

Stakeholder Reference

Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)	
Title	Mr		
First Name	George		
Last Name	Williams		
Job Title (where relevant)	Account Director		
Organisation (where relevant)	na		
Address			
Post Code			
Telephone Number			
E-mail Address			

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which further Main Modification number and/or supporting document of the Local Plan does your representation relate to?

MM no: 78

Supporting document reference:

Do you consider this further Main Modification and/or supporting document of the Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

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

Please give details of why you consider the further Main Modification and/or supporting document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise and concise as possible. If your response exceeds 300 words please also provide an executive summary of no more than 300 words. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

To whom it may concern,

Off the back of the most recent communication from the Liberal Democrats, we've been notified of the intention of the (updated) minimum of 450 houses to be built behind [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Based on all the previous concerns raised around how the current utility infrastructure could not possibly support this level of expansion, as evident from the continuous disruption to the area, this new plan only raises more concerns than ever before.

As per our previous objection to the South Epping Strategic Masterplan Area, I am formally emailing with my below objection reasons with my partner who also lives at the property in CC; General;

- Fundamentally, the new wording on the houses to be built has now been changed from 'approximately 450 homes' to a 'minimum of 450 homes' - Park K i.
- Road access- no vehicular bridge included in plans which increases congestion. Roads are narrow, bendy, with cars on most curbs currently, Ivy Chimneys is already a very busy road with people using it as cut way road and from the school. This will be further exacerbated due to the constant road closures when the water pipes burst, with the road shutting as a result.
- Highway safety- Inadequate access or highways safety- Accessibility Issues Adequacy of parking/loading/turning. Traffic generation- with school etc already busy there.
- The Noise air quality associated with the M25 is still relevant and therefore increasing the dwellings still does not address this.
- Likewise, the presence of the overhead powerline's that have not still been considered nor eradicated.
- The land allocated is on the green belt and therefore still not legally compliant.
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use will affect the value of the nature reserve.
- Loss of light or overshadowing- The height or proximity of the development would be such that unreasonable overshadowing would occur.

- Existing Gp will not be able to accommodate for additional residents.
- New school will also need to be provided as Ivy Chimneys school is at capacity.
- Overbearing nature of proposal - The scale of the works means that the property/premises has an oppressive impact on surrounding areas/houses.
- Increase to flood risk- Additional housing will decrease the opportunity for water to soak into the ground in the field and cause water on the road to slope down into the valley. This is especially evident with the proposed boarder line which proposed to be built for the unlevelled ground

Personal;

- Overlooking/loss of privacy- The proposal would lead to previously private areas being overlooked.
- Health -My partner is extremely asthmatic and how will the dust impact his health?
- We are also expecting a baby, and are very worried about the affects of building work.
- I would also like to add that I brought my property in January 2021, if i was to known this would be happening I wouldn't have brought my property, I feel that i have been mislead and reserve the right to seek redress.

To make this proposal viable,

(Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification and/or supporting document 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 Submission Version of 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.)

- Deleting South Epping from the plan would address these concerns and still enable the district to meet the housing numbers required by the government (especially when taking into account the many new flats proposed for Epping Town Centre) otherwise, infrastructure needed
- A Vehicular Bridge to ease with congestion
- A new health hup / GP / Dentist
- A new additional school
- A local supermarket
- A necessary green infrastructure must be provided

Sincerely,

George Williams

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the further Main Modification and/or supporting document 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 Submission Version of 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 and concise as possible. If your response exceeds 300 words please also provide an executive summary of no more than 300 words.

Signature: George Williams Date:
09/12/2022