

The Epping Society

Planning review process and general policies

Catchment area

This is bordered in the East by the M11 and South by the M25. To the West and North it will follow an ark towards but not including Epping Green. We propose the focus of our attention with be Epping, Coopersale and Thornwood but for major development proposals or when asked for our support by local associations or residents we would be prepared to consider the entire district

Web site – planning content

Communication with members

We will continue to develop our online and digital communications methods in the interests of economy and speed.

Issues surrounding my planning reports – distribution

The standard method for handling cases will be for the committee member responsible for planning to review them according to our list of policies and using his their initiative. The intention is to avoid spending much time on cases we would not resist or enthusiastically endorse.

The committee will review the reports and only debate any contentious ones or where new or serious issues have been raised.

These reports are private to the committee but particular cases may be discussed with members (and may, of course, be raised by them).

Epping Society's planning criteria

No.	Issue
	High level policy matters
1	Consultation on major planning proposals must be well advertised and long enough to ensure full public engagement. Better and innovative methods of communication must inform the public whose district this is.
2	Current issues of high importance include: St John's Road site, North Weald Airfield, Latton Priory and the Local plan
3	The population growth forecasts used by EFDC as the basis for their local plan must be reviewed as we believe it to be excessive.
4	General design guidelines should be used, especially for large developments (certainly the St Johns Road site) and for prominent or sensitive areas such as conservation areas and High Streets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality architectural design – establish a residents panel to advise the council on specific planning applications • Sympathetic scale, design and materials to traditional Epping structures – need to avoid excessive density • Protect historic buildings and those of established merit and familiarity (such as Epping centre as well as cottages nearby)
5	Long term planning must be improved. For instance, the opportunity to transfer existing sports provision economically to the new St Johns School was missed and new schools have been built with too little capacity.
6	Accurate traffic flow forecasts and infrastructure resources must be better understood before large scale development is permitted. Without funded expansion of infrastructure, high levels of additional development should not proceed.
7	The market belongs in the High Street.
8	Full library facilities should be maintained in central Epping
9	We encourage the Town Council to develop a neighbourhood plan. We suggest they could borrow the outline of a policy from another council in the South East and modify to local conditions.

No.	Issue
	Specific local planning policies
10	We will not support development outside the current criteria within existing Green Belt boundaries
11	When judging retail development proposals their likely impact on the existing High Street is vitally important, rather than the speculative viability of possible new shops
12	Conservation area policy (and a policy for the High Street) should seek to maintain a market town style of shop front. This should address architectural styles, window and door design, display, advertising and illuminated signs inside windows, illuminated displays outside, use of music or pa inside premises. We do seek a regimented style but we believe traditional shop fronts create a character which is attractive to shoppers which plate glass and bright unfamiliar colours do not.
13	Density policies for residential premises should be adopted including plot ratio of footprint and floor area, reserved space for vehicle parking not to be diminished, minimum outside amenity area to depend on bedrooms, floor area, house/flat
14	We will resist overbearing additions which are harmful to amenity of neighbouring properties and which tend to establish a terrace-like street scene where now there is clear separation between buildings.
15	Areas which show a particular design scale or style should be considered for protection. These include Orchards and Theydon Grove which we believe should be subject to a higher level of protection for its distinctive character and scale and period interest.
	Trees and footpaths
16	We support the protection of trees, especially native varieties. We resist thinning which is not in the best interests of the health and longevity of the tree.
17	We will encourage the maintenance of public footpaths which are an important and low cost recreational resource of historic importance.
18	We believe the appearance of roads and pavements form an important part of the local amenity and should be planned and maintained accordingly
	Proposals for new initiatives
19	We will submit proposals for listing additional sites or objects, including: for 1930s' lamp posts and other significant architectural or street furniture; Half Moon; flats behind the war memorial (?); what else I don't think anything can be done to save the Half Moon (Charlie has asked Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings for advice.)
20	We wish to see traditional white finger signs replaced where they have been removed in the last decade or so. Where this is not possible and in addition we seek finger signs as in Loughton to direct the hoped-for increase in visitors to the High Street, forest, station etc. Larger numbers of cyclists, walkers and joggers show there is an interest in the district and signs might encourage them to visit the High Street.