

Jackie Leither

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 January 2018 10:00
To: Derek Macnab
Subject: South Epping Plan EPP.R1 and EPP.R2

Dear Mr MacNab

I have read with incredulity that ARUP have assessed the land EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, and after considering all planning merits have selected sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 the best to comply with the Council's agreed strategy.

I have been advised that in your position in management of the Planning Policy Team, your team have produced the Local Plan. I would presume that a list of the merits of the land EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 has been compiled?

I have recently sat in a meeting wherein Mr Tony Church, describing himself as a EFDC Councillor, told the meeting that Epping Councillors acted in the existing residents best interest as the Council had no alternative other than to enter this Green Belt Land otherwise the Government would impose planning on other Green Belt sites in Epping and would double the amount of houses to be built, I was dismayed. Mr Church urged those attending not to complain about the sites EPP.1 and EPP.2, this was obviously a scare tactic. To confess that the Councillors voted for an unsuitable site in order to avoid development on other more accessible and healthier Green Belt sites is disgusting.

You are well aware of the huge negative response by local residents to the proposal to build on EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, but I would remind you that it is also future residents lives that should be considered. It would nice to know if any of your team have actually walked the periphery of the site? If you had you would have realised that the terrain is totally different to how it looks from the road.

I can list my concerns:

1. Having lived at the top of the hill at EPP.R2 for 30 years, I can confirm that this land is always waterlogged, This land was the site of 5 natural ponds which have been filled in.
2. Site constraint the site boundary is the M25 and the junction of the M25/M11.
3. The central line railway line runs through the middle of the site.
4. It is a 20-25 minute strenuous uphill walk to the station for a fit person.
5. It is a 30 minute strenuous uphill walk for a fit person to the town.
6. It is a 50 minute walk for a fit person to the Limes Medical Centre.
7. Due to 4,5, and 6, new residents would no doubt need to use a car (we can assume cycling uphill would be equally difficult) We could probably assume this would cause an extra 1500/2000 cars on the already congested roads of South Epping.
8. The land contains 3 high voltage pylons.
9. No infrastructure is in place in the surrounding area to cope with the amount of new households in one confined area, no senior school in the area, no doctors, no leisure facilities and existing roads unable to cope.
10. Restricted access to the EPP.R1 site via Ivy Chimney's.
11. Restricted access to the EPP.R2 site via Fluxs Lane.
12. The restricted access from Bridge Hill to Brook Road.
13. No access joining both sites.
14. Noise/Air pollution for new residents of EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 is very high. Although we live on EPP.R2 much of the land to be developed is much closer to the M25 and junction of M11. However, the motorway is very loud from our property.
15. Due to the hilly terrain of the sites, the land falls down below M25 on EPP.2.
16. The removal of Green Belt south of Epping would be 'High Risk'. Other potential sites (land east of Orchards/North Weald Golf Course) is low or medium risk.

This land was supposed to have been considered against other sites in Epping, I cannot believe that land not bordering the motorway and within walking distance from railway station, walking distance from the town, walking distance from the Medical Centre and walking distance to senior schools could have been deemed less suitable?? Not only do the other sites have the benefit of being closer to amenities, but the other major benefit is that the infrastructure is in place. **The major point must be that other sites would not require these enormous costly improvements to make them viable.** Also the junctions at Ivy Chimneys/Theydon Road and Fluxs Lane/Bower Hill, these would be the only points of access to the sites and cannot be extended, has the impact on surrounding roads ie Bower Hill and The Bell Common junction been properly assessed?

To make the sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 workable I have heard some of the suggestions put forward by your department are:

- a. The erection of barriers along the M25 to shield the land from noise and air pollution. As this land is very hilly and the land drops down below the motorway, housing close by would be like being in a prison and as the land goes uphill the barriers would probably be useless half way up the hill.
- b. The building of a relief road/bridge over the Central Line or under the Central Line. This is an enormous task and would be extremely costly.
- c. The rebuilding of junctions at Ivy Chimneys and Fluxs Lane.
- c. The building of another school and doctors surgery.

All of the above work will need to be completed to make this South Epping Plan feasible. Can you please advise local residents of the merits of the sites which would make EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 more favourable than others. I cannot understand, as a layman, how your team thoroughly considered the sites and came to the conclusion that the site that requiring 10-20 million being spent on infrastructure improvements before making it viable for building on is the most favourable.

Can you also advise local residents, who will be footing the bill for the infrastructure works of 10-20 million for the sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2? It seems to me that not only does your department intend years of disruption for the residents of South Epping, you also possibly expect them to pay for it! Either through council tax or government collected income tax. Please clarify?

I look forward to receiving your response.

Regards
Gary Levy