

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

25<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

Dear Sir/Madam

Comments on the EFDC District Plan: its impact on Epping

I acknowledge that the Submission Version of the District Plan has been passed by the District Councillors, and I understand that challenges can only be considered if aspects of the plan are deemed to be a) not legally compliant b) unsound, or c) are not compliant with the duty to cooperate.

Where stated objectives are at odds with the effects of the Plan's implementation, this surely constitutes unsound decision-making. I draw your attention to the following discrepancies, especially with regard to the South Epping site:

1. Chapter 2 states that development will occur in the "most sustainable locations." Yet the South Epping site is

- a) affected by noise and pollution from the M25
- b) affected by noise from trains
- c) bordered by a brook which floods
- d) crossed by high-voltage power-lines and an oil pipeline
- e) sufficiently far from the High Street to make car use highly likely – the householders nearest the motor-way will have a walk of at least half an hour up a steep hill.

In what way is this location "sustainable"?

2. Under the sub-heading "Infrastructure" is the aim of "reducing traffic congestion." Building 950+ homes in the same area will inevitably lead to a concentration of extra vehicles and increase congestion, especially at peak times.

3. Under the heading "Visions and Objectives" is the intention that residents should "continue to enjoy a good quality of life." I draw your attention to two recent research papers:

"Living near major roads and the incidence of dementia" – The Lancet, Feb 2017.

"Danger in the Air: How air pollution can affect brain development in young children"  
– UNICEF report, Dec 2017.

Health concerns over air and noise pollution have been in the public domain for years, and yet the Plan intends to build very close to the M25. How will this ensure that residents have a good quality of life?

4. In Chapter 4, it is stated that “Mixed tenure residential properties must be designed to be “tenure-blind.”” This is a laudable aim. But how many people with money at their disposal will choose to live nearest the motorway? So is this where Council housing will go? By proposing to use the land right up to the M25, the Plan practically guarantees a social divide on the South Epping site.

More generally:

1. Chapter 2 states that one of the Plan’s objectives is to “protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” – yet 73% of the new development is on Green Belt land!

2. In the same chapter is found the intention to “encourage residential, cultural, leisure and tourist uses.” Closing the Library, the Sports Centre and the play area at Brook Road/Flux’s Lane and replacing them with housing flatly contradicts this aim.

I re-iterate:

Where stated objectives are at odds with the effect of the Plan’s implementation, this constitutes **UNSOUND** decision-making.

Yours faithfully,

  
\_\_\_\_\_