

I am writing to lodge an objection to the application submission for the South Nazeing Concept Framework Plan Area, the large development outlined in the Local Plan off St Leonard's road in Nazeing for the following reasons:

GREEN BELT LAND

This land is not only in a Green Belt area, it is also, according to your Community Choices document 2012, located within a conservation area. (Naz B pg120) I understand that we need to build more housing in the area but there are already numerous brown fill sites within Nazeing which are much more suited to development for residential use. (as Naz 1) rather than eroding green belt land which can never be reclaimed. Why is the Council not planning to use all Brown Fill sites designated by the Parish Council but choosing to erode precious Green Belt land instead?

I already lodged objections to earlier applications for a development on this site, applications which were, indeed, TURNED DOWN by EFDC. Indeed, the last application was only in 2017 and the Council wrote to me to confirm that their decision was to REJECT this application. Why then are they now proposing a large housing development in the same place?

How is building a large development on Green Belt land compatible with the stated aim of the Local Plan for Nazeing of maintaining "the rural feeling" of the village?

What gives the EFDC the right to cross current Green Belt boundaries and to establish them elsewhere?

What is more, I note that there is also a plan to extend Waltham Abbey extensively at the bottom of the Crooked Mile which will also lead to a huge increase of traffic and which will encroach on Nazeing's rural feel.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

If anything, there had been a sharp rise in the level of traffic using St Leonard's Road and the village in general since the original application in 2014. The chaos caused at key times by the recent Dobbs Weir road closure shows how saturated the junction with Middle Street has already become. I am not only talking about congestion but the speeds which vehicles travel down St Leonard's road – way above the 30 miles an hour speed limit.

I can only foresee even more traffic disruption and greater waiting times for local services if this development were to be built. Another development on the edge of Tatsfield Avenue and St Leonard's road for a group of flats has recently been approved and will already lead to more traffic difficulties as this is near the proposed new junction with St Leonard's road. We already have regular queues along St Leonard's road out of rush hour times, when there are problems on the M11 and M25 and motorway traffic is directed via Sat Nav along the road. Several times a week traffic already queues outside our property at different times of the day and back to Tatsfield Avenue.

Our property itself is situated less than 6 feet from the road. The house literally shakes when the road is busy and especially if heavy lorries drive past. It is obvious that even the current heavy level of traffic is putting considerable strain on the structure of the property. The location of the proposed access road is close to the house and will only increase this strain.

In the 30 years we have owned the property, St Leonard's road has evolved from a quiet rural B road

to a busy, hazardous "rat-run" for commuters and heavy goods vehicles. Any further traffic generated by a potential development on this site would be dangerous and unsustainable. We totally refute the argument that this would have no noticeable impact on the traffic flow.

AIR POLLUTION

The Council itself admits that "The development of the allocated sites within Nazeing have the potential to produce air pollution that could impact upon air quality in the District, including Epping Forest."

As mentioned above, traffic is already stationary or crawling along St Leonard's road from the entrance to the village from the Crooked Mile on most days raising air pollution levels significantly. Imagine what an increase in traffic density and the addition of further traffic light controlled junctions will bring?

HERITAGE

As the council states in the Submission plan,
Heritage Development of the Area, particularly to the north, may impact upon the setting of the
. Development proposals which may affect the setting of this heritage asset should sustain or enhance its significance including the contribution made by its setting. Development proposals should preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Listed Building and its setting, including through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.

I am the owner of _____ and it is indeed _____. Our understanding is that Listed Buildings' regulations state that the setting is often an essential part of the building's character and therefore, any proposals for development which by its character or location may have an adverse effect on that setting will require very careful consideration. As owners of a Listed Building, we are bound by several regulations ourselves which we accept as we understand the importance of maintaining their character. Surely this is nonsense if other planning regulations such as those pertaining to change of use of Green Belt land can be flaunted willy nilly?

As I have already mentioned, the house shakes when heavy vehicles pass by and I can only see this damage worsening with the building of the South Concept Framework development. I see this as having much greater impact than traffic coming from the North which pass by on the other side of the road to the property.

FLOODING

St Leonard's road has a history of serious flooding. Some good alleviation work was carried out by the council a few years ago but since the construction of a large property on the East of the road two years ago, and, ironically, road, pavement and drainage repairs last year, we have been plagued with flooding once again. Indeed, St Leonard's road has been flooded for more days than not over the last two months outside our property. I have written to ECC and the Highways Agency about this and reported it to our local District Councillor, Richard Bassett. I have had to ring the 101 police number twice this year already to alert police to vehicles trapped in water outside the house. Drainage here is totally inadequate. Access to _____ and neighbouring houses is cut off, and the pavement,

our cellar and my neighbours' garages both flood. Pedestrians have to cross the road and walk on the other side in the road as there is no pavement at this point. The boundary wall and pavement outside have been severely damaged by lorries driving through the water at high speed. Any further development will only add to these drainage problems.

STRAIN ON LOCAL FACILITIES

It is also my understanding that the village Primary School already has a long waiting list for places and the local Medical centres in Nazeing and Broxbourne are already struggling with high demand. In addition, our local bus service has been withdrawn several times already and is now only offering a very limited service to connect villagers with local towns. The local station Broxbourne is a mile and a half away and it takes 40 minutes at a very brisk pace to walk there along very narrow and badly maintained footpaths. Therefore, very few people walk to the station from Nazeing but use their private vehicles instead. At peak times a large development in the village is going to increase pressure on the road to the station.

NEW COMMUNITY CENTRE

Finally I am confused by the proposal for community buildings on the site as we already have these facilities at St Giles Hall in Nazeingbury and at the Leisure Centre in Bumbles Green. Indeed, there are already well developed plans to renovate St Giles' Hall to provide better facilities so that community activities there can be increased. St Giles is situated in the hub of the village opposite the Nazeing Parade of shops and has good parking facilities. As such, it is in easy walking distance from all four main streets in the village and close to Clayton Park and the playground in Elizabeth Close too. Surely it would be of much greater benefit to the Community for the Council to spend the funds they were planning on using for this new, remotely located, Community centre on helping the Church Parish Council to improve existing, centrally located, facilities?

In addition and as already mentioned, footpath provision along St Leonard's road is dire and dangerous and as the road is very narrow and dangerous, I cannot see how the footpaths could easily be improved. Most residents would therefore have to drive to this remote Community centre and therefore add to the number of vehicles using the road. Isn't a community centre in a remote location a contradiction in terms anyway?

ECOLOGY

I also note that there are ecological impacts to development of the area. I see from the Local Plan submission that development of the Area may affect a Protected Species (Great Crested Newts) population. Development proposals should be subject to careful design and layout to avoid the loss of Great Crested Newts or their habitat. Where adverse impacts of development proposals on Great Crested Newts are unavoidable, they should be addressed in accordance with the requirements of Policy DM 1.

In addition, we regularly have sightings of Muntjac, hedgehog and sparrows all of which are protected species as well as Roe deer and pheasant. Further development is obviously going to endanger these species yet further.