

# EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE WEST MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday 21 February 2024, 7.00 pm - 8.33 pm

Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

**Members Present:** Councillors S Heather (Chairman), D Stocker (Vice-Chairman), A Green, H Kane, S Kane, J Lea, M Markham, T Matthews, J Parsons, C Whitbread and S Yerrell

**Apologies:** Councillors R Bassett, J Lucas and R Pugsley

**Officers In Attendance:** G Courtney (Service Manager (Planning Development)), N Cole (Corporate Communications Officer) and V Messenger (Democratic Services Officer)

**Officers In Attendance (Virtually):** M Picking (Democracy & Elections Apprentice) and M Rahman (Planning Officer)

## [A RECORDING OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR REPEATED VIEWING](#)

### 37 WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman made a short address to remind all present that the meeting would be broadcast on the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings. The Sub-Committee noted the Council's Protocol for Webcasting of Council and Other Meetings.

### 38 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed members of the public to the meeting and outlined the procedures and arrangements agreed by the Council, to enable persons to address the Sub-Committee in relation to the determination of applications for planning permission.

### 39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- a) Pursuant to the Council's Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor S Heather declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item of the agenda by virtue of being a member of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. The Councillor had determined that he would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the application and as a voting Chairman thereon:
- EPF/2601/22 – Land to the South & East of the former Chimes Garden Centre, Nazeing, Waltham Abbey EN10 6RJ
- b) Pursuant to the Council's Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor C Whitbread declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item of the agenda as a former County Deputy Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and currently the County Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Corporate Affairs. The Councillor had determined that he would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the application and voting thereon:
- EPF/2601/22 – Land to the South & East of the former Chimes Garden Centre, Nazeing, Waltham Abbey EN10 6RJ

**40 MINUTES****RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the Sub-Committee held on 15 November 2023 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**41 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was reported that there was no urgent business for consideration at the meeting.

**42 SITE VISITS**

There were no formal site visits requested by the Sub-Committee.

**43 EPF/2601/22 LAND TO THE SOUTH & EAST OF THE FORMER CHIMES GARDEN CENTRE, NAZEING, WALTHAM ABBEY EN10 6RJ**

The Planning Officer presentation provided an update on the application and clarified that two of the original recommended reasons for refusal from the November 2023 Committee Report were no longer being suggested by officers.

Discussion took place around the need for the development, impact on the Green Belt, and where the financial contributions should be put towards. The level of affordable housing provision (or contribution in lieu of) was discussed, as was potential flood risk, and the designation/quality of the Green Belt land.

It was made known to Members that if planning approval was recommended then this application would have to be presented to the District Development Management Committee (DDMC) for a decision since this would be contrary to policy. Councillor C Whitbread put forward some suggestions/questions for DDMC, which were:

1. That members might benefit from a site visit before the DDMC meeting;
2. That there had to be consistency in planning, which could at times be difficult to achieve;
3. Questions must be asked as to whether the level of contributions was right;
4. There should be certainty on the affordable housing provision;
5. The Council needed to ensure that there was good community gain; and
6. Consideration must be given as to whether this would open up opportunities for other similar greenfield sites to be developed.

A vote was taken to refuse consent as per the officer's recommendation, which was not upheld.

No motion was advanced to approve planning consent.

Four Members then referred the item up to DDMC under a Minority Reference.

Decision: The application was [referred to DDMC](#) with no recommendation from the Area Planning Sub-Committee West and a recommendation to refuse planning consent from the officer.

**44 EPF/2844/22 NETHER KIDDERS FARM, LAUNDRY LANE, NAZEING, WALTHAM ABBEY EN9 2DY**

Members discussed the merits of the scheme and concerns around the existing site and surrounding area.

Following the debate, a vote was taken on the officer's recommendation to refuse planning consent but was not upheld. A motion was proposed and seconded by Members to recommend approval since the proposal would result in an enhancement of the environment, an improvement to landscaping, and would be providing homes.

Members delegated conditions to officers but clarified that they wished to see a condition removing permitted development rights (particularly for outbuildings) and a condition regarding the removal of the existing menage. The vote was carried to approve the application, subject to conditions and a S106 Legal Agreement.

Decision: The application was [approved with conditions \(subject to S106 Legal Agreement\)](#).

**45 EPF/2106/23 HANNAH NURSERY, SEWARDSTONE ROAD, WALTHAM ABBEY E4 7RG**

Decision: The application for advertisement consent was [approved with conditions](#).

**46 EPF/2179/23 BLACK SWAN PH, COMMON ROAD, WALTHAM ABBEY EN9 2DF**

The impact on the listed building and landscaping was debated, with clear opinions being given as to the quality and merit of the proposal and overall scheme.

The vote was not upheld to refuse planning consent as per the officer's recommendation. A motion was proposed and seconded by Members to approve consent, based on the opinion that this would not be detrimental to the setting of the Listed Building or the character and appearance of the wider area. Members voted in favour of approving planning consent.

Decision: The application was [approved with conditions](#).

**CHAIRMAN**