

EPHING FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP

Thursday, 27 September 2012

Minutes of the meeting of the Epping Forest Management Plan Steering Group held at Committee Room - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 27 September 2012 at 2.00pm

Present

Members:

Barbara Newman (Deputy Chairman)	Verderer Richard Morris
Deputy Catherine McGuinness	Verderer Dr. Joanna Thomas
Verderer Peter Adams	Paul Thomson, Superintendent of Epping Forest
Verderer Michael Chapman	

Deputy Catherine McGuinness participated via teleconference.

Officers:

Edward Foale	- Committee & Member Services Officer, Town Clerk's Department
Esther Sumner	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Alderman Gordon Haines, Deputy Stella Currie and Gordon Whyatt.

2. RESPONSES TO TWO LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATIONS

Members considered a report of the Superintendent of Epping Forest, which provided a complete response to the London Borough of Waltham Forest's (LBWF) Development Management Policies consultation for discussion and a draft response to an early stage Local Plan issues and Options consultation by Epping Forest District Council (EFDC).

Relative to the Draft response to Epping Forest District Council (appendix 2 of the report), Members made the following comments:

Draft Letter – substitute “Conservators” for “we” and mention that the City of London Corporation as the Conservators of Epping Forest.

Section 2 – Vision and Aims

- In response to a Member's query, the Superintendent confirmed that “green infrastructure” referred to the linkage between, and chaining of, open spaces.
- A Member expressed concern that the lowest projection for all areas was the equivalent of 20,000, compared with 10,000 mentioned in the report.

Section 3 – Green Belt and natural and built heritage

- The Superintendent confirmed that where the response advised that Epping Forest Land covered 5% of the District, this did not include the buffer land.
- The Deputy Chairman expressed concern with regard to the quality of the maps used in the local plan consultation document. Members agreed to request higher quality maps. The Superintendent undertook to investigate the possibility of allowing the District to use the City's maps, although he believed that a fully accurate map of the Forest and buffer areas did not exist.

Questions 5e and g

- Members agreed that the response should make reference to brown belt as well as green belt.

Question 8 – biodiversity options

- A grammatical error was amended as follows: “the other bullet points *emphasis* on investigate, encourage and monitor...”

Section 4 Options for Growth

- Members agreed the following amendment to the response: “The countryside beyond the Forest boundaries evolved over many centuries with the Forest and represents a landscape of great historic and cultural value, with linking Green Lanes, ancient and veteran trees, ancient woodlands, networks of paths and byways and other important features *set in a wider-developed countryside.*”

The Group discussed the way forward for the consultation and decided that the matter should be progressed at both officer and Member level. The Group agreed that the letter should be signed by the Chairman, rather than the Superintendent. Members also agreed that discussions should take place with the Remembrancer to see what support he could offer. Members noted that EFDC occasionally had meetings with MPs from local constituencies, and the City could submit a briefing note for consideration at this meeting.

Members believed that the report contained insufficient analysis of transport matters in the area. A Member queried whether extending the Central Line between Epping and Ongar would mean that during rush hour the trains would have more commuters than current capacity allowed. The Superintendent undertook to obtain Central Line figures from Transport for London in order to progress this query.

A Member queried why Northweald did not appear in the consultation as it was a well-connected area of considerable size. Another Member advised that there may be heritage factors affecting this matter.

Diagram 4.19 – Theydon Bois Options for Growth

- The Group decided not to comment on option THB-A, and to object to THB-B and THB-C.

Diagram 4.21 – Waltham Abbey

- Members did not consider the objection to WAL-B to be appropriate.
- Members believed a stronger objection should be made to WAL-C
- Members believed WAL-G was unwise as the plan was south of the M25.

Members received and endorsed the Superintendent's response to the London Borough of Waltham Forest relative to its Development Management Policies Consultation (appendix 1 to the report).

3. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

4. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 3.34pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Edward Foale
tel. no.: 020 7332 1426
edward.foale@cityoflondon.gov.uk