

## **Representation 2 Soundness**

The SLP fails in these respects. Details where necessary are given on the following pages

### Positively prepared

Development and infrastructure requirements of Jessel Green LOU R.5 may have been assessed but the plan has not accounted for the highest local population density in the district and numerous large-scale developments since the 1950's. To continue cannot be sustainable if reasonable living standards and service provision are to be maintained

### Effective

Local bus transport to Jessel Green was cut by half in 2017 and local Underground services are strained now. There do not appear to be plans for improvement. I do not see that the plan can be effective if there is no clear provision for an increased population.

### Justified

The selection of Jessel Green is not justified as much of the evidence for its exclusion, presented by various parties during the consultation, has been disregarded while weaker evidence from the same sources has been given preference and used to remove other sites from the SLP. Reasoning based on evidence has not been applied equally.

### Consistent with National Policy

Inclusion of Jessel Green is contrary to EFDC policy DM6 and NPPF sections 76 and 77.

### Duty to Co-operate

Numerous requests to Councillors and EFDC for clarification of evidence provided by the Conservators of Epping received no response. It takes FoI requests to get information. EFDC have failed to provide a list of Alternative sites and will not do so until after the deadline for Representation submission.

## Representation related to Jessel Green LOU.R5

This comparison shows how evidence was utilised for sites in Loughton and Theydon Bois. There is no dispute between communities. It is to illustrate disparity in the use of evidence from documents detailed in the following Appendix related to the submission plan.

I regret this is tedious but EFDC produced a plethora of documents and accurate referencing is necessary for clarity.

Related to A in the my appendix, the Consultation Plan Report 2017 notes at 11.9 on page 53 the comments of the Conservators of Epping Forest (CoEF) on draft policy DM4 about Theydon Bois requiring a Sang. The CoEF made no mention of exclusion of sites in Theydon Bois..

Re draft policy DM6, the same Consultation Report on page 54, 11.9 refers to the CoEF comments that the policy “should not allow for loss of Green space, in particular the proposed site allocations in the Draft Local Plan”, but does not go as far as to specifically mention Jessel Green and Borders Lane and give the full weight the CoEF comments expressed. Particularly the CoEF did not mention SANGS for those areas which is indicative that their intention was that the whole of those areas should be removed from the plan.

Related to B in the appendix, comparison of extracts from the HRA reports for Theydon Bois and Loughton sites make a stronger case for excluding Loughton sites that have been retained in the plan than those at Theydon Bois which have been taken out.

In C in the appendix, Site Suitability Assessments for the Loughton sites pointedly note the loss of green space, potential adverse effects related to development and lack of alternatives. For the Theydon sites it talks of opportunities, no loss of space or likely impact on the settlement character.

Read in conjunction with A, B and C, Sustainability Appraisal D is an inaccurate reflection. It justifies less growth in Theydon Bois due to potential impact on Epping Forest due to increased recreational pressure, yet fails to note stronger comments on the same subject about Loughton or consider the greater cumulative effect of the 1000 plus homes planned for Loughton.

The Appraisal mentions reduction in growth in Loughton due to consultation responses, of which there were many, but gives no emphasis to the unequivocal comments in A, B and C reasoning for the exclusion of the sites.

What was crystal clear in the Conservators comments of 2016 is their specific disagreement with the inclusion of the Jessel Green and Borders Lane sites in Loughton. The SLP ignores that.

The selection of the site is further unsound for these reasons which fall into multiple categories

1. It is contrary to EFDC policy DM6. That is flawed in that it can be used as a “catch anything” in the right circumstances but it does say in paragraph C in terms of partially used sites “the site should be maintained and enhanced together with the visual amenity and its function as appropriate for active play and recreation.” Building a minimum of 154 homes will not enhance it, most of all the visual amenity, and therefore fails that test.

2. It is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework sections 76 and 77. Particularly in terms of section 77:

**“where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;”**

It is in the middle of a large housing estate.

**“where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and”**

Jessel Green is a focal point for community activity, a beauty spot in a built-up area with panoramic views and maturing trees. Its contemporary history and significance are in progress. It is a central feature of the Debden Estate. Created since the 1950s as a garden city to house overspill from the East of London following the ravages of the second world war. To destroy it will rob future generations of that potential and ruin the original concept. It has multipurpose use for recreation and tranquillity. That is supported by CoEF as in Appendix A. Historically the Green owes its name to Sir George Jessel. In 1874 he was Master of The Rolls and made a historic judgement to save Epping Forest for commoners from encroachment from wealthy landowners. It is a supreme irony that EFDC want to build on a space named after a man who played a major role in preserving much of the whole district.

**“where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”**

Jessel Green blends perfectly with the area. Its multipurpose use reflects the nature and needs of the community. The SSA in appendix C 5.2 for LOU.R5 ex SR-0361 specifically states “redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area”. I trust you will please visit to see for yourselves. If that is not possible I have included photographs.

3. The plan does not account for historical large-scale developments in the Debden area and that Loughton has the highest population density in the district.

4. There are several references in the plan to building on available space close to transport links. Jessel Green is 1.57 k shortest walking distance to Debden Underground Station. There were 2 bus routes from Jessel Green to that Station. In 2017 the 167 was discontinued due to the withdrawal of subsidy from Essex CC. The remaining route 20 is under review and only guaranteed until March 2019. If that goes there will be no bus link to either Debden or Loughton stations.

By contrast 3 sites in Theydon Bois, SR-0026B, SR-0026C and SR-0228ii which were withdrawn from the plan, are adjacent to Theydon Bois Station. Ideal for the EFDC policy.

5. There are references in plan policy to growth for Loughton but no reason why. Loughton is constrained by Epping Forest, Roding Valley flood plain, the Central Line and the M11. There are restrictions to avoid settlement merging. Consequently, space to expand is limited and thus EFDC desire to fill in the Green bits that remain without considering population density and effect on the community and local services. I make the analogy of a growing child expected to continually take the same shoe size. Increasingly uncomfortable.

6. The Submission plan P121 Vision for Loughton states “The impact of further development on Epping Forest, both in terms of air quality and also in terms of further recreational pressure will be minimised and mitigation measures will have been implemented where necessary.” That is contrary to the comments of the Conservators of Epping Forest 2016 related to Loughton sites.

7. Page 122 of the SLP Policy P2 shows (v) LOU.R5 Land at Jessel Green – Approximately 154 homes but on page 123 it becomes at (i) a minimum of 154 homes which is vague, suspicious and definitely not sound.

8. The SLP indicates use of half the site. The following artists impressions from EFDC suggest it will be more. Any development on Jessel Green will be totally out of character but the impressions in one scenario, even if for half of the site, show taller buildings which will be imposing, visually intrusive, an eyesore and dominate the whole area. Despite opposition EFDC set a precedent by allowing an out of character 8 storey building on the junction of Rectory Lane and The Broadway. This seems to have been a precursor for the higher rise option for Jessel Green.

9. EFDC have never understood the value and benefit of Jessel Green to its community. It was built as a Council Estate but residents bought, invested in and improved what were plain homes and have made it into a place where people are happy to live. It is disgraceful that EFDC would blight homes they encouraged people to buy with a dystopian monstrosity.

Saving it will significantly benefit the local community. It has been at threat of unwanted and unjustified development at various times by EFDC for over 20 years. Its loss as an entirety will be devastating and detrimental. Partial development is not acceptable, that would be a Trojan Horse for EFDC. An application for Village Green status has been on the table for years. EFDC ignore that in what appears an obsessive quest to punish Loughton for not voting Conservative.

The attached report from Everything Epping Forest dated 30th, November 2016 (2nd section) of a Loughton Town Council meeting perfectly sums up local feeling. Noteworthy is the comment of the Mayor expressing distrust of EFDC.

#### Alternative Solutions

160 alternative sites were proposed across the District in the consultation. In the following response FoI 209 from EFDC they advise a list will only be made public in time for submission of the SLP to the PI. Not in time to be considered by the public before the deadlines for submission of Representations. This is bizarre and does not allow a representation to consider what good alternatives there may be to bad choices in the plan. EFDC had this information before they produced the SLP, their reason for not providing a list inexplicable.

EFDC very much intend to proceed with their original SLP with minimal change. I suggest they are determined to meet deadlines and complete the process at the expense of proper consideration.

One offering is a 600 home Garden City proposal for Woolston Hall Golf site in the angle of Chigwell Lane and Abridge Road. This is discussed in the article from Everything Epping Forest (1st section) that follows. That would have less impact on the local community and could take the quotas for Jessel Green and Borders Lane completely. To Debden station from a pedestrian entrance in Chigwell Lane is less than 1k. To the same station from Jessel Green is 1.57k.

Sites SR-0026B, SR-0026C and SR-0228ii in Theydon Bois were excluded from the SLP on the basis of erroneous and spurious use of evidence as described earlier. My photos show that parts of the sites are derelict and used for fly tipping. Green space there is only used for rambling and dog walking. It is not suitable as a children's play area or for casual or organized events, sporting or otherwise. Footpaths can be retained within a development for access to the surrounding

countryside. Sensible development will enhance this neglected area.

An equitable solution will be to remove the 154 homes from Jessel Green LOU R:5 and spread them over the 3 Theydon sites that in the draft plan were to have a total of 273 homes.

Messrs. Redrow builders proposed development of the sites as outlined in the following flyer but that has been ignored by EFDC.

It will satisfy the suggested requirements of the CoEF in respect of all sites. The reduced number of homes will have a minimal effect on Theydon Bois due to the proximity of the nearby main road and station. The existing community will be barely know it is there.

Sadly Jessel Green needs protection from its own Council and your considerations and recommendations to that effect will be greatly appreciated. The plan process allows for Major Modifications and I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate act to remove it from this plan. Its inclusion is completely unjustified, totally unsound and heinous to the local community.

Thank You for your attention.

Mark Hickey  
25/1/2018

## Appendix

### A. Extracts from Conservators of Epping Forest comments 2016 page 8 Section 6

“The allocation at Theydon Bois is a very large block of housing which would represent over 20% increase in the population of this settlement. This would need a SANG in our view, despite the lower than 400 house threshold (see HRA para 6.4.10).

At Loughton The Conservators would disagree with the proposed loss of green space at Borders Lane and Jessel Green. The latter site in particular, if lost, would place considerable pressure on the nearby Forest and also would seem to be in contradiction to the green infrastructure policies in the draft Plan. Such a large green space is currently valuable and has considerable potential to be developed for both access and for wildlife.”

### B. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) 2016 Related to Epping Forest SAC;

For sites in Theydon Bois removed from the plan the same comments apply to each site.

Page 40 onwards Table 6

Site 1	SR-0026B – approximately 133 dwellings
Site 36	SR-0026C – approximately 121 dwellings
Site 44	SR-0228ii – approximately 19 dwellings

“Potential HRA implications. Sites identified in this policy have potential to result in in-combination impacts relating to recreational pressure upon Epping Forest SAC.”

For sites in Loughton which have been left in the plan

Site 73	SR-0356 Borders Lane College Field
---------	------------------------------------

“Potential HRA implications, From review of freely available aerial mapping, this site comprises existing open amenity green space that appears to contain well used pathways. The presence of this space acts to divert some recreational activity away from the SAC. Loss of this space could act to increase recreational pressure upon the SAC, further compounded by additional new dwellings. It is therefore assumed that development of this site would need to ensure no net loss of open space in line with Policy DM6.”

Site 74	SR-0361 Jessel Green
---------	----------------------

“Potential HRA implications, From review of freely available aerial mapping, this site comprises existing open amenity green space of Jessel Green. The presence of this space acts to divert some recreational activity away from the SAC. Loss of this space could act to increase recreational pressure upon the SAC, further compounded by additional new dwellings. It is therefore assumed that development of this site would need to ensure no net loss of open space in line with Policy DM6.”

6.4.9 It should be noted that the following site allocations could result in the loss of areas of existing green infrastructure that are used for recreational activities. The presence of these green areas is likely to divert a level of recreational activity away from the SAC, as such the loss of these green areas, could result in an increase in recreational pressure upon the SAC, which is then compounded by the provision of an increase in net new dwellings. The sites are as follows:

SR-0356 which from review of aerial mapping appears to comprise existing open amenity green space with well-worn paths; (Borders Lane)

SR-0361 which from review of aerial mapping appears to comprise existing open amenity green space (Jessel Green);

C. Site Suitability Assessment September 2016

Appendix B1.4.2 for Loughton sites

SR-0356 Borders Lane College Field

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would still result in loss of public open space (woodland and semi natural public open space covers c. 98% of the site), with few opportunities for site reorientation or reprovision.

SR-0361 Jessel Green

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would still result in loss of public open space (woodland and semi natural public open space covers 97% of the site), with few opportunities for site reorientation or reprovision.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. However, the whole site is an existing open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area.

Appendix B1.4.2 for Theydon Bois sites

Theydon Bois Sites SR-0026A+B have the same comments for both sites

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Proposed masterplan for site responds to landscape setting, and is separated from settlement by railway line. Proposed amount of development and its layout is unlikely to impact settlement character.

D. Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Equalities Impact Assessment )

Extracts from Page 21 (pdf page 346 of Submission Plan.)

2.48 The results from the technical assessments of alternatives set out above, together with analysis of the Draft Local Plan consultation feedback and the updated evidence base, fed into the Council's preferred approach and led to the following:

Less growth at Theydon Bois due to potential impact on Epping Forest due to increased recreational pressure.

Reduction in growth to be delivered on managed open space sites in Loughton, to reflect consultation responses on the Draft Local Plan.



## LOUGHTON: 'Garden Village' plan revealed

9.23am - 30th November 2016

THE idea of a 'garden village' of 600 homes on the Woolston Manor Golf Course site will be assessed as part of the Epping Forest District Council Local Plan process, the council has said.

The development proposal, drawn up by developers, was reported to last night's extraordinary Loughton Town Council meeting which approved its response to the district council document.

The town council has said it would support the submission and evaluation of proposals for such a development. Councillor Chris Pond told the meeting that the district council had said the idea was not included in the Draft Local Plan because the site was considered too far from a London Underground station.

The site is also in the Green Belt and within a flood zone, the town council's response states.

However district councillor John Philip, whose cabinet portfolio includes the Local Plan, told Everything Epping Forest after the meeting that the site would be assessed.

He said: "The site was not put forward until well after the point where the draft plan was written and being reviewed prior to publication.

"Clearly it will be a site that will be assessed along with all other proposed sites before the next stage."

Mr Pond had told the meeting: "There is no reason why Epping Forest District Council should not consider this. Please consider a garden village. At least it needs to be evaluated seriously."

Councillor Stephen Murray said it had been a "strategic mistake" by the district council to dismiss the 'garden village' option.

"If we are going to realistically have a chance to fight the proposals we have to be seen to be supporting that (a garden village)."

## LOUGHTON: Council to fight for green spaces

8.40am - 30th November 2016

THE importance of Loughton's green, open spaces earmarked by Epping Forest District Council for housing is being highlighted by Loughton Town Council in its response to the Draft Local Plan.

Rochford Green and Jessel Green are well used and valued greatly by the local community with the latter having held large scale community events in recent years, the town council has said.

It is also fighting for the future of Luctons playing fields, off Borders Lane, which - while being considered suitable for some 304 homes - has been earmarked for a sports centre to be used by both Epping Forest College and the local community.

Peter Relph, of the Epping Forest Green and Democratic Left, highlighted the playing field which he said should be protected from any housing development.

Several other members of the public spoke at last night's extraordinary town council meeting at The Murray Hall with Paul Morris, who thanked the town council for its work on the Draft Local Plan response, voicing concerns over the additional traffic problems the new homes would generate throughout the town.

Councillor Chris Pond told the meeting he had never seen anything "quite so preposterous" as the content of the Draft Local Plan document adding that the proposals would "change it (Loughton) for the worst".

He added the town council had to "speak up loud and clear to say that this Plan is totally unacceptable".

Councillor Stephen Murray described the Draft Local Plan as "the worst document that I've ever seen the district council produce".

He added: "They obviously don't understand our town and the needs of our town. I think our green spaces are worth saving."

Councillor David Wixley said: "This is absolutely appalling what is proposed for Loughton."

Councillor Stephen Pewsey said: "This document strikes at the very heart of our way of life in Loughton."

"For the last three generations they (the three green spaces on the Debden estate earmarked for development) have been a place where children play, lovers meet and old people meet for a chat. All that we take for granted is going to be concreted over."

He added roads would be gridlocked and the health and education services would not be able to cope with the additional numbers. "At the same time we are destroying the character of the town."

Mayor Carol Davies, who told the meeting she was born in Epping and had lived in Loughton most of her life, said: "I've seen the town change, not for the better. It all comes down to money. The district council can't be trusted to take forward this development."

"They own (some of) the land, it's too tempting for them to take it forward for development. It isn't to the benefit of local people. They (the district council) cannot resist making money out of it."

Deputy mayor Philip Abraham said: "The people of Loughton have clearly demonstrated that their open spaces are precious to them."

"We should continue this fight with the district council. We are already suffering with the Winston Churchill pub (apartments/retail development) and that's already punishment enough."  
The deadline for comments to be submitted to Epping Forest District Council is 5pm on December 12.



## Freedom of Information – Response to Request

### Reference No. FoI209 Epping Forest District Local Plan

Set out below are details of your request for information held by the Council under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and the Council's response.

- (1) **I understand that following the draft local plan consultation approximately 160 sites were put forward as alternatives for consideration. Please may I have a list detailing those sites indicating which were accepted and those not accepted. I shall be pleased if you will also advise the reasoning excluding the rejected sites;**

The Site Selection Report has been published by the Council as part of the Regulation 19 Publication of the Local Plan Submission Version. However, the Council is yet to publish all of the detailed appendices which accompany the Site Selection Report and provide details relating to the assessment of individual sites. This does not mean that this assessment work has not been completed, but rather the delay in the publication of the appendices is due to the time it takes to generate the pro forma for each site, including the mapping for each site, all of which must be checked for accuracy before publication. These appendices will be published by the Council prior to the Submission of the Local Plan for Independent Examination;

The Council considers that the suite of evidence base documents available is adequate and sufficient to enable those wishing to make representations on the Local Plan Submission Version to do so. The information currently available concerning the sites allocated in the Local Plan Submission Version is sufficient to allow any disappointed party promoting non-allocated sites to make representations as to the comparative merits of allocating the promoted site. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the Council will bring the publication of the remaining appendices to the attention of the Planning Inspector appointed to examine the Plan to ensure that the issue can be considered appropriately through the Independent Examination process.

The Site Selection Report can be downloaded from the 'Site Selection' group of technical studies and evidence documents that have informed and/or supported the preparation of the Local Plan, that is available on the Council's website at:

<http://www.efdclocalplan.org/technical-information/>

# Jessel Green Site LOU.R5 Retained in the Plan



Theydon Bois Sites SR-0026B SR-0026C SR-0228ii Removed from the Plan





Epping Forest

# Save Epping's Urban Green Community Spaces!

New homes are needed in Epping Forest District. But Epping Forest council plans to dig up treasured urban green spaces in Jessel Green and Limes Farm to build them.

Redrow is promoting a site in Theydon Bois which is an ideal alternative location for homes in Epping Forest District.

Register at [www.redrowtheydonbois.co.uk](http://www.redrowtheydonbois.co.uk) to find out more and show your support.

## An alternative to building on community spaces



### Redrow has an alternative. We're planning new homes at Theydon Bois:

- A site with excellent connections to the Underground Station and Village Centre, reducing the need for residents to use their cars.
- Providing homes on currently inaccessible private land, not much-loved community space.
- We will open the site up, preserving and enhancing the green spaces in the area, and connecting the public rights of way.
- Helping Epping Forest meet its unmet housing need in a more sustainable way.
- A development with a dedicated green space for all, as well as green infrastructure corridors and woodland buffers.
- Creating a variety of attractive homes to meet a range of budgets.



## SHOW YOUR SUPPORT

Register at [www.redrowtheydonbois.co.uk](http://www.redrowtheydonbois.co.uk) to show your support, and send a message to Councillors that you oppose building on Jessel Green and Limes Farm.