

Stakeholder Reference:

Document Reference:

## Part A

### Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Ms	
First Name	Susie	
Last Name	Evans-Frank	
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: P 1 Epping

Policies Map:

Site Reference: EPP.R1

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Effective

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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.**

I appreciate that there must be growth in Epping, but Sites EPP R1 and R2 seem to be huge in comparison to most other sites equal sized towns. The sites themselves will require a huge amount of infrastructure to support the multiple car users (per home) and bicycle transport is not going to be an option for the very young, very old or generally people in a rush to get to work of a morning (the journey from there to the station/High Street is steep up hill). There are no frequent buses or shuttles that service the area. A new school and doctor's surgery will need to be provided for the influx of people (as the current services are bursting at the seams). But these are services that are provided by the County Council, not the District - and I find no mention of any consultation that guarantee and agrees these additions to the area prior to a deal being done.

**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.**

There MUST be guarantees gained from County Council by District Council that infrastructure will be provided BEFORE any planned development of these areas are confirmed - as to build such a huge addition to our settlement without basic additions would break Epping's already overloaded services.

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: DM 4 Green Belt

Policies Map:

Site Reference: EPP.R2

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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.**

As I understand it the greenbelt is being used to house these new settlements, but I cannot find the 'exceptional circumstances' that are required to build on said greenbelt. There is also no 'Master Plan' for Epping South which would give us more detail on how the sites would be managed.

**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.**

Could some of the 950 dwellings not be reallocated to the Garden Villages that are mentioned in the Plan? Could the density of dwellings in other areas not be increased to reduce the need for greenbelt encroachment?

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: P 1 Epping

Policies Map:

Site Reference: EPP.R3

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Positively prepared, Effective, Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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.**

Epping Car Park is FULL UP every morning pre-8.30am. I am a commuter (who walks to station) so I see this first hand. Access to the car park on Station Approach is snarled up during rush hours due to inadequate drop-of/pick up areas already and buses not having adequate room to move. To reduce or even interrupt the service of the station car park is madness. I appreciate that developers will potentially provide the same amount of spaces as before, but where will the residents of said new development park? Even if in a perfect Local Plan World we'd like them to cycle or use tubes and buses - the fact is, we live in semi-rural area and people use cars to get places for leisure and convenience. When I lived in a flat in South Woodford (an even better transport connected area) I still had a car. So, the upshot will be - less car park spaces as residents will use them.

**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.**

I would suggest not building on this car park at all. It is already fit to bursting and would require multiple access points to even make it possible. If it is included, I would suggest that any development provides EQUAL IF NOT MORE parking for COMMUTERS and a designated RESIDENTS parking area (down a level?) so that the new residents do not use the much needed commuter spots.

Also - a number of the car park users drive from Harlow because it is considerably cheaper to use TFL underground than the overground from Harlow. Could Harlow be included in TFL Oyster scheme to relieve some of the stress on top of above suggestions?

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: P 1 Epping

Policies Map: No

Site Reference: EPP.R5

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Positively prepared, Effective, Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

### 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.

If the sports centre is built on, there must be a requirement for the Council to re-provide the facility IN EPPING. We are one of the larger towns in the plan and the facilities are central/well used. The whole point of a gym sports centre locally is to promote healthy living within the community, but to then tell your community that you need to drive to the next town to get it - seems counter intuitive. Loughton, Ongar, Waltham Abbey - all towns of a similar or smaller size - have their own sports centre facility and swimming pools, they cannot accommodate the influx of people that would necessarily come from Epping if all our services were lost. I'm sure that the idea in this plan is to relocate Epping residents to go to a new facility that would be built in North Weald - but this would still require Epping locals to drive to their 'local' gym. The bus services are nowhere near regular/reliable enough to encourage regular gym use (in fact they end by 7pm at night and barely run on Sundays - and run by County Council - so not directly influenced by District). How will we encourage our younger residents to a healthy lifestyle if they can't access gym facilities conveniently? It's also not really been a meaningful consultation because the results of previous Local Plan surveys have said that swimming pools / sports centres are high up on residents' lists of services to be provided - yet, this plan is not guaranteeing a replacement sports centre within our town at all. I would also suggest that if the council proposes to build a new gym out of town on greenbelt land this goes against the whole idea of healthy living - as this what the greenbelt was put in place to protect.

**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.**

I would argue that the sports centre and library are services that MUST be retained in Epping and they could actually be housed together. There is a very successful model in South Woodford - where the gym and library are within the same building and keep the same opening hours - this should be used as a model for our town. A potential site for this could be Stonards Hill Recreation -

a site within walking distance of main High Street and a ground where sports team already use the pitches and there is parking already in place. The Town Council are responsible for the land and it could actually be a fantastic place to develop a 'well-being and health' related hub that could house both library and sports facilities.

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: P 1 Epping

Policies Map:

Site Reference: EPP.R11

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Effective,Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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 library is an essential hub for the community and an important facility to maintain in Epping. It is a place that provides vital social opportunities for young and old - as well as being a place of learning and discovery. To lose it for only 11 new homes, seems a poor bargain. If it must be so, however, I would argue that it MUST be replaced in Epping and that the County Council and District Council must seal this deal in advance of any planned development.

**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.**

As mentioned in my previous representation for EPPR5 - I would suggested any replacement facility of library being housed in same building as Sports Centre, so that more residents can take advantage of late night library opening (open same hours as gym). South Woodford Library is a good example of how this mixed use model can work well - their gym/library is open 7 days a week and weekday evenings until 10pm - which would also open up commuters to being able to use the library more often in the evening. A community wellness type facility like this would suit Stonards Hill site well as mentioned previously.

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: P 1 Epping

Policies Map: No

Site Reference: EPP.R6

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Positively prepared, Effective, Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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.**

Problems with parking is in issue that has come up in all versions of the local plan responses, so to suggest building on both the local car parks in the area seems completely wrong. Plus, the scale of these proposed developments of flats above car parks could significantly alter the feel of our Market Town. It is not proposed to increase the number of shopper parking places.

**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.**

Could you double the capacity of one site and devote the other mainly site mainly to flats - this would mean that the sites wouldn't have to be developed at the same time, and extra parking spaces could be provided before any new housing were developed.

**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:**

## REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: P 1 Epping

Policies Map: No

Site Reference: EPP.R4

Settlement: Epping

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Positively prepared,Effective,Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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.**

This site has only 34 homes but compared to other sites within the town is very large. There is potentially a lot of space to develop a mix of dwellings of higher density here that could offset potentially one or two of the other contested sites in area - Station Car Park's 89? Or Baker's Lane's 31? The consultation about what was wanted at this site was done before the Epping South/Station Car Park and other specific sites were under consideration - so a lot of respondents would have requested a mixed use site with retail/leisure. However, knowing now that essential things like car parks / library / greenbelt are under threat, I for one, would prefer just to put housing on the site to offset some of the spaces that are threatened.

**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.**

Increase the density of housing on this site and reduce/delete any retail development so that the 89 dwellings at Station Car Park (EPPR3), the 11 homes from Library site (EPPR11) and 31 at Bakers Lane (EPPR7) can be relocated to this site.

**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: Susie Evans-Frank Date: 29/01/2018