

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Miss	
First Name	Grace	
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.

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

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. No residents received letters received correspondence regarding the development at STAP.R1. 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.

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

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 it would be in breach of green belt protocols.

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.

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. 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). It is liable to flooding from the brook running within its boundaries.

(C) I used to attend the local primary school is full to capacity there are 3 portacabins in the playground, which accommodates approx. 40-50% of the children.

(D) There is a large gas pipe running through the field.

(E) The appearance of a development of this size would not be in keeping with neighbouring properties

(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. Their drainage system which struggles to manage the present capacity.

In 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.

Remove STAP.R1 for the plan is at is consistent with legal policy due to flaws in regulation 18

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

No, I do not wish to participate at oral examination

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

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

Yes

Signature: Grace 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