



**MINUTES**

**Meeting:** PLANNING

**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> November 2013

**Time:** 7.00 PM

**Venue:** NORTH WEALD LIBRARY, HIGH ROAD, NORTH WEALD

---

**Councillors (12)** B Eldridge (Chairman), C Hawkins, B Bartram, T Blanks, A Buckley, B Clegg, P Collins, G Mulliner, N Bedford, Mrs E Godwin Brown, R Spearman, D Stallan\*

*\* Not a member of this committee*

**Officers in Attendance (2)** Adriana Jones, Finance and Administrative Officer  
Sammy Wix, Administration Assistant

**Members of the Public (0)**

**Members of the Press (0)**

**Also In Attendance (3)**

**Mr Glenn Chip Chief Executive – Epping Forest District Council**

**Cllr Chris Whitbread – Leader Epping Forest District Council**

**Sarah King – Forward Planning – Epping Forest District Council**

**P13.078 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (3)**

*NOTED* apologies for absence received from Councillor Mrs A Grigg, G McCormack and D Adams.

**P13.079 OTHER ABSENCES (0)**

None necessary.

**P13.080 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2013 were signed as a true record.

**P13.081 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Cllr Spearman declared a pecuniary interest in item 7, by virtue of the fact he had submitted land via the land call process, however discussions were not expected to be site specific.
- Cllr Stallan declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 by virtue of the fact he took part in the Issues and Options consultation in 2012 where he made comments concerning North Weald Airfield
- Cllr Bartram declared a non-pecuniary interest in item6(2) as a neighbouring property.

**P13.082 REPRESENTATIONS**

The Chairman introduced Mr Glen Chipp, Chief Executive of EFDC and Sarah King, Forward Planning EFDC. In light of there being no members of the public

present concerning the planning applications to be considered, it was **AGREED** to move Item 7 – Local Plan Update – forward.

### **P13.083 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE**

Mr Chipp thanked members of the Planning Committee for giving him an opportunity to address some of the rumours that had been circulating regarding the local plan, specifically reference to numbers of houses for the plan period, stating that the best way to put some of these rumours to bed was to personally come and give an update on both process and process. He stated that he would also address what he thinks this means for North Weald, together with an update on the proposed Latton Priory development.

Mr Chipp stated that firstly, EFDC as the Local Planning authority have not agreed a housing target for the plan period. Some people are saying EFDC have, however Mr Chipp stated that Cllr Stallan would be able to confirm that they haven't. He explained why EFDC are going through the Local Plan process, stating that it's a requirement from central Government that a Local Planning authority should be able to demonstrate an 'objectively assessed need' in terms of housing for their future. This begins with looking at the relevant Government statistics and projections based on the Office for National Statistics, and having a requirement to meet any need. If you just looked at these figures, the housing target would be 16,000 homes.

There are three stages to reaching this target.

- **STEP 1** – Agreeing the need, which is completed taking into account a variety of factors such as demographics, housing and economic.
- **STEP 2** – Reviewing the evidence base against both local planning and national planning policies, and seeing if a target is reasonable if assessed against these.
- **STEP 3** – Creating the Local Plan which goes for public inspection and finally referendum.

Mr Chipp stated that Step 1 is where EFDC are currently at. He stated that as all Regional Spatial Strategies have been revoked, local planning authorities have a duty to co-operate with its neighbouring authorities to establish if they have an unmet housing need, and assess if this can be absorbed by them, taking into account any infrastructure needs (school, transport, etc).

*[Chris Whitbread, Leader of the Council, arrived]*

With reference to **STEP 1** Mr Chipp stated:

**Demographics** - EFDC have appointed Edge Analytics to complete a more detailed study of the factors which go into producing an objectively assessed housing need figure, and the work undertaken to date (works are still ongoing) seem to suggest a housing figure of around 7,000-10,000. This has not been agreed, but is simply what the evidence presented to date is suggesting.

**Housing** - The Housing Market Assessment report (which included other areas such as Harlow and Broxbourne) looks at the different types of houses, the affordability need of the district, past delivery rates, etc., however this document is based on the 2001 census. This document will be updated to reflect the 2011 census figures.

**Economic** – Looks at employment statistics and types of jobs, as some jobs add more value. In the Epping Forest district there is a very high commuting ratio, and as such the number of jobs is moderated by the number commuting.

Mr Chipp stated that the number of houses forecast will need to tie in with any economic forecast.

With reference to **STEP 2**, Mr Chipp stated this would be when the District would measure any of its targets and forecasts against the National Planning Policy Framework and any local policies. EFDC will look at issues such as the capacity in the district (environmental, infrastructure, etc) and assess if this imposes any limits, the viability of any sites (however this tends not to be a problem in this district as the land value is so high), if there are any physical constraints, etc.

Mr Chip stated that due to recent changes, the housing waiting list has been reduced by half.

Mr Chipp stated that he is aware of some wild numbers that have been quoted in terms of targets and the number of properties that already have planning permission. He confirmed that in the plan period, there are 1206 homes with planning permission, 419 of which have already been built. Approximately 800 have permission but are not yet built. This number can be included in the eventual housing target. Mr Chipp also stated that he had heard rumours that 46,000 houses was the target for this district, however stated this was completely false.

Mr Chipp then moved on to what this meant for North Weald. As landowners, EFDC commissioned Drivers Jonas Deloitte to complete a review of the Airfield to assess what options EFDC had in terms of being the land owner of the airfield. This report went to Council. There were three options; aviation intensification, mix use and pure development. Each of these options was measured against technical feasibility, community value, risk, financial viability, and market interest. The Council decided on the mixed use option. The next step is to produce a master plan for the area, as all that has been agreed so far is that EFDC have, as land owners, stated they would like mixed development on the airfield. Planning consultants are about to be appointed to complete this master plan, which will address issues such as infrastructure, transport, other land in the area, and an overall plan for the settlement of North Weald. Mr Chipp stated that one thing is very clear and that is that the Airfield is within greenbelt, and any new housing on the airfield would mean that piece of land would need to be taken out of the greenbelt. EFDC want to identify sustainable green belt boundaries that will remain in place for the duration of the Local Plan period without any creeping of boundaries taking place. The master plan

will also look at any constraints in the area such as the Redoubt. All areas of land in North Weald will be looked at.

Cllr Collins asked if Mr Chipp was stating that the master plan will look at other areas in North Weald, not just the airfield, to which Mr Chipp stated that it will look at the context of the settlement of North Weald as a whole. Mr Chipp stated that the reason behind this is that if the airfield is developed, there would be impacts on other pieces of land, and this impact should be assessed. For example, you would need a Junction 7A of the M11, and the master plan would assess all these factors. Mr Chips stated that despite a public facebook campaign, he can confirm that no allocations in terms of land for development have been made as yet, and that this included the airfield. The Drivers Joan Deloitte report is not a decision to develop.

Cllr Blanks asked if EFDC have ruled out any development at this stage. Mr Chipp stated that EFDC have been looking at the settlement reviews, and it is clear that some 'red blobs' have obvious constraints; however the process to assess all of these sites is at the preferred options stage. It will be the decision of Members to decide a housing target and where these houses will go. EFDC are looking to protect the district against unwanted development, and the important thing is to get a housing figure which is supported by the evidence base. If this doesn't happen, the local plan is likely to be found unsound, and the district will be open to predatory developers. It is true that if EFDC can identify 5 years worth of land supply, the local plan may well be passed, however EFDC want to plan for the entire plan period. Piecemeal development should be avoided, and this process will support that.

Mr Chipp stated there are also a number of myths surrounding the proposed Latton Priory development. It should be noted that this site is in the green belt too. Mr Chipp stated there is a very active developer on this site who has completed all sorts of consultations. EFDC have met with the developers, and have informed them of the planning contract, and that at present their development does not show any very special circumstances which would permit development in the green belt, however this site would be evaluated at the same time as the others at the preferred options stage. In terms of the question 'would this count towards the allocation of houses for North Weald', this is something that would be assessed at the preferred options stage. Mr Chipp stated that it is not the intention of EFDC to build mini towns, but to ensure any development is sustainable.

The question was raised 'what are ECC and EFDC doing currently in terms of Latton Priory?' Mr Chipp stated that this currently has nothing to do with ECC, as EFDC are the planning authority for this areas, however ECC would have an input in terms of assessing infrastructure requirements. EFDC will have a site visit. Mr Chipp stated that it was his personal view, and not necessarily the view of the Council that the developer is looking for a particularly high number of houses on this site, and that development going over the ridge would be inappropriate.

Mr Chipp stated that historically, EFDC has had a pretty good record in terms of planning development, and it is essential the district accommodates any objectively

assessed housing need. The district needs to ensure there are places for the children going forwards, for them to live and work. Mr Chipp invited questions from Councillors.

Cllr Collins asked if EFDC have a deadline by which time this needs to be completed. Mr Chipp stated that ideally they would like to be further down the line than they are, however there is no set time. What is vitally important is that it is done correctly in order to prevent any predatory development. Mr Chipp stated that providing we have a five year land supply, technically this is sufficient, and looking at development and land supply historically for the district, we are fine, however there is a case going through the high court at the moment which is suggesting planning authorities shouldn't be looking at historic figures, but looking at future needs. Mr Chipp stated that nobody wants mass development, however as the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of development, EFDC must ensure they get it correct first time.

Cllr Stellan asked with reference to the Redoubt which Mr Chipp mentioned earlier, and the fact there were comments regarding this in the Issues and Options consultation – with reference to sites which have been withdrawn, Cllr Stellan presumes they will not be included in the preferred option stage, plus he is aware that potential sites are still coming forward and wondered what the format was for public testing of these sites as he was aware that part of the evidence base is what the public have said. In addition, Cllr Stellan stated that many people are concerned that the Latton Priory development if it were approved, would end up being Church Langley part 2, and that the District would build the houses, then Harlow would go for a boundary review – how sure are EFDC that this wouldn't happen. Cllr Stellan also stated for the record that he has not attended any of the presentations or consultation events regarding the proposed Latton Priory development. Mr Chipp responded stating that if you look at a map of Harlow, the Epping Forest district surrounds it on 3 sides. Harlow has very severe constraints, so it would be inevitable they would look for a boundary review, but any houses built would count to our objectively assessed need. Mr Chipp stated he was sure part of the mix of housing will include some development around the edge of Harlow, but that he didn't necessarily see this as a bad thing, however all the sites would need to be looked at.

Cllr Eldridge stated that he feared for Hastingwood residents in that Hastingwood would join up with Harlow. Mr Chipp stated that the main purpose of green belt is to stop that, and one of the main reasons for the district looking at the distributed development option would be to minimize issues such as this. It is a difficult and politically sensitive mix.

Cllr Blanks said that he was sure Mr Chipp was aware of the obvious bias within various parishes and towns in the district, and that this was evident in the issues and options summary document which clearly stated people from Chigwell want any new housing to go onto North Weald Airfield (quoting page 79 of the summary) – how are EFDC handling this. Mr Chipp stated it depends on your point of view, however there have been comments made in public referencing not “carpet bombing North

Weald". It seems right for the district that everybody should take their fair share. Cllr Blanks stated that simply means you need to define what a fair share is. Mr Chipp stated that this is what the Issues and Options consultation was about. We've listened to what the people had to say, and there was a lot of public feedback. Mr Chipp stated that at the end of the day, the District does need to have a distribution which meets the defined target.

Cllr Godwin-Brown stated that the government figures suggest 16,000 houses and Edge Analytics suggesting 7,000. Cllr Godwin-Brown expressed her deep concern at the migration from London to the District, and asked if these figures were for local people or included migration. Mr Chipp stated that both local growth and migration need to be factored into the final housing figure. Migration is applicable across the whole country. You have births and deaths, and net migration (excess of people moving in compared to people moving out). The District cannot simply pull a draw-bridge in. Mr Chipp stated that each year the Government projects what the growth has been between that particular time and the latest census, and historically they have consistently overestimated their figures. With the help of Edge Analytics, the figures have been reduced. Cllr Godwin-Brown asked how the infrastructure in the district will deal with this influx of people, citing Epping station as an example. Mr Chipp stated that the plan period is 22 years, so this will not all happen at once. He understood Cllr Godwin-Brown's concerns, however emphasised the need for having a robust and sound plan which will allow these types of issues to be considered and planned for. In terms of infrastructure, a Junction 7a would be a good solution towards the end of the plan period. Mr Chipp stated that EFDC were approaching local enterprise partnerships asking how they are going to help fund the new junction.

Cllr Clegg stated that the main issue is specifics in terms of numbers, and asked when numbers will be agreed, to which Mr Chipp stated it would be in the next 12 months. Cllr Clegg stated that he is approached on a regular basis regarding different numbers and figures that have been quoted, and stated that as soon as the figures are set, this issue will stop. Mr Chipp agreed.

Cllr Whitbread stated that the Epping Forest district will end up having a lot less in terms of numbers than other areas in the country. For example, Cambridge has a target of approx 14,000 houses. This confirmed that EFDC have done the right thing by taking their time and doing all the extra research.

Cllr Bedford asked why solutions are always thought about in terms of roadways or motorways, and suggested people should think outside the box. Mr Chipp stated that Harlow have some ongoing work with their local roads to try and relieve pressure, but that Epping Forest are in a Local Enterprise Partnership which is the size of Belgium (includes Sussex, Kent and Essex) and that we will need to fight to get our share of the infrastructure. If the district doesn't need high levels of housing, the infrastructure requirements (and thus funding) will be much less. Cllr Bedford asked if there was any integrated thinking surrounding what the Major of London wants to do in terms of airports. Mr Chipp stated that EFDC are speaking with London

Underground regarding their current capacity following recent improvement works. In addition, he stated there is a real debate regarding Heathrow and a new 4 runway hub airport.

Cllr Stellan summarised, stating that the call-in regarding the Airfield decision delayed the local plan process, and that Councillors may continue to bring up the same issues over and over again, so it is essential the process is followed correctly. Cllr Whitbread stated that EFDC are building their evidence base in the correct way, and they would rather get the plan right, than it be thrown out at a considerable cost to the district and its residents.

The Chairman thanked Mr Chipp, Cllr Whitbread and Sarah King for taking the time to meet with the Planning Committee to update them on the Local Plan process.

*[Mr Chipp, Cllr Whitbread and Sarah King left]*

Cllr Clegg proposed that a letter of thanks be sent to all parties thanking them for their time. Cllr Stellan proposed that the source of the incorrect figures should be contacted and informed of these incorrect figures.

### P13.084 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following applications were considered by Members:-

No	Application Number	Location	Proposal
1	EPF/2152/13 <i>Lindsey Trevillian</i>	45 Weald Bridge Road North Weald <i>Mr Anthony Barrington</i>	Single storey side extension and loft conversion with dormer windows. (Revised application to EPF/1578/13.)
No Objection			
2	EPF/1987/13 <i>Lindsay Trevillian</i>	43 Hampden Close North Weald <i>Mr Tony Jennings</i>	Proposed conversion of carport to garage
No Objection			
3	EPF/2158/13 <i>Dominic Duffin</i>	Tree Tops Upland Road Thornwood <i>Mr Richard Kiro Singh</i>	Front, rear and side dormers to existing loft space
No Objection			

### P13.085 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR NOTING

	Application Number	Location	Proposal
(i)	EPF/2180/13 DRC Graham Courtney	Cross Keys Cafe High Road Thornwood	Application for approval of details reserved by condition 12 'Phase II Report' of planning permission EPF/0492/12. (Demolition of existing cafe and outbuildings to be replaced by 2 x five bedroom houses. Conversion of original Public House (Approved restaurant under EPF/0530/07) into four bedroom house and removal of single storey rear and side

			extensions. Amended application to include two double garages and 1 carport, and additional bedroom to rear of 2 new houses) APPROVAL OF DETAILS OF CONDITIONS Condition 12 – Phase II report regarding land contamination
(ii)	EPF/2199/13 CLD Lindsey Trevillian	White Gables Weald Bridge Road North Weald Bassett	Certificate of lawful development for proposed loft conversion

CLlr Stallan reported that the issue of CLDs was raised at District last week, in that Town and Parish Councils may have evidence which would either support or be contrary to any CLD applications, and there may be a move to change this process.

### P13.086 DECISIONS BY EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Members *NOTED* the following:-

- a) **Applications on which the Parish Council had no objections where permission has been *GRANTED*.**  
EPF/1602/13 – 24 Tempest Mead, North Weald  
EPF/1536/13 – 1 Beamish Close, North Weald  
EPF/1525/13 – 70 Tempest Mead, North Weald  
EPF/1162/13 – Threshers, Hastingwood Road, Hastingwood
- b) **Applications on which the Parish Council had no objections where permission has been *REFUSED*.** None received.
- c) **Applications on which the Parish Council raised comments/objections where permission has been GRANTED.**  
EPF/1630/13 – Upper Clapton Rugby Football Club, Upland Road,
- d) **Applications on which the Parish Council had objections (and/or raised comments) where permission has been REFUSED.**  
EPF/0877/13 – Marlow, High Road, Thornwood  
EPF/0868/13 – Marlow, High Road, Thornwood
- e) **Certificate of Lawful Development**  
EPF/1795/13 CLD – 178 Queens Road, North Weald

### P13.087 PLANNING CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk has received the following notifications:-

**Amended Plans/Application/Description**

**Address: Weald Place Farm, 9 Duck Lane, Thornwood, North Weald, Essex  
CM16 6NE**

**Proposal: Provision of hardstanding for agricultural vehicles and machinery,  
Construction of farm access track and re-contouring of land**

Councillors found it very confusing that this alteration / revision had not been included in the weekly list and had been dealt with in a different manner by EFDC. Councillors felt it was not clear if it was a consultation or not, and could not understand what the revision was. The Clerk stated that after having reviewed the application, it seems that the revision was the submission of new statements and loading tickets. Councillors **AGREED** that these revision did not change their objection, and agreed to object on the original grounds. It was also **AGREED** to contact EFDC and ascertain why this application was dealt with in a different manner.

**Meeting closed 20.30**

Signed .....

Date .....