

Copy and paste everything below this point into Word for the redaction process

Stakeholder Reference:

Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Mrs	
First Name	Tracy	
Last Name	Hoffman	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address		, ,
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address		

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which part of the Pre Submission Epping Forest District Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph:

Policy: None of the above

Policies Map:

Site Reference: STAP.R1

Settlement: Stapleford Abbots

Do you consider this part of the Pre Submission Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Consistent with national policy

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Please give details either of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate; or of why the Submission Version of the Local Plan is legally compliant, is sound or complies with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. Please use this box to set out your comments.

FLAWS IN REGULATION 18 PROCEDURE

The purpose of the regulation 18 consultation procedure is to give the public the opportunity to view the draft plan and make representations on its content for consideration before the final plan is produced. The draft did not include the STAP.R1 the 33 house development in Stapleford Abbots. A development of this size would have a significant effect on the village and the final plan has been produced without allowing representations to be made on it. This does not comply with legal guidelines as follows:-

"(1) A local planning authority must-

(a) notify each of the bodies or persons specified in paragraph (2) of the plan which the local planning authority propose to prepare and (b) invite each of them to make representations to the planning authority about with that subject ought to contain.

(2) The bodies of persons referred to in paragraph (1) are-

(a) such of the specific consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider may have an interest in the subject of the proposed local plan;

(b) such of the general consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider appropriate and

(c) such residents or other persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area from which the local planning authority consider it appropriate to invite representations.

(3) In preparing the local plan, the local planning authority must take into account any representation made to them in response to invitations under paragraph (1)."

Furthermore, the draft plan stated "The council does not consider there are distinct spatial options to locating residential development with Stapleford Abbots".

LACK OF AWARENESS

The decision to include STAP.R1 was made on 14th December and the final plan published on 18th December.

Since the inclusion of the site there has been no communication with residents, in particular those who would be most effected by it, such as those immediately surrounding the site. I am the only known resident who has received correspondence. This letter was to announce the publication of the final plan ONLY, there was no reference to the STAP.R1 inclusion. I only discovered it after reading the plan on line.

EFDC failed to correspond with interested parties or to act fairly and openly. Stapleford Abbots residents were unaware of the redevelopment proposals. Awareness was created after flyers were distributed by neighbours.

The obligatory 6 week publication period of the final plan was scheduled to run from 18th

Dec-29 Jan, when days would be lost due to xmas/new year holidays. Any publicity, which was minimal, was overshadowed at this time of year.

INCORRECT DETAILS

Details of the site are incorrect, STAP.R1 is referred to as Oakfield Road instead of Oak Hill Road which has created unnecessary confusion.

GREENBELT CHANGES

The 4 aspects of consideration for development in a green belt area have not been met, when comparing examples from the development at Kensington Park, Stapleford Abbots, it shows the proposed site would score highly and therefore would be in breach of green belt protocols.

CROSS BOUNDARY ISSUES & URBAN SPRAWL

The site forms a natural boundary between Epping Forest and the London Borough of Havering, building on this site goes against planning protocol by creating cross boundary issues and contributing to urban sprawl.

INCORRECT DETAILS

Details of the site are incorrect, STAP.R1 is referred to as Oakfield Road instead of Oak Hill Road which has created unnecessary confusion.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

(A) Access to/from the site would be hazardous, there is a sharp bend in the road at one end of the site and opposite is a junction with Tysea Hill. The property at this junction (which is mine) has had vehicles break through the boundary fence on 6 occasions. A further filter of vehicles (exiting the estate) at this junction would be dangerous. The site is isolated from public transport and occupants would be reliant on a car.

(B) The site is identified by the Environment Agency as a high risk flood zone (see attached).it is liable to flooding from the brook running within its boundaries.

(C) My children used to attend the local primary school, it is so overcrowded they have erected 3 portacabins in the playground, which accommodates approx. 40-50% of the children as there is not enough space in the main building.

(D) There is a large gas pipe running through the field which has created issues for neighbours building near to it.

(E) The appearance of a development of this size, particularly the depth of encroachment into the greenbelt, would be at odds with neighbouring properties which are all built along the road side mainly detached and are street facing, with the exception of a small development at Kensington Park.

(F) An estate of this size would put further strain on the power supply, the village suffers regular power cuts with 3 in the past 6 weeks. There are also issues with the drainage

system which struggles to manage the present capacity.

SUMMARY

Residents in Stapleford Abbots have been disadvantaged by the failure to comply with regulation 18 guidelines which should have allowed the public to make representations on STAP.R1. There should have been a period for responses to be considered before STAP.R1 was included in the final plan. This has also resulted in confusion in the representation process at publication stage for anyone wishing to comment, having firstly to understand the tests of soundness in order to base their response. STAP.R1 was also listed with incorrect details of its location.

There has been an unreasonable lack of communication with interested parties, in particular those with properties surrounding STAP.R1 who would be most affected. Local residents were completely unaware of the proposals and have only been alerted to it by neighbours distributing flyers. The inclusion of STAP.R1 at such a late stage in the process should have triggered greater awareness by EFDC. The decision to hold the publication process over the xmas/new year period has unfairly created a shortened period for responses.

The site itself would require changes to the greenbelt, create cross boundary issues and contribute to urban sprawl all of which go against planning protocol. Furthermore, it would be unsuitable due to its location on a hazardous stretch of road, flooding issues, local school over crowding and is isolated from public transport.

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Pre Submission Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness.

You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

In order to make the plan legally compliant STAP.R1 should be removed it's inclusion does not comply with the Regulation 18 planning guidelines.

If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral part of the oral examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I would like to attend as I feel EFDC have not acted fairly or openly and I would like to ensure I receive the correct information in future.

Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination

Yes

Signature: Tracy Hoffman Date: 24/01/2018

DISCLAIMER

This email is for the use of the intended recipients only. Any opinion or advice it contains is that of the sender and does not bind the authority in any way. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the message. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email.

We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise that you carry out your own virus checks on an attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Internet email is not a secure communication medium,
and we advise that you observe this lack of security when emailing us.

Epping Forest District Council

Postmaster@Eppingforestdc.gov.uk