



Epping Forest District Council



Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Application Number:	EPF/0817/22
Site Name:	Land Off, Honey Lane Waltham Abbey, EN9 3AY

Contains Ordnance Survey Data. © Crown Copyright 2013
EFDC License No: 100018534

Contains Royal Mail Data. © Royal Mail Copyright & Database Right 2013

OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: EPF/0817/22
Application Type: Full planning permission
Applicant: Mr Ray Tod
Case Officer: James Rogers
Site Address: Land Off
Honey Lane
Waltham Abbey
EN9 3AY

Proposal: Application for a mixed use development, comprising of a 75 bed care home, doctor's surgery, dental surgery & x6 no. affordable residential units.

Ward: Waltham Abbey Honey Lane
Parish: Waltham Abbey
View Plans: <https://eppingforestdcpr.force.com/pr/s/planning-application/a0h8d000000Nyzi>
Recommendation: Refuse

This application is before this Committee since it has been 'called in' by Councillor Sam Kane (Pursuant to The Constitution Part 3: Part Three: Scheme of Delegation to Officers from Full Council).

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located on the southern side of Honey Lane, on the eastern edge of Waltham Abbey. It is currently an undeveloped field within the Green Belt, approximately 400m northwest of junction 26 of the M25 and 1.3 miles from the centre of Waltham Abbey.

There are a number of protected trees on the northern boundary of the site and other trees and vegetation throughout. The result of this is a verdant and open site when viewed from Honey Lane.

Proposal

Application for a mixed use development, comprising of a 75 bed care home, doctor's surgery, dental surgery, 6 affordable dwellings and a new access.

Relevant Planning History

EPF/2124/16 – Proposed erection of 90 bed care home – Refused for the following reasons:

1. The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the proposal constitutes inappropriate development that is harmful to the Green Belt. Whilst the benefits of providing care accommodation to meet local needs is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the development it is not considered that this, or the other material considerations, are sufficient enough to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Therefore no very special circumstances exist and the application is contrary to the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CP2 and GB2A of the adopted Local Plan and Alterations.
2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development can be achieved without unacceptable loss or damage to existing landscaping on the site, contrary to the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and policy LL10 of the adopted Local Plan and Alterations.

Development Plan Context

Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011- 2033

The Local Plan (2011-2033) has now been formally adopted by the Council and therefore has full weight when considering planning applications. The following policies are relevant:

SP2	Spatial Development Strategy 2011-2033
T1	Sustainable Transport Choices
DM2	Epping Forest SAC and the Lee Valley SPA
DM3	Landscape Character, Ancient Landscapes and Geodiversity
DM4	Green Belt
DM5	Green and Blue Infrastructure
DM7	Heritage Assets
DM9	High Quality Design
DM10	Housing Design and Quality
DM15	Managing and Reducing Flood Risk
DM16	Sustainable Drainage Systems
DM19	Sustainable Water Use
DM20	Low Carbon and Renewable Energy
DM21	Local Environmental Impacts, Pollution and Land Contamination
DM22	Air Quality

National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (“The Framework”)

The Framework is a material consideration in determining planning applications. As with its predecessor, the presumption in favour of sustainable development remains at the heart of the Framework. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states that for determining planning applications this means either;

- a) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- b) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - i. the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making, but policies within the development plan need to be considered and applied in terms of their degree of consistency with the Framework.

In addition to paragraph 11, the following paragraphs of the Framework are of relevance to this application:

Paragraphs	126 & 130
Paragraphs	137, 147 - 150
Paragraph	180
Paragraphs	189, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 207 & 208

Summary of Representations

Waltham Abbey Town Council – **Objection**

“The committee recognises that this is a revised application and ultimately a smaller care home than previously designed, however, there is still significant concern over the size and scale of the development and its impact on the green belt. The committee feels that the inclusion of the extra units aside from the home itself overdevelop this green belt site. There are also concerns that the levels of parking are not sufficient for all users of this development. There has been an objection from a resident noting a number of issues with the proposed development.”

18 Neighbour objections received, summarised as:

- Significant undue harm to the Green Belt
- The need for the development has not been demonstrated
- The site is not allocated in the Local Plan
- Proposal is completely out of character with the area
- There will be significant increased traffic

Planning Considerations

The report will now consider the application against the requirements of the Development Plan and the adopted Local Plan.

The Green Belt

The Framework identifies that the Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The fundamental characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and its permanence, or in other words, it is characterised by an absence of development.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Government requires the decision maker to ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The adopted Local Plan echoes the position of the NPPF and both identify that certain forms of development are not considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt.

In this case it is clear that the proposal does not fall into any identified exception and is therefore inappropriate development. In addition, given its significant size and scale it will cause considerable harm to the visual openness of the Green Belt. The proposal will cause a significant urbanising effect, due to the buildings themselves, the swathes of hardstanding, large areas of car parking and the significant increase in residential paraphernalia and domestic activity in and around the proposed new dwellings. The proposal conflicts with the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt of keeping land permanently open and will result in substantial urban sprawl. In accordance with the requirements of the Framework, this harm must be afforded substantial weight against the proposal. Very special circumstances are required to clearly outweigh these and any other harm, and these are considered in the planning balance and conclusion section of this report.

Impact on the surrounding area

The existing site is an open field directly adjacent to existing houses on the southern side of Honey Lane and marks the end point of development on this side of the road. Opposite, the town continues with housing and other types of development in a continuous row until it stops with the Marriot Hotel located on the northern roundabout of the M25. The absence of development on the southern side of Honey Lane marks a significant area of green space between Waltham Abbey and the M25 motorway.

The proposed development is significant, both in terms of its scale and also the level of activity it would generate. Essentially it can be categorised as three separate forms of development across the full extent of the site: the proposed care home, the doctors surgery/dentist, and the six affordable housing units. Given the context of the site, which is on the outskirts of one of the largest urban areas in the District and which has a rather substantial amount of development opposite, the notion of new development on the site would not, in principle, appear out of place.

Dealing with each detailed design in turn, the proposed care home is a large three and a half storey building which would provide 75 places for new residents. It is well set back from Honey Lane and therefore whilst large in scale it would not serve to dominate the frontage, particularly given the quite robust landscaping that already exists adjacent to the road. In terms of its detailed design, it is a conventional albeit unremarkable style of care home and given that it will not be overtly visible from public view it would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would be important however for the building to use high quality materials to ensure a good finish and this could be secured through condition.

Similarly, the building for the doctors/dentists surgery is well set back from Honey Lane and therefore would not appear overly prominent from the road, despite the fact that it too would be a large building in the area. The detailed design has some conventional elements with hipped and gabled roof profiles but also has a rather awkward ridge and eaves profile with differing levels, giving the building a disjointed appearance. Whilst far from ideal, on balance the proposed architectural design would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area given its set back from the road. Similarly to the proposed care home, high quality materials will be required for the design to appear successful and this can be ensured through condition.

Turning to the proposed dwellings, a conventional residential design has been chosen with traditional hipped and gabled roof profiles, of which there are many in Waltham Abbey. The proposal has a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings which will give a little architectural interest as opposed to an identical row of houses. Proposed new dwellings of this design would clearly not be harmful in the context of an existing town. Subject to a condition requiring high quality materials, there will not be harm caused to the character and appearance of the area.

Whilst the proposal would result in significant change to what is essentially an open field at present, in the context of the site, directly adjacent and also opposite to substantial development in Waltham Abbey it is concluded that the proposal would not cause harm or appear out of place to the character or appearance of the area.

Tree and landscaping issues

The EFDLP requires that new development must, amongst other things, ensure that there will not be direct, indirect or cumulative harm to the existing landscape character of an area and proposals must retain and where possible enhance existing provision. In this case, the Tree and Landscape Team have objected to the application, summarising that:

Our records show that on the site boundary nearest to Honey Lane there are two veteran trees (also subject to a TPO)....Trees and their surroundings are nationally recognised as irreplaceable habitats and need to be afforded greater protective areas than non-veteran trees because they can be harmed by even small changes within their rooting areas.

The current proposal includes siting a corner of the care home building within the recommended buffer zone around one of the veteran trees (T13 on TPP) and a 'No Dig' system within the rooting area of the other (T2 on TPP). Given that the trees are currently growing in an open field environment, the alteration of their rooting area & surrounds is unacceptable. It is not just the actual tree that requires protection, but the whole soil structure and rooting environment of the tree. The buffer zone around these trees, as prescribed by Government Standing Advice, needs to remain as field.

Additionally, the submitted Arboricultural Report does not note that these trees have veteran status, so the Arb Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are all based on the standard calculations and methodology within British Standard BS5837:2012. This gives insufficient consideration & protection to the veteran trees and their environment.

As a result it is clear that the proposal does not demonstrate that there would not be harm caused to the existing landscape assets towards the front end of the site, in direct conflict with policy DM5 of the EFDLP.

Living conditions of neighbours and standard of accommodation proposed

The proposed new houses will have their gardens facing westwards, towards some existing dwellings known collectively as "Cobmead". The two most northerly proposed dwellings would back onto the rear garden of no.176 Honey Lane, however, leaves a significant distance to the boundary and therefore would not cause excessive overlooking.

The remaining dwellings to the south will back onto either the side elevations of existing houses or parking areas and therefore will not cause significant overlooking.

Highway and parking

The Essex County Council highway engineer has commented that:

The Highway Authority has considered the above planning application, visited the site and thoroughly assessed the submitted transport information and has concluded that the proposal is not contrary to National/Local highways and transportation policy and current safety criteria.

The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA), that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, in terms of safety and capacity, that the vehicular impact of the proposed development will be minimal on the highway in the vicinity of the site and on the wider highway network.

The proposed access has suitable geometry and visibility for the speed of the road. Furthermore, the proposed pedestrian facilities and access arrangements have not raised any issues within the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

The applicant has also demonstrated that suitable turning for all vehicles is available on-site and all vehicles will be able to egress from the site in a forward gear. Furthermore, a Car Park Accumulation Assessment has been undertaken that demonstrates that the proposed parking provision should be able to cope with the demand.

Consequently, the Highway Authority has concluded that the proposal will not be detrimental to highway safety, capacity or efficiency at this location or on the wider highway network.

Land Drainage

The Land Drainage Team consider that the proposal is acceptable subject to planning conditions to ensure that there is a sustainable drainage strategy in place in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

Land Contamination

1940-1970 historic photographs show small buildings, disturbed ground & imported soils present along the Northern & North eastern boundary, 1990 photograph shows the onsite disposal of additional soils during construction of the offsite car park to the East, 2001-2004 photographs show a track created

across the top of the site and down the Western side of the site between these dates, and more recent photography shows that made ground has been spread across the site following construction of the 4 dwellings on the former car park to the East.

It is reported that ground gas mitigation measures suitable for Characteristic Situation 2 are to be installed in lieu of additional ground gas monitoring (only a single round of gas monitoring reported to have been previously undertaken) in order to remove the accumulation and inhalation risks to occupiers pathway, which is acceptable provided that a verified proprietary gas membrane with a Gas Protection Score of 2 is used in addition to a very well ventilated beam & block floor void (the use of 1200g or 2000g polythene membranes is no longer acceptable).

Apart from ground gases, the submitted report has not mentioned any specific contaminants associated with former potentially contaminating uses (e.g. Made Ground: *asbestos, PAH, metals & inorganics* or the Electric Substation: *Petroleum Hydrocarbons & PCBs*) and the Qualitative Risk Assessment presented in Table C5 has not been carried out in accordance with the Classification of Severity criteria presented in Table C3 which classifies short term acute potential exposure risks as Severe (e.g. inhalation of asbestos fibres and explosive/asphyxiant accumulation/inhalation ground gas risks) and chronic exposure risks as Moderate (e.g. Lead and Benzo(a)pyrene) which if there is considered to be a Low Likelihood of an event occurring, would result in a Moderate risk for exposure to asbestos and a Low/Moderate risk with respect to other made ground potential contaminants (PAH, Metals & Inorganics) and organic contaminants (PCBs & petroleum hydrocarbons) which would require further investigation.

Provided that a detailed list of potential pollutant linkages is submitted with the required Phase 2 investigation protocol, it should not be necessary for a Phase 1 condition to be added to any approval granted.

The Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation

Biodiversity features within, or associated with, a Special Area of Conservation are given the highest level of protection under UK law, and national planning policy in England. The provisions of the EU Habitats Directive are given effect in UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, as amended ("the Habitats Regulations").

Under the Habitats Regulations, the EFSAC is classified as a 'European Site' and, as such, any plans and projects (including applications for planning permission) that are likely, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, to have a significant effect on the EFSAC must be subject to an assessment, known as an Appropriate Assessment ("AA"). The purpose of an AA is to ascertain whether any plan or proposal, either alone or in combination, will have an adverse effect the integrity of the European Site.

The Council has a legal duty as the 'competent authority' under the Habitats Regulations (2017) to protect the EFSAC from the effects of development (both individually and in combination) having regard to the representations of Natural England ("NE").

The EFDLP was supported by a Habitats Regulations Assessment dated June 2021 ("the HRA 2021"). Two specific 'pathways of impact' relating to new development within the District were identified as being likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the EFSAC. Firstly, an 'urbanisation' pathway of impact primarily as a result of increased levels of visitors using the EFSAC for recreation arising from new residential development (referred to as "recreational pressure"). Secondly, damage to the health of the protected habitats and species of flora within the EFSAC from an atmospheric pollution 'pathway of impact' (referred to as "air quality") caused primarily by motor vehicles using roads within 200m of it. The HRA 2021 undertook an Appropriate Assessment of the planned development allocated within the EFDLP, including the effect of that development on the EFSAC. The HRA 2021 concluded that, subject to securing urbanisation/recreational pressure and air quality mitigation measures the growth of EFDLP will have no adverse effect on the EFSAC.

Recreational pressure

With regards to recreational pressure, the site is located within the 6.2km zone of influence to the EFSAC and as such new occupants of the development have the potential to use it for recreational

purposes, which as noted above has the potential to cause it irreversible harm. However the Council does have a recreation strategy to mitigate against such potential adverse effects. The strategy includes various mitigation measures, including a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (“SAMM strategy”). The measures identified require financial contributions from new residential development in the order of £343.02 per dwelling which in this case would include the 75 new care places. This is of course dependent on an appropriate method to deliver such financial contributions, which can only be through either a S106 legal agreement or a unilateral undertaking on behalf of the applicant and both are dependent on planning permission being granted.

Air Quality

The HRA 2021 advises that without appropriate mitigation measures, new development proposed in the District would cause harm to the integrity of the EFSAC as a result of atmospheric pollution. A key contributor to atmospheric pollution arises from vehicles using roads in close proximity (i.e. within 200m of the EFSAC).

The strategic solution to the potential adverse effects caused by the increased level of traffic is the Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy (“The APMS”). The APMS identifies a number of mitigation measures, a number of which are required to be delivered as part of individual planning applications alongside strategic initiatives and monitoring requirements, the implementation of which will require a financial contribution to be secured from individual developments.

The evidence base that has been developed to inform the APMS has taken into account Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) that would arise from proposed allocations in the EFDLP. The use of AADT is the appropriate method for understanding the effects of atmospheric pollution on both human and ecological health. The APMS therefore provides the mechanism by which the competent authority can arrive at a conclusion of no adverse effect on the EFSAC as a result of planned development. In this case, the proposal has not been allocated in the EFDLP and so cannot simply rely on the APMS for its mitigation. Rather, it will need to deliver its own bespoke package of mitigation measures. These measures have been set out by the Council’s transport consultants who have concluded no adverse effect on the EFSAC subject to the following:

- EFDC HRA contribution per household;
- Resident Welcome Packs to include Travel Packs that identify the active travel and public transport facilities and services;
- All in curtilage residential car parking spaces to include EV charging provision;
- Staff Travel Plans to be prepared and submitted for approval and managed thereafter for by the operators of the GP and Dental surgeries and the Care Home provider; and
- 30% of all non-residential car parking spaces to include EV charging provision, with the ability to extend this provision to all parking spaces.

These measures can all be secured by either conditions or legal agreements and as such, subject to their delivery it is concluded that there will not be an adverse effect on the special interest features of the EFSAC. Similarly to the recreational issues, if planning permission is refused, the failure to deliver of these measures will need to form an additional reason for refusal.

Very special circumstances advanced

Since the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt that causes additional harm to its openness and conflicts with its fundamental purposes, the applicant must advance very special circumstances (“VSCs”) to clearly outweigh this harm.

The main thrust of the VSCs advanced by the applicant is the need, principally for the care home itself, but also the doctors surgery/dentist and the delivery of affordable housing.

As with any material planning consideration, the starting point is to first consider the requirements of the Development Plan and the status of the EFDLP. It is pertinent to consider the recent Local Plan Inspectors (“the LPI”) report, particularly in relation to “Issue 2”:

“Whether the Local Plan makes appropriate provision for housing of all kinds to meet the needs of society”.

The LPI concluded that:

“Subject to the main modifications described above, the plan makes sufficient provision for housing over the plan period and takes a practical and sound approach towards housing delivery and the housing trajectory. There is adequate evidence to indicate that a 5-year supply of housing will be maintained. The plan delivers an appropriate mix of housing tenures, types and sizes and makes adequate provision for affordable housing, older people, specialist housing, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and accessible homes to meet the identified needs of different groups. The plan therefore makes appropriate provision for housing of all kinds to meet the needs of society.”

It is clear therefore that in general, the recently adopted EFDLP does indeed provide an appropriate amount of specialist housing, which includes care homes for older people.

It is also important to note however that policy H1 of the EFDLP sets out general policy support for specialist types of accommodation, including care homes where there is evidence of an unmet need. In order to further understand the issue, the Council has commissioned the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (“Housing LIN”) to undertake an assessment of housing and accommodation needs of older people. The report covers the following areas:

- Demographic evidence relating to the local older population.
- Housing, health and social care, and socioeconomic factors in relation to the local older population.
- Evidence in relation to the current supply of specialised housing and accommodation for older people.
- Quantitative estimates of future need for housing and accommodation for older people to 2033, and to 2037.

Housing LIN identified that over the plan period (2011-2033) there is a need for 1,538 residential and nursing care beds in the District. On an annualised basis there is a need for 70 care beds to be provided each year from 2011, and therefore the District should have provided 839 care beds by 2023. However, the current level of provision is 1,268 beds, which equates to an annual delivery of 106 care beds each year since 2011. So currently 429 additional care beds have been provided above the annualised trajectory. Whilst there remains a total need for 270 care beds over the plan period, which equates to 27 care beds per year from now until 2033, given the current annualised overprovision there is no immediate need for the care home.

These figures are, however, very conservative since Housing LIN did not include two extant permissions that have not yet been delivered which are:

- EPF/2686/20 – Chapelfield. This development has permission to provide 80 bedspaces including provision for dementia patients.
- EPF/1244/11 – Bell Hotel – this development has permission to provide 60 bedspaces.

Therefore, another 140 care beds that could be delivered have not been included in these figures, which if included would leave only 130 beds, or 13 care beds per year, needed by 2033.

In the context of the conclusion reached by the LPI that the EFDLP makes sufficient provision for housing over the plan period as well as the clear oversupply that currently exists in the district, there is not a demonstratable need for the proposed care home.

Turning to the proposed doctors surgery/dentist, the applicant sets out that there is a local need for such facilities in the local area. The Hertfordshire and Essex Integrated Care Board (“the ICB”) as the primary healthcare commissioner with full delegation from NHS England have commented that they have no

objection subject to conditions and planning obligations. However, this does not constitute a clear support of the scheme, nor does it identify a need for the delivery of the healthcare facilities but in actual fact comment that the development would:

“...have an impact on primary healthcare provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable”.

Indeed, the EFDLP itself sets out the infrastructure requirements for each area within the District through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (“the IDP”). The IDP identifies a need for 173sqm of additional GP spaces in Waltham Abbey over the plan period as well as the equivalent of 0.4 full time dentists. However, there are numerous allocation sites in Waltham Abbey capable of delivering such a need, including the Waltham Abbey Strategic Masterplan Area. As such whilst it can be concluded that there is a general need for such provision in Waltham Abbey, this is a need over the plan period (until 2033) but it does not demonstrate a current acute need in the local area.

Finally, turning to the proposed affordable housing, it is clear that the delivery of affordable housing is always a positive aspect of development proposals, even though, in this case there is no policy requirement for them to be so. However, in the context of the now adopted EFDLP, which as the LPI identified:

“...The plan delivers an appropriate mix of housing tenures, types and sizes and makes adequate provision for affordable housing...”

It is clear that there is no “need” for the delivery of affordable housing over and above the growth contained in the EFDLP and therefore it is unconvincing as a VSC.

This conclusion is entirely consistent with that reached on the previously refused application in 2017 (EPF/2124/16) where a similar argument was advanced by the applicant, that there was an acute “need” for a care home in this location and that should constitute the VSC required to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

There is even more compelling evidence in this application to conclude that the VSCs advanced are unconvincing due to the adoption of the EFDLP and consequent conclusion that the district provides an adequate supply of specialist housing. This is further underpinned by the up-to-date information provided by Housing LIN, that the Council has a current, significant, oversupply of residential care beds at this stage in the plan period.

Final balance and conclusion

The entirety of the proposal is clearly inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would cause significant additional harm to its openness, would fundamentally conflict with the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt and would erode its open character. In accordance with the requirements of the Framework, each of these harms must be afforded substantial weight against the proposal. In addition, there would be significant, undue harm caused to the existing landscape assets on the site and considerable weight should be attached to this.

In such circumstances the applicant must demonstrate VSCs to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. For the reasons set out above, it is clear that the care home, the doctors surgery/dentist and the affordable housing are not necessary in the context of the allocated development in the EFDLP. As such, considered individually and cumulatively they do not outweigh, never mind clearly outweigh the very significant harm that would be caused to the Green Belt as well as the landscape harm that has been identified.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused and, in such circumstances, an additional reason for refusal will need to be added since the financial contributions towards the mitigation measures of the EFSAC cannot be secured.

If you wish to discuss the contents of this report item please contact the case officer by 2pm on the day of the meeting at the latest, or if no direct contact can be made please email: contactplanning@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Case Officer: James Rogers

Email: jrogers@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Refusal Reason(s): (3)

- 1 The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. In addition, the proposal would cause significant additional harm to its openness and would conflict with its fundamental purpose of keeping land permanently open. The nature of the proposal would cause a significant increase in the residential paraphernalia in and around the site which would cause additional significant harm to the character of the Green Belt. The very special circumstances advanced by the applicant do not clearly outweigh these identified harms to the Green Belt and the other harms identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM 4 of the adopted Local Plan (2011-2033) and with the requirements of chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
- 2 The proposal fails to demonstrate that it would not cause significant harm to the existing landscape character of the site, particularly on its front boundary adjacent to Honey Lane. As such it is in conflict with policy DM5 of the adopted Local Plan (2011-2033) and with the landscape guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
- 3 Since there is no appropriate mechanism to secure the necessary financial contribution towards managing the effects of air pollution and recreational pressure on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation, the proposal fails to demonstrate its compliance with policies DM 2 and DM 22 of the adopted Local Plan (2011-2033), with paragraphs 181 and 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations (2017)

Informatives: (2)

- 4 The Local Planning Authority has identified matters of concern within the officer's report and clearly set out the reason(s) for refusal within the decision notice. The Local Planning Authority has a formal post-application advice service. Please see the Council's website for guidance and fees for this service - <https://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/planning-and-building/apply-for-pre-application-advice/>. If appropriate, the Local Planning Authority is willing to provide post-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development through this service.

This decision is made with reference to the following plan numbers:(21) 1 F, (00) 4D, (00) 5C, (00) 7D, (9) 1, (9) 4 A, 009 A, (21) 3D, (21) 2, (00) 6 D, (27) 2, (00)3 E, (9) O, (00) 2 E, (27) 1 A, (00) 8 A and 01 Rev B