officer</p> <p>Chigwell Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>
<b>Directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>CHG-A</b>	Metropolitan Police Chigwell Sports Club, Chigwell Hall, High Road.  (SLAA site SR-0115)	Metropolitan Police Chigwell Sports Club  Within Green Belt. Site area = 19.24ha	<p>Although this site is currently in use as a Sports Club, it was suggested by the owner through the Call for Sites for potential future re-development. The owner suggests that the site could be developed for housing and enhanced sports recreation and social facilities, but not immediately (owner suggests 10-15 years).</p> <p>The site is well related to the existing settlement, and is near to Chigwell's shops and services, and the Central Line station.</p> <p>The main building on site, Chigwell Hall, is Grade II listed, so re-development would need to be designed sensitively around it.</p> <p>There are also several preserved trees along the south eastern boundary, but development could be designed to avoid these. A very small part, also along the south eastern boundary, is within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 575 dwellings (at 30 dwellings per hectare) – but the likely total would be less, as the Listed Building would need to remain.</p>	Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education & affordable housing	Site owner  EFDC Conservation and Landscape officers  Chigwell Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)



	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>CHG-B</b>	<p>Area on the south corner of the junction of High Road and Vicarage Lane. (incorporating western part of SLAA site SR-0318)</p>	<p>Vacant plot Within Green Belt. Site area = approx 1.8ha</p>	<p>This site is entirely within the Conservation Area, so any development would need to be carefully designed. It is fairly close to shops and services.</p> <p>There is also potential contamination on part of site, but it is thought that redevelopment could be an opportunity to enhance the land.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 54 dwellings (at 30 dwellings per hectare)</p>	<p>Potential need to improve roundabout junction of High Road and Vicarage Lane?</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owner EFDC Conservation officer Chigwell Parish Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>CHG-C</b>	Area to the south-east of Chigwell Primary School, and to the east of Vicarage Lane, (not including allotment gardens) (incorporating eastern part of SLAA site SR-0318)	Agricultural fields Within Green Belt. Site area = approx 9.7ha	<p>This area lies on the north eastern edge of Chigwell, fairly close to shops and services, and next to Chigwell Primary School.</p> <p>There are some preserved trees on the site but the SLAA concludes that impact on these could be mitigated. It is also adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SLAA identified potential contamination across a large part of site (from sewage sludge), but thought that redevelopment could be an opportunity to enhance the land.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 291 dwellings (at 30 dwellings per hectare)</p>	<p>Potential need to improve roundabout junction of High Road and Vicarage Lane?</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owner</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation and Landscape officers</p> <p>Chigwell Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>CHG-D</b>	Land due south of Courtland Drive and Chigwell Brook to the Central Line. (NB this does <u>not</u> include land south-east of Daleside Gardens).  (incorporating western part of SR-0098)	Agricultural fields  Within Green Belt. Site area = approx. 14.8ha	<p>This site was suggested through the Call for Sites by the owner for a combination of residential housing, some employment, and a community facility to serve the housing.</p> <p>The site is well related to the existing settlement, and is near to Chigwell's shops and services, and the Central Line station.</p> <p>There are some listed buildings nearby, although not on the site itself. There are some preserved trees on the border (near no. 40A), but any development could be designed to avoid these.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 355 homes and 1.2ha employment plus a community facility (assuming an 80:20 split of housing to employment, a 30 dwelling per hectare housing density, and a commercial plot ratio of 0.4)</p>	<p>Need for new access off Courtland Drive?</p> <p>If CHG-1 were to be developed, it could be used to form a new access to CHG-D off Hainault Road?</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owner</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation and landscape officers</p> <p>Chigwell Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>

**Question 25:**  
 Have we identified the right potential development options for Chigwell? **Yes / No**  
 If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 26:**

Only one potential opportunity area has been identified in this area – CHG – 1. Do you think this area may be appropriate for development? **Yes / No**

**Question 27: 9**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 26 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Chigwell;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Chigwell;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Chigwell;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

**Question 28:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

- CHG – A**
- CHG – B**
- CHG – C**
- CHG – D**

**Question 29:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 28 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Chigwell;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Chigwell;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Chigwell;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

iii) Chipping Ongar

Diagram 4.11 – Potential development options for Chipping Ongar




Table 4.21 – Potential development options for Chipping Ongar

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>ONG-1</b>	Rear of 101-103 High Street. (SLAA site SR-0022)	Urban site to the rear of Royal Oak pub – existing business premises  Site area = 1.04ha	This site was suggested for residential development (5 homes) through the Call for Sites.  It is well located for the town centre, but near to listed buildings, so redevelopment would need to mitigate any impact.	As this is a small site, it is not thought that it would require significant infrastructure improvements	Site owners – relocation of existing businesses would be required.  EFDC Conservation officer Ongar Town Forum ECC (Schools)
<b>Directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>ONG-A</b>	Area to the east of Fyfield Road and north of the A414 Chelmsford Road.  (Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0055, 0183, 0184, 0185, 0186, and part of 0395 to east of Fyfield Road, 10ha)	Agricultural fields and scrub land  Within Green Belt. Approx total = 27ha	This area is a fair distance from the town centre, but is closer to shops and services within Shelley, including the primary school. Parts of the area were suggested through the Call for Sites for housing.  Much of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity (Settlement Edge Landscape Sensitivity Study (SELSS)).  Potential capacity: for housing alone could be roughly 795 homes (assumes 30 dph). However this site may be suitable for mixed use, and could accommodate roughly 635 homes plus 5.3 hectares employment land. It may also be appropriate to include a community facility.	Development of a site of this size will require expansion of Shelley primary school, and may attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar  Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education & affordable housing	Site owners  EFDC  Ongar Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>ONG-B</b>	<p>Area to the east of Roding View and Mayflower Way, and south of the A414 Chelmsford Road.</p> <p>(Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0051 and 0387)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields</p> <p>Within Green Belt.</p> <p>Approx total = 14ha</p>	<p>This area is some way between the shops and services of the High Street, and those within Shelley, including the primary school. Parts of the area were suggested through the Call for Sites for housing and employment.</p> <p>Part of the area is within Great Stony School conservation area, so development would need to be sensitive to built heritage.</p> <p>Potential capacity: roughly 345 homes and roughly 1 hectare of employment (assumes 30 dph, and an 80:20 land split of housing to employment). It may also be appropriate to include a community facility.</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size may require expansion of Shelley primary school. It is not clear at this stage whether development would attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation officer</p> <p>Ongar Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>



ONG-C	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>Area to the east of High Street. (Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0255 and 0315)</p>	<p>Playing field/recreation ground and amenity open space, sports club and car park, some residential garden land and agricultural fields</p> <p>Recreation field and sports club at Love Lane, including all buildings especially the garage, sports club and former Council Offices.</p> <p>Within Green Belt. Approx total =59.5ha</p>	<p>This area is near the High Street with its shops and services, and fairly near Chipping Ongar primary school. Part of the area was suggested by Ongar Town Council through the Call for Sites for housing and a community facility.</p> <p>The area adjoins a Conservation Area and the site of Ongar Castle, so development would need to be sensitive to built heritage. All of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity (SELSS).</p> <p>Part of the area is within flood zones 2 and 3a, which would mean that about 12 hectares could not be developed, however, the overall available area would still be very large.</p> <p>Potential capacity: for housing alone could be roughly 1,805 homes (assumes 30 dph).</p> <p>This site may be more suitable for mixed use, and could accommodate roughly 1,445 homes plus 4.8 hectares employment land. It would need to include a community facility to replace the Council Offices which would be lost, and re-provision of open space, the sports centre, the playing field and the recreation ground. The site may need to include the provision of a new secondary school, unless a more suitable site can be found elsewhere within the town, given the scale of potential development.</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size would require expansion of Shelley primary school and/or Marden Ash primary school, and attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar</p> <p>Relocation of existing sports centre, Council Offices and recreation space would be required</p> <p>Depending on the scale of development, a bypass south from the A414 might be needed</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners. EFDC Conservation, Landscape and Land Drainage officers Ongar Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Ongar Town Forum</p>

ONG-D	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>Area to south east of Marden Ash (Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0053, 0090, 0267 and 0391)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields. Within Green Belt. Approx total = 56 ha</p>	<p>This area is a fair distance from the town centre, but is close to Marden Ash primary school. Parts of the area were suggested through the Call for Sites for housing, employment/retail and a community facility.  Some of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity Study (SELSS)), so development would have to be carefully designed.  Potential capacity: for mixed use could be approximately 1,344 homes, 4.48 ha employment plus a community facility (assuming an 80:20 split of housing to employment, a 30 dwelling per hectare housing density, and a commercial plot ratio of 0.4)</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size will require expansion of Marden Ash primary school, and could attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar  Depending on the scale of development, and if ONG-D and ONG-C were both to be developed, a bypass south from the A414 might be needed  Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners  EFDC Conservation, Landscape and Land Drainage officers  Ongar Town Council  ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)  Ongar Town Forum</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>ONG-E</b>	<p>Area to south west of Marden Ash</p> <p>(Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0112 and 0268)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields.</p> <p>Within Green Belt.</p> <p>Approx total = 18 ha</p>	<p>This area is a fair distance from the town centre, but is close to Marden Ash primary school. Parts of the area were suggested through the Call for Sites for housing, employment and a community facility.</p> <p>Some of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity (SELSS), so development would have to be carefully designed.</p> <p>A large part of this area is in single ownership but occupied by a tenant farmer – however the promoter suggests it may be available in 10-15 years.</p> <p>Potential capacity: for mixed use could be approximately 432 homes, 1.44 ha employment plus a community facility (assuming an 80:20 split of housing to employment, a 30 dwelling per hectare housing density, and a commercial plot ratio of 0.4)</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size will require expansion of Marden Ash primary school, and could attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar</p> <p>Depending on the scale of development, and if ONG-F and ONG-E were both to be developed, a bypass south from the A414 might be needed</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation, Landscape and Land Drainage officers</p> <p>Ongar Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Ongar Town Forum</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>ONG-F</b>	<p>Area to the west of High Street and existing residential development, and south of the A414 Chelmsford Road</p> <p>(Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0067 (all 3 parts), 0120 and 0390)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields and a few houses</p> <p>Within Green Belt. Approx total = 84 ha</p>	<p>This area is near the High Street with its shops and services, and near Shelley and Chipping Ongar primary schools. Most of the area was suggested through the Call for Sites for housing.</p> <p>Part of the area is in a flood risk zone, meaning that about 18 hectares could not be developed, however, the overall available area would still be very large. Much of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity (SELSS). There are TPOs, and the site adjoins a Conservation Area, so development needs to be sensitive.</p> <p>Potential capacity: for housing alone could be roughly 2,530 homes (assumes 30 dph). This site may be more suitable for mixed use, and could accommodate roughly 2,015 homes plus 6.7 hectares employment land. It may also be appropriate to include a community facility. The site may need to include the provision of a new secondary school given the scale of potential development, unless a more suitable location elsewhere in the town can be identified.</p> <p>Area F includes some land to the south of Greensted Road. It may be more sensible to exclude this, as the road could be used as a defensible Green Belt boundary.</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size will require expansion of Shelley and/or Chipping Ongar primary schools, and attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar</p> <p>Depending on the scale of development, a bypass south from the A414 might be needed</p> <p>Other local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation, Landscape and Land Drainage officers</p> <p>Ongar Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Ongar Town Forum</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>ONG-G</b>	<p>Area to north of Shelley</p> <p>(Could include part or all of SLAA site SR-0102, and the eastern part of SLAA site SR-0395)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields, woodland</p> <p>Within Green Belt.</p> <p>Approx total = 21 ha</p>	<p>This area is a fair distance from the town centre, but is closer to shops and services within Shelley, including the primary school. Parts of the area were suggested through the Call for Sites for housing.</p> <p>Some of the site is within an area of moderate to high landscape sensitivity (SELSS), so development would have to be carefully designed.</p> <p>Potential capacity: for housing alone could be roughly 630 homes (assumes 30 dph). This site may be more suitable for mixed use, and could accommodate roughly 504 homes, 1.68 ha employment plus a community facility (assuming an 80:20 split of housing to employment, a 30 dwelling per hectare housing density, and a commercial plot ratio of 0.4)</p>	<p>Development of a site of this size will require expansion of Shelley primary school, and could attract sufficient population growth to justify the provision of a new secondary school in Ongar</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Conservation, Landscape and Land Drainage officers</p> <p>Ongar Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Ongar Town Forum</p>

**Question 30:**  
 Have we identified the right potential development options for Chipping Ongar? **Yes / No**  
 If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 31:**

Only one potential opportunity area has been identified in this area – ONG– 1. Do you think this area may be appropriate for development? **Yes / No**

**Question 32:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 31 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

**Question 33:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

- ONG – A
- ONG – B
- ONG – C
- ONG – D
- ONG – E
- ONG – F
- ONG – G

**Question 34:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q33 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Chipping Ongar;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

iv) Epping  
Diagram 4.12 – Potential development options for Epping






Table 4.22 – Potential development options for Epping

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>EPP-1</b>	St John's Road area (SLAA Reference SR-0281)	Vacant school and community buildings. Also includes Epping Hall and EFDC depot. Access from St John's Road and High Road.  Site area – 3ha	Consultation period on potential options for the future of this land expired in April 2012.  Consultation options were: 1. Retail-led 2. Leisure-led 3. Retail & Leisure 4. Residential  Planning officers will feed the outcomes of this consultation exercise into the preparation of the Local Plan	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing (should residential development be considered suitable), community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	Landowners: EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Potential developer
<b>EPP-2</b>	Epping Sports Centre, Hemnall Street (SLAA Reference – SR-0347)	Existing sports centre & parking owned by EFDC  Site area – 0.4ha	The sports centre is ageing, and over the period of the Local Plan it is reasonable to consider (a) whether this centre will continue to meet the needs of the residents of Epping, and (b) relocating the Sports Centre and allowing redevelopment of the site.	Re-provision of the Sports Centre in an accessible location  Contributions to education, affordable housing (should residential development be considered suitable), community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways)

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>EPP-3</b>	54 Centre Drive. (SLAA Reference – SR-0005)	1970s building used for offices and warehousing Site area – 0.2ha	Site could be redeveloped for residential purposes, subject to further investigation into the continued need for this employment generating use in this location.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways)
<b>EPP-4</b>	Bower Hill Industrial Estate & Laundry Site, Bower Hill  (SLAA Reference SR-0278)	Existing allocated industrial area Site area – 1.9ha	This industrial area is between the Central Line and Bower Hill, and is adjacent on two sides to residential development.  Some of the existing business users on this site have previously expressed a desire to move to a more suitable location, where less nuisance to residential neighbours would occur.  Would result in a loss of employment land, and existing users would need to be relocated.  Potential capacity – 55-95 dwellings (30-50 dph)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways)  Site owners / agents. Leaseholders.

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>EPP-A</b>	Land between Kendal Avenue and Stonards Hill (SLAA Reference SR-0071)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area – 14.5ha	Potential for residential development, subject to careful design to accommodate a number of preserved trees throughout the site.  Sensitive pre-18 <sup>th</sup> century landscape – impact would require further investigation.  Maximum capacity 300 dwellings, subject to retention of trees.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Landscape officer  Epping Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Site owners / agents.
<b>EPP-B</b>	North of Stonards Hill, north west of former Central Line and south east of recreation ground. (SLAA Reference SR-0406)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area approx – 7.8ha	Potential for residential development.  Sensitive pre-18 <sup>th</sup> century landscape and adjacent to Local Wildlife Site – impact would require further investigation.  Maximum capacity 230 dwellings	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC  Epping Town Council  ECC  Site owners / agents are currently unknown.  Deliverability unknown.

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>EPP-C</b>	Rear of Woodmeads, north east of Lynceley Grange, Beulah Road, Woodberry Down, Barfield and James Street, west of Wintry Park House (SLAA Reference SR-0132a)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area approx – 12ha	Potential for residential development. Maximum capacity 350 dwellings (30dph), subject to protection of veteran trees	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Site owners / agents are currently unknown. Deliverability unknown.
<b>EPP-D</b>	Land between Lindsey Street and Bury Lane (SLAA Reference SR-0132a)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area – approx 53ha	Potential for substantial extension to Epping. Mixed use development providing residential, employment, community facilities and open space. Adjacent to Swaines Green Local Wildlife Site and allotments.	Development of a site this size would require significant infrastructure investment including (but not restricted to) utility connections, education, affordable housing, community facilities, public transport and highways.	EFDC Countrycare Epping Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Utility providers London Underground Site owners / agents

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>EPP-E</b>	South of Theydon Place (SLAA Reference – SR-0208)	Open space within Green Belt Site area – 5.9ha	Recent planning application (EPF/2040/10) refused on Green Belt grounds, however could provide a reasonable extension to Epping.  Potential capacity – 60 dwellings.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC  Epping Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Site owners / agents
<b>EPP-F</b>	North of M25, west of Central Line, south of Ivy Chimneys Road. (SLAA References – SR-0069; SR-0333b)	Open space within Green Belt Site area – approx 17ha  High voltage electricity lines running through site would reduce development capacity by approximately a third  Potentially developable area – approx 12ha	Potential for residential development. Would need to be focused to the northern part of the site due to the electricity lines.  Low landscape sensitivity, and good access to Ivy Chimneys primary school, although capacity would need to be extended.  Maximum capacity approx 350 dwellings (30dph)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC  Epping Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Site owners / agents – only known for small part of area.  Deliverability of majority of site unknown at this stage.

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>EPP-G</b>	North of M25, east of Central Line, south of Brook Road (SLAA Reference – SR-0113)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area – approx 26ha High voltage electricity lines running through site would reduce development capacity by a marginal amount	Potential for residential development which would need to be focused to the northern part of the site due to the electricity lines. Site promoters only suggest the northern part of the site for development.  Low landscape sensitivity, and good access to Ivy Chimneys primary school, although capacity would need to be extended.  Maximum capacity approx 250 dwellings (equivalent to 10dph – suggested SLAA capacity)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Epping Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Site owners / agents

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>EPP-H</b>	<p>East of The Orchards and former Central Line, north of Stewards Green Road (SLAA References – SR-0153; SR-0343)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area – approx 23ha</p>	<p>Potential for substantial extension to Epping. Mixed use development providing residential, employment community facilities and open space.  Close to Epping Central Line station, but is an area of high landscape sensitivity.</p>	<p>Development of a site this size would require significant infrastructure investment including (but not restricted to) utility connections, education, affordable housing, community facilities, public transport and highways.</p>	<p>EFDC Countrycare (the Green Lane on the east side of the site is a Local Wildlife Site)  Epping Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Utility providers  London Underground  Site owners / agents – owners of northern part of site currently unknown.  Deliverability of whole area unknown.</p>

**Question 35:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Epping? **Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 36:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?:

- EPP – 1**
- EPP – 2**
- EPP – 3**
- EPP – 4**

**Question 37:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 36 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Epping;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Epping;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Epping;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).



**Question 38:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

- EPP – A
- EPP – B
- EPP – C
- EPP – D
- EPP – E
- EPP – F
- EPP – G
- EPP – H

**Question 39:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 38 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Epping;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Epping;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Epping;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

v) Loughton / Debden  
Diagram 4.13 – Potential development options for Loughton / Debden




Table 4.23 – Potential development options for Loughton / Debden

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>LOU-1</b>	SR-0058 Land to north of Clay's Lane and east of Stanmore Way.	Agricultural field and stable paddocks Within Green Belt. Site area = 2.59ha	This area was suggested by the owner through the Call for Sites for residential development.  The site is on the edge of the existing settlement, and is fairly near to the shops and services in Loughton. It is classified as an area of High Sensitivity (Red) within the Settlement Edge Landscape Sensitivity Study (SELSS), so development would have to be carefully designed. Potential capacity = 78 homes (at 30 dph).	Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education & affordable housing	Site owners EFDC Loughton Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)
<b>LOU-2</b>	SR-0325 Broad area north east of Langston Road for extension to Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate.	Vacant  Site area = 9.06ha  Within Green Belt	This site is adjacent to the Langston Road industrial estate, at the edge of Debden, and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.  The SLAA suggests that residential or commercial development may be appropriate here. Given the proximity of a large employment estate, it is considered that development for commercial uses would be more appropriate.  Due to the presence of some flood risk (a small part of the site is within flood zone 3a), the Strategic Land Availability Assessment recommends that only part of the site be developed. Potential capacity = 3.02 ha employment.	Local road improvements	Site owners Loughton Town Council ECC (Highways) Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership Land drainage (some flooding issues on part of this area)

LOU-3	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>SR-0355 Parts of Oakwood Hill / Langston Road industrial estates.</p>	<p>Existing Industrial Estate / Business Park – various businesses                      Site area = approx. 33.51ha</p>	<p>This large area encompasses the existing Langston Road and Oakwood Hill Industrial Estates.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review suggests that selective regeneration and modernisation of units in this area (encompasses ELR Site 4) could yield 2.0 ha of new employment development. The site is within Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.</p> <p>The land is contaminated, with a potential high cost of remediation (as buried asbestos prefabs have been identified) but this is likely to be able to be mitigated.</p> <p>A small part of the site is within flood zones 3a and 3b, but it is not thought that this would affect whether the site could be developed.</p> <p>Part of site is across the road from Roding Valley Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Any redevelopment would need to mitigate negative impacts on the LNR, part of which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>The Strategic Land Availability Assessment recommends that only part of this large existing employment area be redeveloped, to provide approximately 2.0 ha additional employment.</p>	<p>Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements</p>	<p>Site owners                      EFDC (which owns part of site), including any tenants                      Countrycare officers (who manage the LNR)                      Loughton Town Council                      ECC (Highways)                      Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>

LOU-4	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>SR-0018 Former Bank of England sports ground (not including the Academy Britannia Club), Langston Road</p>	<p>5 a side football pitches and clubhouse  Within Green Belt  Site area = 6.24ha</p>	<p>This area was suggested by the owner through the Call for Sites for residential or employment development. Given that the site is well located near a large existing employment area, it is considered that employment use would be preferable, despite the suggestions of both the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and the site owner that both uses should be accommodated.</p> <p>The site is within Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station. It is classified as an area of High Sensitivity (Red) within the SELSS so development would have to be carefully designed.</p> <p>The land may be contaminated, with a potential high cost of remediation (former use as print works), however the adjacent development has overcome this.</p> <p>Flood risk would restrict potential development to roughly half of the site for housing, or roughly two thirds of the site for employment uses.</p>	<p>Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements</p>	<p>Site owners  Existing tenants – it is thought the current tenants have a fixed termination/buy-out clause  EFDC  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership  Land drainage (some flooding issues on part of this area)</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
LOU-5	SR-0279 Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate (East)	Vehicle yard and vacant land  Site area = 3.87ha	<p>This area was identified through the Employment Land Review for potential redevelopment (ELR Site 4).</p> <p>The site is on the edge of Debden, very near to shops and services, and the Central Line station. It is also adjacent to a large existing area of employment.</p> <p>Roughly one half of the site could be developed as there is some flood risk present.</p> <p>The land may be contaminated, with a potential high cost of remediation (former use as print works), although nearby plots have been developed without problems.</p> <p>The Strategic Land Availability Assessment suggests a potential capacity of 0.77 ha employment development, due to the flooding constraint.</p>	Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements  Relocation of existing vehicle yard?	Site owners  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership  Land drainage (some flooding issues on part of this area)

LOU-6	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>SR-0289 Vere Road.</p>	<p>Urban site comprising car parking and garages to the rear of Loughton Broadway  Site area = 0.97ha</p>	<p>This large site was identified for regeneration and redevelopment through the Loughton Broadway Development Brief prepared for EFDC, which owns this site. The Brief suggested residential and retail uses.  It is in Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.  There may be contamination on a small part of site (which was formerly brickworks land), however the Strategic Land Availability Assessment concluded that dealing with this could be an opportunity to improve the site.  The SLAA suggests a potential capacity of 41 dwellings (roughly 42 dph)</p>	<p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing  Need to re-provide car parking elsewhere</p>	<p>EFDC (site owners) Estates &amp; Valuation officers  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<p><b>LOU-7</b></p>	<p>SR-0285 Winston Churchill Public House, The Broadway</p>	<p>Urban site with public house and car park</p> <p>Site area = 0.24ha</p>	<p>This site was identified for regeneration and redevelopment through the Loughton Broadway Development Brief, and also through the Town Centres Study.</p> <p>It is in Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.</p> <p>The Strategic Land Availability Assessment suggests a combination of retail and residential development. It is felt, however, that retail is more suitable on this 'gateway' site to The Broadway.</p> <p>There may be contamination on this site (which was formerly brickworks land), however the SLAA concluded that dealing with this could be an opportunity to improve the site.</p>	<p>Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements</p> <p>Replacement of community facility – public house adjoining town centre</p>	<p>EFDC (site owners) Estates &amp; Valuation officers</p> <p>Tenant – brewery</p> <p>Loughton Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>



	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<p><b>LOU-8</b></p>	<p>SR-0284 Sainsbury's Supermarket and adjoining land, Burton Road and The Broadway</p>	<p>Sainsbury's supermarket, other retail units and petrol station  Site area = 0.52ha</p>	<p>This large site was identified for regeneration and redevelopment through the Loughton Broadway Development Brief, and also through the Town Centres Study.</p> <p>It is in Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.</p> <p>The Strategic Land Availability Assessment suggests a combination of retail and residential development. It is felt, however, that retail is more suitable on this 'gateway' site to The Broadway.</p> <p>There may be contamination on this site to do the use as a petrol station However the SLAA concluded that dealing with this could be an opportunity to improve the site.</p> <p>It is understood that the current tenant of the supermarket, Sainsbury's, has a fairly long existing lease, so the site will only be available in future. The cost of relocating/accommodating existing occupiers and dealing with contamination could make development viability marginal, but this is not yet known.</p>	<p>Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements  Re-provision of petrol station, retail units and supermarket?</p>	<p>EFDC (site owners) Estates &amp; Valuation officers  Tenants – Sainsbury's, BP  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>

LOU-9	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
	<p>SR-0286 Burton Road.</p>	<p>Urban site comprising three plots along Burton Road identified in Loughton Broadway Development Brief and adjacent land (car park and green area).  Currently used as garages/retail service area/car parking  Site area = 1.28ha</p>	<p>This large site was identified for regeneration and redevelopment through the Loughton Broadway Development Brief prepared for EFDC, which is the owner.  The Brief suggested residential and retail use for this site, but it is thought more suitable purely for housing.  It is within Debden and is therefore well served by shops and services, and the Central Line station.  The Development Brief suggested 53 homes. Additional land could accommodate a further 27 (at approx. 40dph), therefore total potential capacity = 80 homes.</p>	<p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing  Need to re-provide retail service area and parking elsewhere</p>	<p>EFDC (site owners) Estates &amp; Valuation officers  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>

LOU-10	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
SR-0280 Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate (West)	Vacant scrub land  Site area = 0.55ha	<p>This area was identified through the Employment Land Review for potential redevelopment (ELR Site 4).</p> <p>The site is within Debden, near to shops and services and the Central Line station. It is also adjacent to a large existing area of employment. The land is contaminated, with a potential high cost of remediation (as buried asbestos prefabs have been identified). The site is covered by a TPO, although the preserved trees are on the borders. Part of the site is across the road from Roding Valley Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Any redevelopment would need to mitigate negative impacts on the LNR and SSSI.</p> <p>The Strategic Land Availability Assessment suggests a potential capacity of 0.22 ha employment.</p>	<p>Local road improvements - potential need for access improvements</p>	<p>EFDC (Site owners) Estates &amp; Valuation officers Trees team Countrycare officers (who manage the LNR)  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  Loughton Broadway Town Centre Partnership</p>	
LOU-11	SR-0059 Land at 20 Albion Hill, Loughton	<p>Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens  Site area = 0.29ha</p>	<p>This area was suggested by the owner through the Call for Sites for residential development.</p> <p>The site is within the existing settlement, and is near to the shops and services in Loughton High Road.</p> <p>Potential capacity = 10 homes (at 30dph)</p>	<p>Local road improvements, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing  Need to re-provide parking elsewhere</p>	<p>Site owners  EFDC  Loughton Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)</p>
<p><b>Directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b> None identified</p>					

**Question 40:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Loughton? **Yes / No**  
If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 41:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?:

- LOU – 1
- LOU – 2
- LOU – 3
- LOU – 4
- LOU – 5
- LOU – 6
- LOU – 7
- LOU – 8
- LOU – 9
- LOU – 10
- LOU – 11

**Question 42:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q41 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Loughton;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Loughton;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Loughton;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

vi) Lower Nazeing  
Diagram 4.14 – Potential development options for Lower Nazeing




Table 4.24 – Potential development options for Lower Nazeing

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>NAZ-1</b>	<p>Hoe Lane area. (Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0135a, 0135b, 0136, 0166, 0168, 0276, part of 0302)</p>	<p>Multiple uses including glasshouses, residential, industry, agricultural fields.  Within Green Belt. Approx total =13.5ha</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised by the Parish Council regarding HGV movements damaging Hoe Lane.  A change of use to residential could result in less heavy goods vehicle movements and help to alleviate pressure on the road, and at the traffic light controlled crossroads at Middle Street/North Street/Nazeing Road/St Leonards Road.  It would also prevent further industrial 'creep' in an area without sufficient highways infrastructure to cope with HGV movements.  Parts of this overall area have been suggested for residential development through the Call for Sites. A large part of the area is within the Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area.  Potential capacity = roughly 400 homes (assumes 30 dph)</p>	<p>Further investigation of capacity at the primary school may be necessary  Relocation of existing industrial and glasshouse businesses would be required.  Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners EFDC Conservation and Land Drainage officers Nazeing Parish Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>NAZ-A</b>	<p>Area to north of Maplecroft Lane and Shooters Drive</p> <p>(Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0301 &amp; 0150)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields, and existing fencing centre business.</p> <p>Within Green Belt.</p> <p>Approx total = 23ha</p>	<p>Parts of this overall area have been suggested for residential development through the Call for Sites.</p> <p>Also, this area is within an area of moderate to high sensitivity (Settlement Edge Landscape Sensitivity Study (SELSS)).</p> <p>Potential capacity = roughly 690 homes (assumes 30 dph)</p>	<p>Further investigation of capacity at the primary school may be necessary</p> <p>New access road?</p> <p>Public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners – relocation of existing fencing business would be required.</p> <p>EFDC</p> <p>Nazeing Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p>



	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>NAZ-B</b>	<p>Area to south of Pound Close / Middle Street (Could include all or parts of SLAA sites SR-0011, 0101 &amp; 0300)</p>	<p>Agricultural fields, and a farm. Within Green Belt. Approx total = 27.5ha</p>	<p>Parts of this area have been suggested for residential and employment development through the Call for Sites. Area is near to existing settlement centre.  Potential capacity according to the SLAA is roughly 450 homes and 3.2 ha employment  However, any commercial development could worsen the existing highways issues regarding HGV movements.  Also, this area is within an area of moderate to high sensitivity (SELSS).  Small part of site within conservation area.</p>	<p>Further investigation of capacity at the primary school may be necessary  New access road?  Public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing</p>	<p>Site owners  EFDC Conservation officer  Nazeing Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)</p>

**Question 43:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Lower Nazeing? **Yes / No**  
If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 44:**

Only one potential opportunity area has been identified in this area – NAZ – 1. Do you think this area may be appropriate for development? **Yes / No**

**Question 45:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q44 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

**Question 46:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

NAZ – A

NAZ – B

**Question 47:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 46 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Lower Nazeing;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

vii) Lower Sheering

Diagram 4.15 – Potential development options for Lower Sheering & Sheering




Table 4.25 – Potential development options for Lower Sheering & Sheering

Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>				
None identified within settlement boundaries				
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>				
<b>LSH-A</b>	West of Lower Sheering Road, south of Sawbridgeworth Road – adjacent Railway Hotel, Lower Sheering	Green space, largely tree covered  Approx area – 0.5ha	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	EFDC Landscape officer
	(SLAA Reference – SR-0121)	Could be appropriate for residential development, subject to more detailed investigation of the trees that cover the majority of the site. These trees are not currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order.  Potential residential capacity – 14 subject to further assessment of tree cover.	Sheering Parish Council ECC (Highways) Site owner/agent	
<b>LSH-B</b>	South of Sawbridgeworth Road, east of Lower Sheering Road, north of Back Lane, Lower Sheering	Large area comprising agricultural fields, and some vacant grass / scrub land  Approx area – 21ha	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, highways, open space, affordable housing and other community facilities will be required to support any new development of a significant scale.	EFDC Sheering Parish Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Site owner/agent – the landowner is unknown for a large proportion of the site, therefore deliverability is unknown.
	(SLAA References – SR-0032; SR-0313)	Area could be appropriate for mixed use development comprising residential, commercial and community uses		

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>SHE-A</b>	Land west of Crown Close, east of M11, Sheering (SLAA Reference – SR-0073)	Grass / scrub land within the Green Belt Site area approx. - 4.7ha	Site has been promoted for development through the SLAA  Potentially suitable for residential development, subject to treatment on site to mitigate against the impact of the motorway.  Potential residential capacity – 71 dwellings.	No significant infrastructure constraints identified at present.  Contributions to community facilities, affordable housing, open space and highway improvements may be necessary should principle of development be considered appropriate.	EFDC  Sheering Parish Council  ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools)  Land owner / agent

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>SHE-B</b>	Land at Daubneys Farm and north of Primley Lane and The Plashets, Sheering (SLAA References – SR-0033; SR-0311)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt Site area approx. – 14 ha	<p>A small area has been promoted through the SLAA.</p> <p>Potentially suitable for mixed use development, bringing local jobs and facilities provision alongside residential development.</p> <p>Any design will need to respect the Listed Buildings within the farm complex, and the large preserved woodland to the north.</p> <p>Potential dwelling capacity at 30 dph – 420. This could reduce subject to other uses being proposed.</p>	Contributions to community facilities, affordable housing, open space and highway improvements may be necessary should principle of development be considered appropriate.	<p>EFDC Landscape and Conservation officers</p> <p>Sheering Parish Council</p> <p>ECC</p> <p>Land owner has not been identified for the majority of the northern part of the site, Deliverability of the overall area is therefore unknown.</p>
<b>SHE-C</b>	Land south of The Street, west of Church Lane, Sheering (SLAA Reference – SR-0265)	Agricultural fields and open space within Green Belt Site area approx. - 6.1ha	<p>Potentially suitable for mixed use development, bringing local jobs and facilities provision alongside residential development.</p> <p>Any design will need to consider any potential impact on the large preserved woodland to the south of the site.</p>	Contributions to community facilities, affordable housing, open space and highway improvements may be necessary should principle of development be considered appropriate.	<p>EFDC Landscape officer</p> <p>Sheering Parish Council</p> <p>ECC</p> <p>Land owner / agent</p>

**Question 48:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Lower Sheering & Sheering? **Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 49:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

LSH – A

LSH – B

SHE – A

SHE – B

SHE – C



**Question 50:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q28 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Lower Sheering & Sheering;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Lower Sheering & Sheering;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Lower Sheering & Sheering;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

viii) North Weald

Diagram 4.16 – Potential development options for North Weald




Table 4.26 – Potential development options for North Weald

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
NWB-1	Hurricane Way / Merlin Way Industrial Estate, North Weald (SLAA reference SR-0274)	Commercial and industrial estate – primarily warehouse uses.  Approx 8ha.	Intensification of existing commercial & industrial uses may be possible.  May be opportunity to accommodate businesses relocated from Thornwood Common if principle of that redevelopment accepted.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  Site owners / leaseholders
NWB-2	Leader Lodge, Epping Road, North Weald (No SLAA reference)	Single house in large garden, currently converted to two self-contained flats. Vacant since 2010. Poor state of repair.  EFDC ownership – approx 0.2ha	Number of previous attempts by the Council to re-use or redevelop this site for housing purposes. “ <i>Planning for Real</i> ” has been carried out to determine most appropriate future use. May not require change to policy approach.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  Hastoe Housing ( <i>Planning for Real</i> exercise – Spring 2012)
NWB-3	Rear of Kings Head, High Road, North Weald (SLAA reference SR-0240)	Car parking and vacant land – approx 0.3ha	Submitted via the Call for Sites as an “in-fill” site between High Road and Tempest Mead.  Potential capacity for residential development.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Area for replacement car park?	EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  ECC  Site owners / agents

Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<p>NWB-4</p> <p>Former Redoubt and surrounding land, east of High Road, North Weald</p>	<p>Scheduled Monument - late 19<sup>th</sup> century concrete structure &amp; earthworks formerly used as munitions store. English Heritage has identified as a building at risk from concrete failure and vandalism.</p> <p>Surrounded by open countryside, within the Green Belt and Ongar Great Park Ancient Landscape. Current S106 restrictions on further development in the Green Belt in the vicinity of the Redoubt.</p>	<p>Current structure is dangerous and unsecured.</p> <p>Discussions have been ongoing for a number of years between the site owners, EFDC and English Heritage to refurbish the Redoubt to allow public access.</p> <p>Identified costs of refurbishment have proved prohibitive so far.</p> <p>Enabling development would be necessary.</p> <p>Further detailed investigation is necessary into the extent of such development needed.</p> <p>This would need to be sensitive to (i) the Green Belt and the need to identify long term boundaries, and (ii) the position of the Redoubt within Ongar Great Park (Ancient Landscape).</p>	<p>Refurbishment of Redoubt to either permit public access, or to create a tourist attraction as necessary</p> <p>Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education &amp; affordable housing.</p> <p>Potential to link to improvement of existing community facilities e.g. village hall, etc.</p>	<p>EFDC</p> <p>North Weald Parish Council</p> <p>English Heritage</p> <p>ECC</p> <p>Land owners / agents - has been identified via Call for Sites and SLAA as broadly deliverable and suitable</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
NWB-A	Land between A414, Vicarage Lane, Queens Road and Beamish Close (SLAA References SR-0036; SR-0072; SR-0158a)	Within Green Belt. Existing farm house, associated buildings and agricultural fields. Adjacent to St Andrew's Primary School and Queen's Hall Community Centre. Includes Chase Farm.  Land area approx 35ha	Could accommodate mixed use development incorporating residential, commercial, community facilities and open space. Care needed to appropriately accommodate Tyler's Farmhouse listed building	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present, although development of this site would require additional investment in local infrastructure.  St Andrew's Primary School has some surplus capacity at present, but may need further investment.	EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  Site owners / agents (deliverability unknown for some of this area at present)
NWB-B	Land north of A414, south of Vicarage Lane East (SLAA Reference SR-0036)	Within Green Belt. Currently in agricultural use.  Land area approx 10.8ha	Could accommodate residential development, with potential access from Vicarage Lane East.  SLAA suggests potential capacity could be 323 dwellings.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present, although development of this site would require additional investment in local infrastructure.  St Andrew's Primary School has some surplus capacity at present, but may need further investment.	EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  Site owners / agents - has been identified via Call for Sites and SLAA as broadly deliverable and suitable

**Question 51:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for North Weald Bassett? **Yes / No**  
If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 52:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?:

**NWB – 1**

**NWB – 2**

**NWB – 3**

**NWB – 4**

**Question 53 :**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 52 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;

Impact on landscape;

Impact on biodiversity;

Traffic congestion in and around North Weald Bassett;

Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around North Weald Bassett;

Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around North Weald Bassett;

Flood risk;

Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;

Impact on heritage assets;

Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);

Other (please specify).

**Question 54:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

**NWB – A**


**NWB – B**

**Question 55 :**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q53 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around North Weald Bassett;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around North Weald Bassett;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around North Weald Bassett;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

ix) North Weald Airfield  
Diagram 4.17 – Potential development options for North Weald Airfield





### **North Weald Airfield (NWA)**

- This historic airfield within the Green Belt covers approximately 130ha of land to the north west of North Weald village. It is owned and operated by Epping Forest District Council, and still provides a wide range of light aviation operations. There are a number of commercial and airfield related uses within the developed area to the south, with some allocated employment areas that are still unused. A weekly open-air market is in operation, which uses a large area of the hardstanding close to the southern end of the runway.
- The Council commissioned a review of the aviation operations in 2010 and, following its recommendations, Councillors have determined that an option of “active development” should be pursued subject to a further detailed review of a range of issues. This second review has not yet been commissioned.
- As a significant publicly owned area of land, it is appropriate to consider the options for the future of NWA in slightly more detail at this stage. There are a number of reasonable options that could be considered, some of which may require a change in the existing planning policy framework for the Airfield:
  1. Maintain existing policies and approach to the use of the airfield including encouraging existing operators to expand their businesses and small new aviation operators to start businesses within current policy parameters.
- Current policies in the Local Plan state that the Council will continue to promote and enable the use and development of NWA as a major multi-functional recreation and leisure centre and showground, and to continue to enable use as a working airfield. Additional policies protect the historic interest and permit some development in specified areas.
- This option therefore maintains the broad status quo. Development in future would continue to be restricted to supporting existing and some new airfield uses and some employment generating uses on the periphery of the runway. There is an area of allocated employment land. This brings advantages in that the historic character would remain largely unchanged, and existing operators could be provided with opportunities for expansion or diversification of their current businesses and some new small aviation operations may also be possible.
- However, at present NWA is reliant on the market to remain profitable and as a public landholding this level of financial risk is not considered acceptable in the long term. Further investigation is necessary on the range of uses which could be accommodated within the existing developed areas of the airfield (Areas A & B in Diagram 4.16), and whether development of only these areas could alleviate the financial risk to public funds.
  2. Moderate expansion of commercial activity around the NWA, with retention of current level of aviation use.

- A previous report into the potential future use of NWA (Drivers Jonas, 1999), found that more intensive development to the southern end of the existing runway could take place without jeopardising the current general aviation uses.
- This option could deliver commercial growth in Area C in Diagram 4.17, in addition to Areas A and B in support of the existing general aviation use. Whilst such development would impact on the Green Belt in this area, this could help to mitigate the financial risk of the dependency on the market. Development could be restricted to commercial use, to prevent potential conflicts from noise, light and general activity caused by the aviation uses.

### 3. Active development of commercial aviation

- The aviation intensification report by Halcrow considered the options available to increase the aviation use of NWA, and concluded that it may be possible to attract a commercial operator to do so. NWA is currently unlicensed by the Civil Aviation Authority, and such licensing would be required to enable a commercial operator to run an effective business, for example by using small jet type aircraft.
- Significant investment, and potentially further land acquisition and uses, would be required to bring the runway and surrounding areas up to the necessary standards, and this level of investment is not available from the Council's funds.
- Additional development areas would also need to be allocated on the periphery of the airfield to provide space for associated new supporting development (see Area D in Diagram 4.16). Further detailed investigation would be necessary into this as a potential option if the principle of such development is supported.
- This option would clearly preserve the continued aviation use of NWA. However, by becoming a commercial licensed operation, there could be some negative implications in the area from noise, light and traffic. The associated development that would be needed to accompany such an intensified use could also have implications for the Green Belt.

### 4. Cease aviation uses – pursue alternative uses for NWA.

- A further option for NWA is to not pursue continued aviation use of any type, and to allocate the land for alternative purposes within the Local Plan. This would require a significant change in policy approach in this area, although specific historic features could be protected and retained.
- It should also be noted that existing agreements/leases with airfield users would have to be ended with potentially significant financial consequences. It is reasonable to consider that a mixed use development, incorporating housing, employment, community facilities and open space could be delivered on this land, should other aviation oriented alternatives not prove acceptable or deliverable.
- Any of the options above would require a partnership approach to delivery between EFDC, North Weald Parish Council, Essex County Council and the existing operators and lease holders of NWA.

- Infrastructure investment will be necessary at varying levels depending on which option is pursued, but could potentially be significant and impact on the viability of proposed development.

**Question 56:**

Have we identified the relevant issues for North Weald Airfield up to 2033?

**Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 57:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for North Weald Airfield? **Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

x) Roydon  
Diagram 4.18 – Potential development options for Roydon




Table 4.27 – Potential development options for Roydon

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
None identified within settlement boundary					
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>ROY-A</b>	East of High Street, north of Harlow Road, west of pumping station. (SLAA References – SR-0169; SR-0304)	Vacant grass / scrub land within Green Belt Approx area - 8.8ha	Potential area for mixed use development including residential, commercial and community uses.  Careful consideration of position adjacent to conservation area will be necessary.  All of the land around Roydon is considered to be of high landscape sensitivity for different reasons.  Further detailed investigation will be required to determine whether this scale of development could be delivered without significant harm to the landscape.  SLAA suggests potential capacity of 289 residential units at 30dph, although this would be reduced depending on other proposed uses.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC  Roydon Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Land owners/agents – ownership of the majority of the site is unknown, therefore deliverability is not known at this stage.

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>ROY-B</b>	East of, Epping Road, south of recreation ground and Grange Lane. (SLAA References – SR-0197; SR-0306)	Part of large domestic garden and vacant grass/scrub land within Green Belt Approx area - 11ha	Potential area for mixed use development including residential, commercial and community uses. Estimated dwelling capacity at 30dph is 330, although could be reduced subject to other proposed uses.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Roydon Parish Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Land owners/agents – ownership of the majority of the site is unknown, therefore deliverability is not known at this stage.
<b>ROY-C</b>	West of High Street, north of Hansells Mead. (SLAA References – SR-0035; SR-0117; SR-0303)	Vacant grass/scrub land, agricultural fields and paddock within Green Belt. Majority of area is within Lee Valley Regional Park. Approx area – 26ha	Potential area for mixed use development including residential, commercial and community uses. Estimated dwelling capacity from information provided via the SLAA and an estimate of capacity at 30dph is 766, although could be reduced subject to other proposed uses.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present Contributions to education, affordable housing, community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.	EFDC Roydon Parish Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Lee Valley Regional Park Authority Land owners/agents – ownership of the majority of the site is unknown, therefore deliverability is not known at this stage.

**Question 58:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Roydon? **Yes / No**  
If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 59:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

**ROY – A**

**ROY – B**

**ROY – C**

**Question 60:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 59 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Roydon;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Roydon;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Roydon;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

**xi) Theydon Bois**  
Diagram 4.19 – Potential development options for Theydon Bois






Table 4.28 – Potential development options for Theydon Bois

Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>				
None identified within settlement boundary				
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>				
<b>THB-A</b>	Triangular site east of Dukes Avenue, west of Central Line.  (SLAA References – SR-0327b; SR-0070)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt.  Approx area – 6.6ha	Area is adjacent to existing residential development, and within close proximity to the Central Line station, village centre services and the primary school.  Potential capacity for residential development at 30 dph – 198 dwellings.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Contributions to education, affordable housing community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.  The primary school is currently operating near to its capacity, and would therefore require investment and expansion.
			EFDC  Theydon Bois Parish Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Land owners/agents. Land ownership is unknown for the northern part of this site, therefore deliverability of this area is currently unknown.	

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>THB-B</b>	Land at Coppice Farm, Coppice Row. (SLAA Reference – SR-0080)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt. Approx area – 2.3ha	<p>Site adjoins Epping Forest SSSI (and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)), although sensitive residential development may be possible.</p> <p>Of the sites potentially available, this is the furthest from village services.</p> <p>Potential capacity for residential development at 30dph – 68 dwellings</p>	<p>No significant infrastructure constraints known at present</p> <p>Contributions to education, affordable housing community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.</p> <p>The primary school is currently operating near to its capacity, and would therefore require investment and expansion.</p>	<p>EFDC</p> <p>Theydon Bois Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Land owners/agents.</p>
<b>THB-C</b>	East of Central Line, south of Abridge Road (SLAA Reference – SR-0342)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt. Approx area – 36ha	<p>Potential for mixed use development including residential, commercial and community facilities.</p> <p>Potential capacity for approx 1,000 dwellings, although likely total number would be less. This is dependent on land given over to other uses.</p>	<p>No significant infrastructure constraints known at present</p> <p>Contributions to education, affordable housing community facilities and local road improvements are likely to be necessary.</p> <p>The primary school is currently operating near to its capacity, and would therefore require investment and expansion.</p>	<p>EFDC</p> <p>Theydon Bois Parish Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Land owners / agents – site owners are currently unknown, so deliverability is unknown at present.</p>

**Question 61:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Theydon Bois? **Yes / No**  
If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 62:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?

TBA – A

TBA – B

TBA – C

**Question 63:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 62 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Theydon Bois;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Theydon Bois;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Theydon Bois;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

xii) **Thornwood Common**  
Diagram 4.20 – Potential development options for Thornwood Common




Table 4.29 – Potential development options for Thornwood Common

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>THO-1</b>	Former Popplewells site and current Jonen depot, High Road/Weald Hall Lane.  (SLAA reference – SR-0271)	Area currently designated as an employment site in adopted Local Plan – approx. 0.7ha  Popplewells site – vacant, last in use as car and coach bodywork and repair centre  Jonen depot – freight and distribution services	Significant concern has been raised over vehicle movements within and around both sites in recent years.  The Parish Council and Village Design Statement Group have expressed a desire for these sites to be developed for residential use including some small scale retail use.  Within Flood Risk Zone 2 – design could overcome constraint.  Potential capacity – 15-20 dwellings and “village shop”  Potential capacity could be increased if opportunity area is extended to also include the Weald Hall Lane Industrial Estate adjacent to Jonen.	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present.	Jonen – relocation would be required. No indication at present whether this would be feasible.  Other land owners/agents  EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  Village Design Statement Group  ECC (Highways)

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>THO-2</b>	Randalls Yard, Woodside. (SLAA reference – SR-0203)	Waste metal transfer site – approx 0.4ha	Significant concern has been raised over vehicle movements and noise within and around site in recent years. The Parish Council and Village Design Statement group have expressed a desire for this site to be developed for residential use.  Potential capacity – 5 dwellings	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	Site owners – relocation would be required. No indication at present whether this would be feasible.  EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  Village Design Statement Group  ECC (Highways)
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>THO-A</b>	Area to north of recreation ground and allotments, Weald Hall Lane. (SLAA references – SR-0149; SR-0043)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt – approx 8.8ha	Site could provide a reasonable extension to the village, recognising that other directions of growth are either restricted by strategic constraints or are not well related to Thornwood Common.  Potential capacity - 231 dwellings and 1,400 sq m commercial (Call for Sites/SLAA)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present  Local road improvements, public open space, contributions to education and affordable housing.  Potential to link to improvement of existing community facilities e.g. village hall, allotments, etc.	Site owners/agents – has been identified via Call for Sites and SLAA as broadly deliverable and suitable  EFDC  North Weald Parish Council  Village Design Statement Group  ECC

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>THO-B</b>	Land to east of Duck Lane, Thornwood (SLAA reference – SR-0023)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt – approx 0.6ha	Potential capacity - 19 dwellings (Call for Sites / SLAA)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	Site owners/agents – has been identified via Call for Sites and SLAA as broadly deliverable and suitable EFDC North Weald Parish Council Village Design Statement Group ECC
<b>THO-C</b>	Land to west of High Road / north of Smith’s Court, Thornwood (SLAA reference – SR-0410)	Agricultural fields within Green Belt – approx 4.18ha	Potential capacity - 125 dwellings (Call for Sites / SLAA)	No significant infrastructure constraints known at present	Site owners/agents – has been identified via Call for Sites and SLAA as broadly deliverable and suitable EFDC North Weald Parish Council Village Design Statement Group ECC

**Question 64:**

Have we identified the right potential development options for Thornwood Common? **Yes / No**

If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 65:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?

THO – 1

THO – 2

**Question 66:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 65 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;

Impact on landscape;

Impact on biodiversity;

Traffic congestion in and around Thornwood Common;

Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Thornwood Common;

Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Thornwood Common;

Flood risk;

Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;

Impact on heritage assets;

Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);

Other (please specify).



**Question 67:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

THO – A

THO – B

THO – C

**Question 68:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Q66 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Thornwood Common;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Thornwood Common;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Thornwood Common;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

xiii) Waltham Abbey

Diagram 4.21 – Potential development options for Waltham Abbey




Table 4.30 – Potential development options for Waltham Abbey

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential Opportunity Areas</b>					
<b>WAL-1</b>	<p>Various sites and buildings in the town centre (SLAA References – SR-0283; SR-0380; SR-0381; SR-0382)</p>	<p>Town centre uses, although there are a number of vacant and underused units, particularly within the upper floors. Car parking areas are not consistently used, nor well signposted.</p>	<p>The town centre area is not as successful as it once was, and the arrival of two large supermarkets on the periphery of the town centre has had a negative impact on the historic core.  There is an opportunity to adopt a different strategy for the town centre to make more use of the historic character and tourist attractions (Abbey &amp; Gardens, Gunpowder Park, White Water Centre, etc)</p>	<p>No significant infrastructure identified at present, although new developments may create opportunities may create requirements.  If the existing car parks are to be considered for rationalisation and some development for retail purposes, careful implementation will be required to ensure no significant overall loss of spaces.</p>	<p>EFDC Waltham Abbey Town Council Waltham Abbey Town Partnership ECC (Highways) Lee Valley Regional Park Authority Royal Gunpowder Mills White Water Centre Various site owners/agents</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-2</b>	Former Gunpowder Factory – area directly north of Powdermill Lane.  (SLAA Reference – SR-0085)	Former Gunpowder Factory buildings, now on English Heritage Buildings at Risk register.  Area currently subject to adopted policy HC16, within Green Belt, and adjacent to SSSI.	Sensitive re-use of some buildings for commercial, tourism or residential use may be achievable, subject to a number of detailed assessments including flood risk, impact on listed buildings, conservation area and biodiversity	A number of mitigation measures around flood risk, biodiversity and building heritage are likely to be necessary to deliver any redevelopment of the buildings at risk.	EFDC  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Highways)  English Heritage  Environment Agency  Lee Valley Regional Park Authority  Royal Gunpowder Mills (owner)
<b>WAL-3</b>	North of Honey Lane and west of Mason Way.  (SLAA Reference – SR-0021)	Small area of open space/amenity land. Not clear to what extent this area is used as public open space.	Small scale residential development could be delivered, subject to more detailed flood risk assessment.  Potential residential capacity – 10 dwellings	No significant infrastructure identified at present.  On-site flood alleviation work may be required to deliver a residential scheme on this site.	EFDC Land Drainage officer  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC  Site owner/agent

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Use</b>	<b>Potential for Change</b>	<b>Key Infrastructure Required</b>	<b>Key Delivery Partners</b>
<b>WAL-4</b>	King Harold School and playing fields, Broomstickhall Road. (SLAA Reference – SR-0384)	Secondary school, playing fields and sports centre. Site area approx – 7ha	Over the period of this Local Plan it is likely that the existing buildings will need significant maintenance and/or replacement.  Some residential development may be necessary to ensure that any scheme to provide new school and community buildings is viable.	New secondary school (in part or in whole) and sports centre would need to be provided.  Contributions to highway improvements and affordable housing may also be required.	EFDC  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Schools)  King Harold School

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>Potential directions for growth beyond existing boundaries</b>					
<b>WAL-A</b>	North of M25, south of Honey Lane.  (SLAA References – SR-0065; SR-0100)	Open space & grass/scrub land adjacent to junction 26 of M25 and Leverton Infant & Junior Schools	Potential for commercial, residential, and community facility development. Commercial development in particular would be well located in close proximity to the M25.  SLAA suggests capacity may be 685 dwellings and 20,000sqm of commercial space.	No significant infrastructure identified at present.  Air pollution assessment/monitoring?	EFDC  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Highways Agency  Site owner/agent
<b>WAL-B</b>	East of Old Shire Lane and the Ninefields estate, north of Honey Lane, south of Upshire Road  (SLAA References – SR-0034; SR-0253; SR-0277)	Agricultural fields and grazing land within the Green Belt.  Site area approx – 21 ha  Area could be developed in conjunction with WAL-C below.	Moderate eastern expansion of Waltham Abbey could provide a range of development. This could help to provide better access to facilities for residents in the eastern part of the town, as the current town centre and associated facilities are to the far west.  SLAA suggests potential capacity of 500 dwellings, although this would need to be supplemented with a range of community facilities.	No significant infrastructure identified in this area at present. However, delivery of development of this scale would create infrastructure demand including (but not limited to) highway improvements, education, health and community facilities, open space and affordable housing.	EFDC  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Primary Care Trust  Highways Agency  Land owners / agents

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-C</b>	West of Woodgreen Road (including Southend Farm), north of the M25.  (SLAA Reference – SR-0372)	Agricultural fields and grazing, including Southend Farm complex. Within Green Belt.  Site area approx – 45ha	<p>Could form part of significant expansion to Waltham Abbey, to provide a range of commercial, retail, residential and community facility development. This could help to provide better access to facilities for residents in the east of the existing town, as the current town centre and associated facilities are at the western end.</p> <p>Up to 950 dwellings, and 54,500sqm of commercial floorspace for the larger area.</p>	<p>No significant infrastructure identified in this area at present. However, delivery of this scale of development would create a need for infrastructure including (but not limited to) highway improvements, education, health and community facilities, open space and affordable housing.</p>	<p>EFDC</p> <p>Waltham Abbey Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>Primary Care Trust</p> <p>Highways Agency</p> <p>City of London Corporation</p> <p>Land owners / agents</p> <p>This land has not been promoted through the Call for Sites, therefore deliverability of this larger area is not known.</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-D</b>	<p>North east of Pick Hill. (SLAA References – SR-0137; SR-0148; SR-0332)</p>	<p>Existing farm buildings, and disused horticultural glasshouses and agricultural land. Some dwellings within this area.</p> <p>Within Green Belt, and partially designated as “E13 (glasshouses) – potentially de-designated E13 area”</p> <p>Site area approx – 41ha</p>	<p>Potential for mixed use including residential, commercial and community facility development. However, landscape sensitivity in this area is high, and it is adjacent to a conservation area. Existing road access is poor; Pick Hill reduces to a single track road at the eastern end.</p> <p>SLAA suggests potential capacity could be up to 967 dwellings, although this could be reduced to provide other land uses.</p>	<p>Significant upgrade would be required to Pick Hill, however this is part of Epping Forest and may therefore not be deliverable. Alternative access would be necessary.</p> <p>Contributions to affordable housing, education, health and community facilities would be necessary.</p>	<p>EFDC</p> <p>Waltham Abbey Town Council</p> <p>ECC (Highways)</p> <p>ECC (Schools)</p> <p>City of London Corporation</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Land owners / agents</p> <p>The owners of the northern part of this site are not known, and this land has not been promoted through the Call for Sites. Deliverability of this larger area is therefore not known.</p>



	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-E</b>	North west of Pick Hill and north of Paternoster Hill.  (SLAA References – SR-0020; SR-0083; SR-0161)	Former glasshouse nursery site, agricultural and grazing land.  Within Green Belt, and partially designated as “E13 (glasshouses) – potentially de-designated E13 area”  Site area approx – 18ha	Potential for residential development including community facilities.  Northern part of site subject to flooding, therefore detailed assessment would be required, and development capacity would be constrained accordingly.  Adjacent to Local Wildlife Site.	No significant infrastructure identified in this area at present.  Contributions to affordable housing, education, health and community facilities would be necessary.  Access available from Pick Hill and Paternoster Hill, subject to transport assessment.	EFDC Land Drainage officer  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Environment Agency  Land owners / agents

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-F</b>	<p>North of Parklands, east of Crooked Mile. (SLAA References – SR-0089a; SR-0089b; SR-0099; SR-0104; SR-0376)</p>	<p>Existing allocation for horticultural glasshouse use. Within Green Belt. Operator to east of area has shown intent for further expansion, subject to land availability. Site area approx – 42ha</p>	<p>A study into the Glasshouse Industry in the district shows continued demand for appropriate land for expansion. This land has been allocated for 6 years, but the majority of it has not yet come forward for such development. Further investigation is required into whether this allocation remains appropriate, or whether this land would best be suited for an alternative use. SLAA suggests 5-600 dwellings could be achieved, although this would be reduced dependent on the level of commercial development and community facilities also included.</p>	<p>No significant infrastructure identified in this area at present. Contributions to affordable housing, education, health and community facilities would be necessary should residential development be considered appropriate.</p>	<p>EFDC Land drainage officer Waltham Abbey Town Council ECC (Highways) ECC (Schools) Environment Agency Land owners / agents</p>

	Description	Current Use	Potential for Change	Key Infrastructure Required	Key Delivery Partners
<b>WAL-G</b>	South of M25, north of A121, east of Sewardstone Road.  (SLAA References – SR-0061 (northern part); SR-0370)	Agricultural land within Green Belt  Site area approx – 26ha	Mixed use development could be suitable in this area, given proximity and good access to the motorway network. Residential development may be constrained by this proximity to the major road network, and the associated nuisance that may come with this.  Potential capacity for employment purposes – 104,000 sqm	No significant infrastructure identified in this area at present.  Air and noise pollution assessments?	EFDC  Waltham Abbey Town Council  ECC (Highways)  ECC (Schools)  Land owners / agents

**Question 69:**  
 Have we identified the right potential development options for Waltham Abbey? **Yes / No**  
 If no, please tell us which areas you think should also be included.

**Question 70:**  
 Do you support or object to development of the identified potential opportunity areas?:

**WAL – 1**  
**WAL – 2**  
**WAL – 3**  
**WAL – 4**

**Question 71:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 70 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

**Question 72:**

Do you support or object to development of the identified potential development areas?:

- WAL – A
- WAL – B
- WAL – C
- WAL – D
- WAL – E
- WAL – F
- WAL – G

**Question 73:**

Please give us your reasons for your answers to Question 72 above. The prompts below are intended to help you provide your answers. Some or all of the factors below may be relevant:

- e.g. Impact on the Green Belt;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Traffic congestion in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Impact on services (e.g. schools, doctors etc) in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Impact on utilities (e.g. water, electricity, etc) in and around Waltham Abbey;
- Flood risk;
- Competition with other towns in Epping Forest District;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on residential amenities (e.g. proximity to existing dwellings, light, noise etc);
- Other (please specify).

## 5. Housing

### 5.1 “Community Visioning” consultation results:

- The provision of housing within the district was not identified as one of the top three priorities for the area.
- The provision of affordable housing and different types of housing to meet specific needs were both considered as important as one another. The provision of affordable housing was more important to respondents in Ongar and the rural areas, relative to the rest of the district.

### 5.2 What are the main issues?

#### 5.3 Green Belt, housing growth and density

- Protection of the Green Belt is the key priority for residents;
- Adequate planned provision for growth to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the district must be made;
- There is no longer a national minimum density requirement, but there is a need to ensure that effective and efficient use of available land is made when permitting residential development;
- The density of development that is sought in all locations will have an effect on the amount of Green Belt land that is required. We need to consider whether it is appropriate to adopt policies which require development of a particular density in different locations around the district. Examples of different densities within the district are given in the Options section of this chapter;
- There is now no requirement at national level for a set percentage of new development to be delivered on previously developed (brownfield) land. Continued encouragement for developing available brownfield land ahead of greenfield land has, however, still been retained, which will help to continue protection of the Green Belt;
- Within the Green Belt, the NPPF (paragraph 89) states that limited infilling or redevelopment of previously developed sites is not inappropriate.

#### 5.4 Affordable housing

- There is a large and growing need for various types of affordable housing within the district. The Council’s housing waiting list increased by 183% between 2001 and 2010 (from 1,769 to 5,008 people). A review of the list is due to be completed shortly;
- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) suggests there is also a high need for “intermediate housing”, ie houses that falls between open market and social rented units. The SHMA is currently being reviewed to take into account the likely abolition of the EEP, and the introduction of locally determined housing targets;
- Current planning policy requires that, on sites in urban areas that are to provide 15 or more units, or where the site is 0.5ha or greater, 40% of the units should be affordable. Current housing policy requires that within the affordable housing provided, 70% of this should be for social rent and 30% should be for shared ownership / intermediate rent.

### 5.5 Dwelling size and design

- The Local Plan must help to deliver the right types and sizes of houses to meet the needs of residents. There is a particular need for smaller family dwellings (i.e. 2- and 3-bedroom properties) across all tenures.
- Current policy requires that at least 10% of all new houses on sites of 10 or more dwellings should be constructed to the Lifetime Homes Standard - ie houses that can be readily adapted to changing circumstances, therefore meaning that people are less likely to have to move because of illness, disability or old age. The standard is now incorporated into the Code for Sustainable Homes;
- New development will need to take into account paragraphs 56 to 66 of the NPPF (Requiring good design). The Council will also require achievement of “Secure by Design” standards to encourage residents to feel safe in their homes and neighbourhoods.

### 5.6 Provision of specialist types of housing

- The population is ageing, and it is clear that some provision should meet the demands of this changing population structure. Further work is due to be commissioned shortly on the type of facilities that will be needed over the Plan period. It may also be appropriate to include a policy on delivering wheelchair accessible homes.

### 5.7 Provision for Gypsies and Travellers

- National policy requires that adequate provision is made for Gypsies and Travellers within all Local Plans (see also section 4.3);
- There is a need to ensure that a five years' supply of deliverable land is identified in Local Plans to meet locally assessed needs. National guidance is clear that Plans are likely to be found unsound if proper provision is not made;
- While Traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt, recent planning appeals in the district have concluded that owing to (i) the high percentage of Green Belt in the district; and (ii) the subsequent high value of available development land, it will only be possible to find new sites for Travellers within the Green Belt.

#### **Question 74:**

Have the relevant issues for the delivery of new housing in the district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

#### **Question 75:**

Have the relevant options for addressing the identified issues for the delivery of new housing been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what other options do you think we should look at?

5.8 What are the Options?

5.9 Green Belt and density

- The Local Plan could stipulate an appropriate density range for new residential development. This would affect the amount of Green Belt land required to meet the housing needs of the district. Higher density development both within existing urban areas, and within newly allocated development areas, would require less land to be removed from the Green Belt. Design principles would need to ensure that new development complements the character of adjoining areas, and the landscape setting of the town or village;
- Encourage high density development (50 dwellings per hectare 'dph', or more) to reduce the amount of land that will need to be released from the Green Belt;
- Seek development of around 30dph to allow larger residential gardens and space for car-parking, meaning that more land will need to be released from the Green Belt;
- The diagrams below show examples of density ranges within the district:

Diagram 5.1 - 15 dph: The Crescent, Loughton



Diagram 5.2 - 36 dph: Theydon Grove, Epping





Diagram 5.3 - 42 dph: Meadow Road, Loughton



Diagram 5.4 - 73 dph: Kendall / Harrison Road, off Meridian Way, Waltham Abbey



- Permit redevelopment of previously developed land for housing, subject to economic development requirements;
- Prevent or restrict the change of use from housing to other uses.

**Question 76:**

Do you consider that the Local Plan should include policy which seeks housing developments of a particular density? **Yes / No / Don't know**

**Question 77:**

If you answered yes to question 76, what density should the Local Plan seek to achieve?:

**30 dwellings per hectare or less**

**30-50 dwellings per hectare**

**More than 50 dwellings per hectare**

**A mixture of densities, depending on the character of the area**

### 5.10 Affordable housing

- Decrease the threshold for seeking affordable housing in urban areas to 10 units;
- Decrease the site size threshold in urban areas where affordable housing is sought to 0.2ha;
- Review the 40% affordable housing target on all appropriate development sites in the light of the emphasis on viability of development schemes;
- In rural areas, consider the use of a rural exception policy which seeks between 80 and 100% affordable housing for local needs, applying this also to infill and redevelopment opportunities as per the NPPF.

#### **Question 78:**

Should the Local Plan seek affordable housing on smaller sites than current policy allows? (i.e. less than 15 units, or less than 0.2 hectare)

**Yes / No / Don't know**

#### **Question 79:**

If you answered yes to question 78, should the Local Plan seek a different proportion of affordable housing on appropriate sites (paragraph 5.10)?:

**Yes, it should be higher**

**No, it should stay the same**

**Yes, it should be lower**

**Don't know**

### 5.11 Dwelling size and design

- Adopt policy which dictates the proportions of different size dwellings to be achieved in various locations around the district - or leave the market to determine the most appropriate houses to be built;
- Adopt specific space standards for habitable rooms within new residential development.

#### **Question 80:**

Do you think the Local Plan should include a policy which sets minimum space standards for new dwellings?

**Yes / No / Don't know**

### 5.12 Provision of specialist types of housing

- Identify the need for a range of specialist housing types, particularly to address the needs of the generally ageing population;
- Require that provision is made as part of any urban extensions to existing settlements.

### 5.13 Provision for Gypsies and Travellers

- Seek a collaborative working approach to provision of pitches across local authority boundaries;
- Continue the work on regularising the remaining tolerated or other unauthorised sites, including enforcement action where necessary;
- Review and amend the existing criteria based policy approach;
- Assess the capacity for expansion on any of the existing authorised sites;
- Require provision to be made for pitches within areas allocated for urban extensions;
- Explore the potential for designating rural exception sites for Travellers, including existing long-established sites.

**Question 81:**

Do you think the potential options identified for making provision for Gypsies & Travellers are the right ones?

**Yes / No / Don't know**

## 6. Economic development

### a) Town centres

#### 6.1 “Community Visioning” consultation results

- The need to achieve the right balance of shops and restaurants was particularly important to those living in the Epping, Theydon Bois and Loughton areas;
- There was a mixture of views on how our town centres should develop in the future with some respondents stating that they would like to see a shift towards more retail and less restaurant and bar activity whilst others would like to see more restaurants;
- There was support for encouraging smaller, independent retailers.

#### 6.2 What are the main issues?

#### 6.3 Characteristics of the existing town centres

- Epping Forest District does not have a single main town centre, but has six town centres of varying sizes;
- The average percentage of convenience retail shops (such as supermarkets and newsagents) for the district’s six town centres is 33.2%. This is almost double the national average (16.7%)<sup>18</sup>.
- The average percentage of comparison retail shops (e.g. clothes or gifts) for the district’s six town centres is 32.6%, much lower than the national average (51.1%);
- The average levels of retail related services such as hairdressers for the district’s six town centres (7.6%) is generally slightly above national average (4.9%). Only Chipping Ongar is below this figure, at 4.1%;
- The proportion of financial and professional services (such as estate agents and banks) in the town centres varies widely, from 6.0% in Loughton Broadway to 20.2% in Chipping Ongar. The national average is 7.7%.
- Several of the town centres have significantly more restaurants and cafes than the national average of 9.2%, particularly Waltham Abbey (14.0%), Loughton High Road (13.5%), Epping (12.3%) and Buckhurst Hill (10.5%). Only Loughton Broadway and Chipping Ongar are lower, at 7.4% and 5.9% respectively;
- The small size of some units can restrict the range of potential tenants, i.e. it discourages larger or multiple retailers;
- Vacancy rates within the town centres (which average 4.3%) are generally significantly lower than the national average of 9.3%;
- There is an evening economy in some centres e.g. Loughton High Road, Epping (and to a lesser extent Chipping Ongar and Loughton Broadway), but this is not so evident in Waltham Abbey or Buckhurst Hill. This may be because the cafes and restaurants present in these towns are busier during the day than in the evening;
- Some of the town centres areas suffer from deprivation, such as Waltham Abbey and The Broadway;
- Traditional shop fronts in town centres have often been damaged by insensitive development such as uPVC windows or conspicuous and inappropriate signage;

---

<sup>18</sup> Town Centres Study, 2010

- The floors above shops are often underused;

#### 6.4 Competition from centres outside the district

- Quite a few residents of the district choose to shop outside the district, leading to 'retail leakage', i.e. money which could be spent in the district's shops is effectively being lost to larger nearby centres outside the district;
- This applied to roughly 70% of all comparison goods in 2009, amounting to roughly £694 million<sup>19</sup>;
- To a certain extent this is unavoidable, as the town centres in Epping Forest District are small, and so will not always provide all the shops and services which customers require;
- For comparison goods the majority of leakage is to Harlow (20.4%);
- Smaller amounts are lost to Enfield (8.6%), Romford (6.2%) and Ilford (5.3%);
- Further afield, there is competition from national shopping centres such as Westfield (Stratford), Brookfield (Cheshunt), Lakeside, Bluewater and London's West End;
- The total leakage relating to convenience goods is slightly lower (66.2%), as the district is home to several supermarkets and food stores. This convenience goods leakage amounted to roughly £377 million in 2009.

#### 6.5 Balance of retail shops and other services

- The NPPF states that local planning authorities should '.....define the extent of town centres.....based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations' and 'promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflect the individuality of town centres' (para. 23);
- The current policy approach is to have an area of 'key frontage' within each town centre. The aim is to keep at least 70% of the length of the key frontage in retail uses, e.g. clothes shops, newsagents, hairdressers etc. This approach is applied to each of the six town centres in the same way;
- The policy was designed to maintain the level of retail frontage in our main town centres, as generally retail units attract the most 'footfall' (shoppers/visitors) to an area<sup>20</sup>;
- However, it has not been effective. Currently all but one of the centres (Loughton Broadway) has fallen below the 70% retail limit<sup>21</sup>. Once the 70% limit is breached it is even more difficult to enforce this policy;
- The Town Centres Study projects significant need for new town centre development over the next 20 years, including all of the uses mentioned above;
- The town centres which are predicted to need the most additional floorspace compared to their current size are Loughton High Road (34.1%) and Epping (26.1%)<sup>22</sup>;
- Should policies aim to retain the individual distinctiveness of the centres, or should they attempt to encourage a range of retailers frequently found in other centres throughout the country?

<sup>19</sup> Town Centres Study, 2010

<sup>20</sup> Mary Portas Review, 2011

<sup>21</sup> Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11

<sup>22</sup> Town Centres Study, 2010

## 6.6 Area-specific issues

### 6.7 Loughton High Road

- This centre has a strong evening economy, however this has caused some anti-social behaviour problems on occasion;
- The larger units are generally on the northern side of High Road only;
- There is good parking provision, but a definite problem with commuter parking, especially relating to the nearby London Underground station.

### 6.8 Epping

- There is a lack of large retail units, which discourages the multiples or other operators interested in the town, e.g. the Body Shop, Monsoon/Accessorise;
- There is good parking provision in the town centre, but commuter parking relating to the London Underground station causes problems;
- The restaurants, bars and clubs in the town form an evening economy, but there have been some anti-social behaviour issues.

### 6.9 Loughton Broadway

- Debden is also home to several large employment/industrial areas, on Langston Road and the Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate. Traditionally these employment areas have been defended from any retail uses, but permission has recently been granted for a retail park on Langston Road, subject to developer contributions being agreed;
- The town centre is within an area of general deprivation, particularly relating to income; employment; health; education, skills and training; and crime;
- The Town Centres Study reported a slightly higher vacancy rate than the national average, but this was due to the large former Woolworth's store being vacant at the time of the survey.

### 6.10 Waltham Abbey

- Waltham Abbey's town centre is at the far western end of the urban area, meaning that a large part of the population live quite far away from it, and are less likely to visit;
- The town centre has struggled in recent years to maintain its vitality and viability;
- The interesting historic centre of the town is a cultural asset, but as with Epping, the small size of the existing shop units makes it difficult for larger retailers to locate there, despite there being a demand for suitable premises;
- There is a large area of employment at the nearby industrial estate of Brooker and Cartersfield Roads. Traditionally these employment areas have been defended from any retail uses, although a Lidl store has been built on Cartersfield Road following a permission in the late 2000s;
- The town centre is within areas of general deprivation, particularly relating to income; health; education, skills and training; barriers to housing and services; crime; living environment; and employment;
- There is limited public transport available from bus routes. The nearest railway station at Waltham Cross is approximately 20-30 minutes walk away from Waltham Abbey town centre;
- There have been some problems with evening disturbances in the Tesco car park.

### 6.11 Chipping Ongar

- The centre has a strong evening economy, but this has caused anti-social behaviour problems on occasion;
- Only two large retailers are present, however this is probably due to the overall size of the centre, and the fairly small size of shop units;
- There is limited public transport (buses only);
- There have been some instances of nuisance from youth behaviour.

### 6.12 Buckhurst Hill (Queen's Road East)

- The shops and services in Buckhurst Hill are split between two areas, one at the eastern and one at the western end of Queen's Road, with residential housing in between. Only the eastern half is designated as a 'main' town centre;
- The centre is characterised by smaller units, high-end clothes shops and several restaurants. There is only one large retailer present (Waitrose), but the centre has an 'upper middle market' position, suggesting it is thriving;
- There are two car parks available, but these are under pressure from both shoppers and commuters. Commuter parking is a major problem.

#### **Question 82:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to the town centres in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

### 6.13 **What are the options?**

#### 6.14 Characteristics of the existing town centres

- Seek regeneration in town centres which have declined in recent years, e.g. Waltham Abbey and Chipping Ongar, to help support retail growth and encourage local economic development;
- Direct residential development towards settlements with struggling town centres;
- Increase the level of control over shop fronts in historic centres to improve their quality and ensure use of sensitive materials and signage etc.;
- Continue to take a fairly relaxed approach to shop front design.

#### 6.15 Competition from centres outside the district

- Allow the redevelopment of existing employment sites near town centres for town centre uses, as these uses do provide jobs in their own right. This could encourage large retailers to locate in the area;
- Pursue large-scale retail developments to compete with other centres;
- Emphasise a 'town centre first' approach for offices, to encourage office workers to use the shops and services in town centres;
- Resist out-of-town retail developments which compete with the town centres;
- Capitalise on the tourism potential of shopping areas, for instance the shops and restaurants featured in The Only Way Is Essex.

#### 6.16 Balance of retail shops and other services

- Reduce the 70% minimum retail frontage threshold to e.g. 50%;

- Relax the existing policy completely to allow changes of use to non-retail uses within key frontages;
- Use the suggestion within the Town Centres Study to re-classify our main towns as follows:
  - ‘Town centres’: Epping and Loughton High Road; then
  - ‘Small district centres’ – Waltham Abbey, Loughton Broadway, Chipping Ongar, and Buckhurst Hill
 and relax the existing policy within the small district centres only;
- Maximise the individual strengths of each centre, i.e. have a different approach for each of the six;
- Keep the current policy approach.

## 6.17 Area-specific

### 6.18 Loughton High Road

- Promote the use of upper floors for residential use, to have more ‘eyes on the streets’ to discourage anti-social behaviour at night;
- Investigate the potential for provision of more parking, especially near the station;
- Encourage redevelopment of existing sites into larger retail units, to attract other multiples or traders needing larger premises.

### 6.19 Epping

- Promote the use of upper floors for residential use, to have more ‘eyes on the streets’ to discourage anti-social behaviour at night;
- Pursue the regeneration of the town centre through the St John’s Road Development Brief, which could bring in more residents or retail shops to increase the viability of the town centre;
- Consider re-developing sites within the town which were highlighted by the Strategic Land Availability Assessment: the Epping Sports Centre on Hemnall Street (which is ageing and could potentially be re-provided in a more accessible area), 54 Centre Drive (an ageing office building), and Bower Hill Industrial Estate & Laundry Site;
- Investigate the potential for provision of more parking, especially near the station.

### 6.20 Loughton Broadway

- Promote redevelopment of the general town centre area, through the Loughton Broadway development and design brief, to start to address deprivation by provision of new housing and jobs;
- Specifically promote redevelopment at the sites which the Strategic Land Availability Assessment identified within the town centre for redevelopment: the Winston Churchill Pub; the site of Sainsbury’s Supermarket and the petrol station; and areas at Vere Road and Burton Road (not including current housing);
- Pursue redevelopment of other existing designated employment land on the Langston Road/Oakwood Hill industrial estates for town centre uses.

### 6.21 Waltham Abbey

- Promote the use of upper floors for residential use, in order to bring more potential customers for the town centre into the area, and to have more ‘eyes on the streets’ to discourage anti-social behaviour at night;



- Allow redevelopment of some existing designated employment land on the Cartersfield Road/Brooker Road industrial estates for town centre uses;
- Capitalise on the heritage nature of the town and promote Waltham Abbey as a tourist centre for heritage and leisure – this could involve relaxing retail requirements to allow more cafes and restaurants to promote tourism ;
- Consider redevelopment of part of some of the existing car parks within the town (Darby Drive, Town Mead/Green Yard, Quaker Lane and Cornmill), without a significant overall loss in the total number of parking spaces;
- Promote the redevelopment of other areas near the town centre which were identified in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment, such as the Town Mead Playing Fields Complex.

#### 6.22 Chipping Ongar

- Promote the use of upper floors for residential use, to have more 'eyes on the streets' to discourage anti-social behaviour at night;
- Pursue the redevelopment for housing of the site to the rear of 101-103 High Street, which is just outside the town centre boundary.

#### 6.23 Buckhurst Hill (Queen's Road East)

- Investigate the potential for provision of more parking, especially near the station;
- Limit the size of new units, to encourage further 'boutique' shops.

**Question 83:**

Have the right options been identified to address the issues? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

## b) Employment Land

### 6.21 “Community Visioning” consultation results

- The growth of local jobs and businesses was the second most frequently identified priority for the district by the local community, highlighting the importance of the employment and the local economy.

### 6.22 What are the main issues?

#### 6.23 Employment in the district

- The local economy is dominated by the following sectors; (i) distribution, hotels and restaurants (25.5%); (ii) banking and finance (23.9%); and (iii) public services (20.7%)<sup>23</sup>;
- The construction and transport and communications sectors in particular have expanded significantly in recent years (5.4% per annum and 7.4% per annum respectively);
- Over the next 20 years, projections<sup>24</sup> suggest that job numbers in labour recruitment, security and cleaning; construction; and retail and catering will continue to rise significantly;
- Most business services such as real estate, research and development, transport and public sector jobs such as health and education, are expected to expand slightly over the period;
- The number of jobs in the finance sector is expected to fall slightly, and more traditional employment sectors such as manufacturing are predicted to decline;
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities ‘plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century’ (NPPF, paragraph 20);
- Business survey work by Essex County Council in 2010 suggests that 58% of all businesses within the district only have a local market reach, i.e. the area in which most of their customers are based is fairly small;
- There are several national retail centres within a short car or Central Line journey of the district, including Lakeside, Westfield (Stratford), and the Brookfield Centre (Cheshunt). These provide tough competition for the district’s retail centres. There is also significant ‘leakage’ of spending to other retail centres close by, such as Harlow, Enfield and Romford;
- Unemployment has historically been slightly lower than the average for the East of England region (by approx. 0.25%), and significantly lower than the average for Great Britain (by approx. 1%)<sup>25</sup>;
- The average gross weekly wage for a resident of the district in 2011 was higher than that for the East of England region (by approx. 14%), and even higher than average for Great Britain (by approx 19%)<sup>26</sup>.

#### 6.24 Existing designated employment sites

- Because so little previously developed land outside the Green Belt becomes available for development, it tends to be used for residential rather than commercial development, as residential development is more valuable and

<sup>23</sup> Employment Land Review, 2010

<sup>24</sup> East of England Forecasting Model (run dated May 2011), which projects job changes up to 2031 only

<sup>25</sup> This measure is the percentage of the working age resident population aged 16-64 claiming Job Seekers Allowance, (data from 2000 to 2012)

<sup>26</sup> Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, Office for National Statistics, 2011

profitable. This means that finding suitable land for commercial development is more difficult;

- There are several designated employment areas throughout the district. Some have outdated and dilapidated facilities, and some areas originally designated for employment use either have buildings which stand empty, or were never developed for business use at all;
- The NPPF states that (i) 'Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose', and (ii) 'Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits.' (paragraph 22).

#### 6.25 Small businesses / entrepreneurship

- A large proportion of businesses within the district are either 'micro' businesses (one to ten employees) or small businesses (eleven to forty-nine employees). These two together contribute a total of over 60.4% of jobs<sup>27</sup>;
- The district also has high levels of entrepreneurship. Indeed self-employment has accounted for just over 15% of all employment in recent years<sup>28</sup>;
- The proportion of business start-ups (new business ventures) in the district is much higher (95.6 start-ups per 10,000 people) than the national rate (57.2 per 10,000 people)<sup>29</sup>. This entrepreneurial activity is mostly within the construction; wholesale, retail and repairs; and real estate, renting and business sectors;
- The Employment Land Review included workshops with business representatives from the district. There was strong support for the provision of further facilities for small businesses/start-ups, and 'seedbed centres'.

#### 6.26 New, modern employment sectors

- Some smaller, more innovative sectors such as computer-related business are predicted to grow over the next 20 years;
- Research & development and manufacturing, in relation to life sciences, are an important sector for the West Essex area, and show significant growth potential. There are already some clusters within West Essex, and one within the district (Fyfield Business and Research Park) which includes several crop science/research & development companies<sup>30</sup>. In order to encourage growth in this sector however, it may be necessary to plan for more modern facilities;
- The South East Local Enterprise Partnership (incorporating East Sussex, Essex and Kent) was successful in its bid for a two part Local Enterprise Zone in Harlow to be created. There are plans for a 126-acre development at the 'Enterprise West Essex @ Harlow' site, to support medical technology and other high technology companies which could create up to 5,000 new jobs.

#### 6.27 Commuting / new ways of working

- The proximity of London means that the area is already quite attractive to house buyers and businesses, being within commuter distance. There is a

<sup>27</sup> Employment Land Review, 2010

<sup>28</sup> 15.1% of the working age population (2008-2009 figures) – from Appendix 2 of the Essex Economic Assessment: Local Assessments

<sup>29</sup> Appendix 2 of the Essex Economic Assessment: Local Assessments

<sup>30</sup> Regeneris Health and Allied Industries study, 2011 cited in Enterprise West Essex @ Harlow, prepared by CLG and Harlow Council

high level of commuting both into and out of the district, but mostly into London. Almost 62% of the district's residents commute out to work;

- 42.9% of those out-commuting in 2001 worked at a 'Higher' ranked occupational level (e.g. higher managerial, administrative or professional roles), compared to 35.0% of those commuting into the district;
- Conversely, 22.6% of those commuting in worked at a 'Lower' ranked occupational level (e.g. lower supervisory and technical roles), compared to 18.1% of those commuting out of the district<sup>31</sup>;
- Residents of rural areas will often rely on private cars to commute, as the rural areas of the district are not well served by public transport. Some drive to London Underground stations and park there or nearby for the day, which causes associated problems of congestion and a need for more parking spaces;
- There are changing patterns of working at a national level. More people are choosing to work from home, so having a job in London need not always result in commuting. There is evidence of higher rates of working from home in the more rural wards of this district.

#### 6.28 Tourism

- The district has many attractive facilities to suit a range of interests, e.g. Epping Forest, Waltham Abbey Church and gardens, the Lee Valley Regional Park, historic North Weald Airfield, Greensted Church, the Royal Gunpowder Mills and the market towns of Chipping Ongar, Epping and Waltham Abbey;
- The White Water Centre, constructed for the 2012 Olympics, and just over the district border in the Lee Valley near Waltham Abbey, could also be a catalyst in the medium to long-term to encourage sport and other tourism-related activities in the locality.

#### **Question 84:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to employment land in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

#### 6.29 **What are the options?**

#### 6.30 Managing existing employment sites

- Consider whether the existing designations are still the most appropriate to support local businesses;
- Allow the redevelopment of entire existing sites which are vacant/derelict and have been for some time, for other uses e.g. housing;
- Pursue the redevelopment of existing employment sites which are out of date, to provide upgraded facilities for newer technologies;
- Resist redevelopment of designated employment sites for uses other than employment.

#### 6.31 Support small businesses / entrepreneurship

- Plan for business premises tailored to small/start-up businesses, including for rental space, business units and serviced office space;

<sup>31</sup> Census Origin Destination Statistics, 2001

- Plan for proportionately more employment development to include smaller units;
- Allow the use of part of a home or outbuildings such as sheds in gardens, for workspace.

6.32 Encourage growth in new, modern employment sectors

- Plan for high quality premises for research and technology businesses;
- Designate specific 'cluster areas' for employment development for new technologies;
- Identify other newer sectors of the economy to promote in the district, e.g. 'green' technologies such as renewable energy;
- Maximise the potential benefit of the new Local Enterprise Zone site in Harlow by encouraging 'high tech' and medical technology businesses into Epping Forest District as well, by planning to provide and support high quality facilities in 'clusters' near Harlow.

6.33 Reduce commuting / facilitate new ways of working

- Plan for local business hubs that residents can use for office services and facilities, rather than commuting;
- Encourage live-work developments;
- Pursue the provision of high-speed broadband in the district, so more people can work effectively from home;
- Seek to reduce the levels of out commuting from the area by providing more appropriate employment sites and business infrastructure, to encourage the provision of more 'high-value' jobs.

6.34 Support tourism

- Encourage linked visits to attractions in the district, capitalising on existing facilities and sights;
- Promote sports tourism, focusing on golf, cycling, walking in Epping Forest, horse riding and the nearby Lee Valley White Water Centre;
- Promote tourism to other places in the district made 'famous' through television shows, e.g. The Only Way Is Essex;
- Promote the heritage Epping-Ongar rail line as a leisure attraction.

6.35 Alleviate areas of deprivation

- Pursue regeneration and redevelopment in economically static areas, such as Waltham Abbey, Loughton Broadway and Chipping Ongar;
- Allocate significant employment development in economically deprived areas, to encourage local job creation.

**Question 85:**

Have the right options been identified to address the issues?

**Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

## c) Rural Economy

### 6.36 “Community Visioning” consultation results

- None of the Community Visioning questions related directly to the rural economy. However, one of the main priorities selected by respondents was ‘encouraging local jobs and businesses’.

### 6.37 What are the main issues?

#### 6.38 General rural economy

- The NPPF states that local plans should ‘support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas’ and ‘promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses’ (para. 28);
- Some of the rural areas in the district score more poorly in the Deprivation Indices of 2010 than urban areas, due to the lack of access to housing (taking into account affordability) and services such as shops and post offices. These areas include Passingford, High Ongar & Willingale, Moreton & Fyfield and Lower Sheering;
- There are many farm buildings which are now surplus to requirements;
- The Council’s current approach is to favour the re-use of agricultural buildings for business purposes rather than for housing. Such changes of use must meet several criteria, including traffic impact, and effect on the Green Belt.

#### 6.39 The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry

- The NPPF states that local planning authorities should ‘.....assess the needs of the food production industry and any barriers to investment that planning can resolve’ (para. 161);
- The district has long been home to part of the Lea Valley glasshouse industry, now mainly focused in Roydon, Nazeing and Waltham Abbey;
- Glasshouse horticulture is an appropriate land use in the Green Belt, but the use is not included in the statutory remit of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority;
- The Council has operated a policy approach of concentrating glasshouse development to designated areas, in order to protect the landscape of the area, and the openness of the Green Belt;
- The Council commissioned a study on the industry in 2011, and the conclusions and recommendations became part of the evidence base for the Local Plan in July 2012;
- Initial conclusions show that there is a need for taller and much larger facilities, which the current policy approach cannot meet;
- Without the designation of much larger areas, the consultants suspect that much of the industry will become unviable in the period of the Local Plan, creating significant problems of dereliction;
- Many new glasshouse developments now include packhouses and import produce from the continent for packing to win contracts with the major food retailers, which are in almost total control of the market for salad crops. This creates further problems, as HGVs carry the produce to the packhouses and then deliver the packed goods to distribution centres, using unsuitable narrow rural roads. This causes significant disturbance to local residents and damages the road infrastructure;
- It is very expensive to bring derelict sites back into productive use – the ground can be heavily contaminated with broken glass and other materials.

There is an issue of 'hope value' for residential re-development, but this is generally an inappropriate use in the Green Belt;

- With a growing season of 22 weeks and a range of activities outside this period, growers want to be able to offer a higher standard of temporary accommodation to attract high quality workers, but Green Belt restrictions act against this, as residential use is inappropriate.

## 6.40 What are the options?

### 6.41 General rural economy

- Allow sensitive development in rural areas to help address deprivation, by providing some new housing to support local services;
- Continue to permit the re-use of buildings in rural areas for residential and/or employment use;
- Promote the development of live/work units in rural areas, so people can work in areas without much public transport;
- Take a flexible or tolerant approach to the operation of suitable small businesses from homes in rural areas;
- Direct rural employment development to areas with existing infrastructure capacity, such as those with bus routes and local schools;
- Support the re-use of rural buildings or new development in rural areas for 'greener' business sectors e.g. renewable energy, ICT etc. to mitigate the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from commuting;
- Work with other agencies to pursue the provision of high-speed broadband internet access in rural areas;
- Consider requiring a contribution to high-speed broadband for development in rural areas, through the forthcoming Community Infrastructure Levy;
- Support agricultural tourism through permitting farms to provide other facilities such as cafes, farm shops and activities for children.

### 6.42 The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry

- Permit larger, taller glasshouses within designated areas to continue to support high technology food production;
- Consider expanding existing areas designated for glasshouses<sup>32</sup>;
- Designate new sites for glasshouse development, not restricted to the Lea Valley<sup>33</sup>;
- Create policy 'buffer zones' between new designated glasshouse areas and existing residential areas, so that taller glasshouses can be built without adversely affecting the light and visual amenity of nearby residents;
- Encourage the County Council to prepare a Freight Management Strategy to include the Nazeing and Roydon area;
- Introduce a policy of 'managed decline' for the industry;
- Allow derelict sites to be developed for residential housing or other commercial uses, where it can be shown that the existing use is financially unviable;
- Co-operate with adjoining authorities to investigate the options of identifying new sites for glasshouse development;
- Engage with the LVRPA to discuss an agreed approach to continued glasshouse development in the Lea Valley;
- Review policy approach to temporary accommodation for seasonal workers.

<sup>32</sup> As proposed by the Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Report, 2012

<sup>33</sup> As proposed by the Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Report, 2012

**Question 86:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to the rural economy in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 87:**

Have the right options been identified to address these issues?

**Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 88:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to the glasshouse horticulture (and in particular the Lea Valley industry) been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 89:**

Have the right options been identified to address these issues? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?



## **7. Transport, access and movement**

### **7.1 “Community Visioning” consultation results:**

- Reduction of traffic congestion, and associated pollution, was important for Buckhurst Hill and Loughton residents;
- Access to public transport was most important for Ongar, Chigwell and the rural areas and north-east of the district;
- The favoured approaches for locating new development were (i) close to public transport links and (ii) around/within existing towns;
- Concern was expressed about capacity on the Central Line and there was support for re-opening the Epping to Ongar link.

### **7.2 What are the main issues?**

- We need to encourage the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases (GHG) resulting from transport movements in the district, as part of a wider carbon reduction strategy;
- We need to identify ways to address and reduce congestion, which reflects the capacity of some parts of the district’s road network (including the southern end of the M11), and to ensure it does not get any worse due to new developments;
- The Central Line from Stratford south will reach capacity at peak travel times within the Plan period, and we need to assess how this will affect where we put new residential and non-residential development sites in the district;
- We need to investigate the feasibility and likelihood of the re-opening of the Epping to Ongar link as part of the Central Line. London Underground has advised that there are no plans to re-open the line, so it is likely that its immediate future rests on the success of its operation as a heritage/tourist attraction, with a possible expansion as a commuter service at some time in the future;
- We need to ensure that new development maintains or improves the range of transport options for access to shops, health services, schools, employment and leisure interests, recognising that the range of such options in rural areas will necessarily be more restricted;
- Excess commuter parking around the district’s eight Central Line stations is an on-going problem as this spills over onto residential roads;
- We are aware of long-standing problems of excessive HGV movements in the Roydon and Nazeing area which damage the rural road infrastructure and cause significant disturbance to local residents. There are several likely causes: (a) “convenient” short route between Hoddesdon and Harlow; (b) “rat-run” link from the industrial areas of Hoddesdon to the M25 at Waltham Abbey; (c) traffic requiring access to the area, ie local industrial uses, the glasshouses and the associated packhouses; and (e) traffic generated by activities outside the district, eg Hoddesdon Business Park;
- We are also aware of pollution issues arising from vehicular traffic and in particular the long-term impact on Epping Forest;
- We will monitor the possible provision of an additional junction on the M11 north of junction 7, in association with development to the north and east of Harlow;
- While the construction of a second runway at Stansted Airport has been abandoned, we will also need to monitor the increase in use of the first runway to its maximum capacity, in terms of aircraft noise and local road

traffic implications. We also believe that there are intentions, currently shelved, to alter flight paths;

- While there has been little interest shown in this for a number of years, we will continue to monitor external pressure for major infrastructure projects which may impact upon the district, eg motorway service areas.

**Question 90:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to transport in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

### 7.3 What are the Options?

#### 7.4 Carbon Reduction

- Locational policies for new development that should reduce the need to travel or ensure that development is served by adequate public transport services;
- Design and layout policies that ensure new developments (i) make full provision for walking and cycling and (ii) improve linkages to and within existing development and key facilities, and to public transport routes;
- Require travel plans to be an integral part of any large scale commercial or residential development to encourage people to use transport other than the car e.g. through cycle facility provision. Ensure they include an information pack detailing local public transport options;
- Promote the extension and upgrading of walking and cycling routes as part of any developer contributions;
- Encourage mixed use developments that could encourage shorter trips;
- Encourage development along existing bus routes and enter into discussions with bus companies to see if routes cater for the needs of the local communities;
- Support the provision or expansion of more rural services through developer contributions (Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)).

#### 7.5 Congestion/Air Quality

- Encourage the use of public transport using measures such as (i) travel plans for new and expanding developments; (ii) reducing parking provision for new developments in places in close proximity to an adequate public transport service; (iii) involving public transport providers in the design of major schemes to ensure full integration of services with construction, including the use of information technology;
- Encourage development around public transport nodes, including the Central Line (but not forgetting the capacity issue), rail and bus services. While there is only one overground rail station in the district (at Roydon), the stations at Waltham Cross, Broxbourne and Sawbridgeworth are considered to be in reasonable proximity to parts of the west of the district;
- Work with developers, residents' groups and other organisations to promote car clubs and car sharing schemes.

#### 7.6 Central Line capacity

- Concentrate development away from the stations, ie Waltham Abbey and Ongar, and the larger villages except Theydon Bois (ie North Weald, Lower Nazeing, Roydon and Lower Sheering);
- Allow some development near stations but require detailed travel plans to try and discourage the use of the car.

#### 7.7 Parking at Central Line stations

- Promote the use of other transport alternatives to get to the stations;
- Investigate the potential to extend car parks through developer contributions;
- Investigate the possibility of using part of North Weald Airfield for a park and ride service to Epping Station;
- Amend and extend the use of Controlled Parking Zones to address the problems being faced by residents.

#### 7.8 HGVs on rural roads

- Encourage the preparation of a County Freight Strategy by Essex County Council (the Highways Authority);
- Encourage the police to regularly enforce local weight restrictions;
- Work with the highways authority and developers to ensure road signage is as clear and up-to-date as possible;
- Carry out a new traffic survey to establish the reasons so many HGVs are using particular rural routes.

**Question 91:**

Have the right options been identified to address the issues? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

## **8. Infrastructure and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

### **8.1 What is the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)?**

- Major infrastructure such as new schools and hospitals, extensions to water treatment plants (e.g. Rye Meads), or significant transport projects are normally funded through Central Government budgets and the capital programmes of statutory agencies.
- The CIL allows local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds (the levy) from developments in their area which result in an increase in internal floorspace. The money can be used to contribute towards the costs of building or providing smaller-scale infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. This could include local projects such as the provision of seats, benches and play equipment for young children in public open spaces, landscaping schemes and small-scale flood alleviation systems - this list is far from exhaustive.
- A useful analogy is to regard Government budgets and capital programmes as “cake” and the levy as “the icing”. It is up to the Council to decide what use to make of CIL receipts.
- Levy rates, which are likely to be based on new housing units and additional areas of commercial and retail floorspace, will be set after consultation with local communities and developers (an exercise separate to the Local Plan consultations). We intend to commence this process, with a draft charging schedule, around the time the Draft Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (provisionally Autumn 2013).
- In April 2014, the levy will replace Section 106 obligations, although the latter may continue to be used for the provision of (i) affordable housing and (ii) anything required just for the development site to make it acceptable in planning terms. The Government is currently (May 2012) consulting on whether to include affordable housing within CIL. The contributions from S106 can be pooled from up to five development sites to fund larger infrastructure projects.

### **8.2 “Community visioning” consultation results**

- While there were no questions in the consultation directly related to infrastructure provision for existing and future community needs, the following were identified as priorities, most of which have implications for local infrastructure projects:
  - Protecting and enhancing green spaces;
  - Providing more local job opportunities;
  - Reducing traffic congestion.
- Other issues which received some support were:
  - Improved community facilities (education, health and a cinema were specifically mentioned);
  - Better access to public transport and better integration between bus and rail;
  - Affordable housing, especially in rural areas.

### **8.3 What we are currently doing**

- We need to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This will identify what infrastructure is currently planned and budgeted for by providers, and what else is needed in the district to support new or existing development. It

will also include information about available funding for this infrastructure. This is an ongoing process which will become clearer as the Local Plan progresses when we will have definite targets for household and employment growth, and specific locations for the developments.

#### 8.4 Your input to the Issues and Options consultation

- At this stage we would like statutory consultees who have (i) identified projects with funding agreed or (ii) evidenced information regarding their future infrastructure needs to submit this to us, so it can be added to our database. Appendix 1 is a blank template through which you can let us know of any infrastructure needs/projects.
- We would also like the local community to give us their views on key infrastructure needs for the district over the next 20 plus years.

**Question 92:**

Do you think we are considering the most appropriate action to deliver the infrastructure necessary to support new development in the district?

**Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

*If you are a statutory or infrastructure service provider please fill in Appendix 1 as part of your response.*

## 9. Responding to Climate Change

### 9.1 “Community Visioning” consultation results:

- Of the five issues listed in the consultation, reducing the impacts of climate change was identified as the least important priority for the district over the next 20 years by residents;
- However the need to reduce the level of traffic, and concerns about environmental sustainability and pollution, were frequently raised when local people were asked to consider the planning issues that most need to be addressed in their area.

### 9.2 What are the main Issues?

- The Climate Change Act (2008) sets targets for greenhouse gas emission reductions in the UK of at least 80% by 2050, and reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of at least 26% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline;
- The Council has designated one Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to pollution from traffic, at Bell Common just south of Epping. Loughton High Road and Epping High Street are also considered to be traffic pollution “hotspots” but have not so far been designated as AQMAs;
- The Coalition Government has continued to support the previous Government’s target that all new homes should be zero carbon from 2016. Step changes in Building Regulations Part L are leading to this, and authorities are encouraged to use the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) (CLG 2006) to increase energy efficiency standards in new development;
- The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2011) identifies Lower Nazeing, Waltham Abbey, Abridge, Loughton, Chigwell, Chipping Ongar, North Weald, Fyfield, Thornwood Common and Roydon as being at particular risk from flooding. The district has a long history of flooding with the Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP - 2009) estimating that between 2,000 and 5,000 homes are at risk from a 1% annual probability river flood (flood zone 3). Significant numbers of homes are also at risk from surface water flooding;
- Flood risk assessments should be produced for most development within flood risk areas under national guidance;
- Additional housing will increase pressure on surface water and sewer drainage systems;
- Thames Water has estimated that climate change could reduce the availability of water in the London area by over 100 million litres a day by 2025.
- The Council is shortly to commission a study to investigate potential ways to incorporate carbon reduction and renewable energy into new development and planning policies.

#### **Question 93:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to climate change in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

### 9.3 What are the Options?

#### 9.4 Carbon reduction

- Vehicle emissions - see the seven options listed in the “Transport, access and movement” chapter (section 7.4);
- Buildings - ensure a more consistent and effective use of the Code for Sustainable Homes, and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) for non-domestic buildings, and any updated guidance in dealing with new developments.

#### 9.5 Water usage and flooding

- Ensure that all new developments incorporate measures to reduce water usage;
- Incorporate rain water harvesting into new developments, both domestic and commercial;
- Ensure we develop policies on all forms of flooding for the next Plan period that are consistent with the NPPF, the Essex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment;
- Take a cautious, sequential approach to allocating any land for future development at risk of flooding and ensure no allocated development takes place in areas most at risk of flooding (flood zone 3b);
- Manage surface water drainage through the introduction of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all new development;
- Ensure where development takes place in areas known to be at risk of flooding, measures are incorporated to mitigate flood impact and a route to safety is provided. Development management policies will also ensure that the most vulnerable parts of a development are not at risk, eg by ensuring no bedrooms are permitted in basements or on the ground floor in areas of risk;
- Require that ‘all brownfield development should show an improvement in surface water runoff’. This could include adaptations such as green roofs and walls which reduce runoff as well as providing energy efficiency measures. This helps to improve flood risk in areas that fall outside flood risk zones, but where surface water runoff should be controlled;

#### 9.6 New Development

- Assess the possibility of setting on-site targets for renewable energy generation for new developments and the scale for which this would be appropriate;
- Assess the suitability/ effectiveness of encouraging widespread small-scale carbon reduction schemes on a property by property basis;
- Ensure all new developments incorporate ways to reduce carbon emissions within their design, including orientation;
- Investigate the idea of promoting or encouraging upgrades to house insulation, linked to any permissions for new extensions.

#### 9.7 Other Measures

- Assess locations for larger renewable and low carbon energy schemes;
- Make provision for waste storage and promote recycling.

#### **Question 94:**

Have the right options been identified to address these issues? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

## **10. Community facilities**

10.1 This subject embraces accessibility, culture, education, faith, health, informal recreation, leisure, social, sport and safety issues and facilities in the interests of promoting healthy and inclusive local communities. The list is not exhaustive.

### **10.2 “Community visioning” consultation results**

- Although none of the questions asked directly about the provision of facilities, the outcome of the exercise identified a wish for better education and health services, better access to public transport in rural areas, and protection and enhancement of green spaces.

### **10.3 What are the main issues?**

- The NPPF (paragraph 70) advises that planning policies should:
  - plan positively for the provision of community facilities and other local services;
  - guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services;
  - ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a sustainable way, and be retained for the benefit of the community; and
  - ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses, and community facilities and services;
- The NPPF (paragraph 28) also advises that planning policies should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship;
- Policy CF12 of the Local Plan Alterations already addresses this issue and, while it does not differentiate between rural and urban areas, the supporting text makes clear that it was intended to be applied more strictly in rural areas;
- However well intentioned or community minded such a policy is or would be, there is a limit to what the planning system can achieve. If a commercial use or a community service becomes financially unviable in its current location, it will close or move to another area unless funding or other forms of subsidy or support can be secured to ensure its continuation. The Council is well aware of the gradual loss of some facilities, particularly in rural areas of the district – eg village shops, post offices, petrol filling stations and pubs;
- It is inevitable that accessibility to a range of services or facilities will be more restricted in the rural areas of the district – with implications particularly for those without direct access to a car;
- Subject to a short list of criteria, the NPPF (paragraph 74) states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on;
- The Council commissioned an assessment of the levels of provision and capacity of open spaces, playing pitches and other sports facilities in the district in 2012. The study, including its conclusions and recommendations on the setting of some standards for local provision, was added to the evidence base (June 2012) and will be used to prepare options for future stages of the local Plan preparation;
- Health inequalities, significant differences in life expectancy and areas of deprivation occur in parts of the district, especially Waltham Abbey, Loughton Broadway, Passingford and Grange Hill;



- There will be an increasing proportion of elderly people in the district through the period of the Local Plan.

**Question 95:**

Have the relevant issues in relation to community facilities in Epping Forest district been identified? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

#### 10.4 What are the options?

- Audit of village and rural facilities, including involvement of town and parish councils, to assess current availability of services, changes which have occurred, related trends and establish needs and wishes of local communities;
- Use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to support provision and maintenance of rural facilities;
- Co-location of services and multi-functional use of facilities;
- Design of new facilities to include consideration of adaptability for other community uses;
- Encourage community participation in running or supporting local services;
- Collaboration with service providers and other agencies (eg Rural Communities Council of Essex) to identify alternative methods of maintaining or improving services;
- Design of new development to encourage accessibility and social contact;
- Significant new development to make adequate provision for (i) public open space, sport, leisure and other community facilities, and for future maintenance where appropriate; and (ii) cycle paths and storage/parking and footpaths to encourage less use of cars;
- Initially through the Local Plan, and later through Neighbourhood Plans, local communities can identify 'Local Green Space' for special protection (paragraph 76 of NPPF).

**Question 96:**

Have the right options been identified to address these issues? **Yes / No**

If no, what do you think is missing?

**Question 97:**

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix 1: Infrastructure needs / projects template

Location	Identified need	Planned Scheme?	Cost	Delivery timetable
<i>Example: Anytown</i>	<i>Additional primary school places needed</i>	<i>Extension to existing school</i>	<i>£xxx</i>	<i>By September 2014</i>