

## Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	1367	Name	Neil and Carol	Moonie
----------------	------	------	----------------	--------

Method	Letter
--------	--------

Date	1/12/2016
------	-----------

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: [ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

### Letter or Email Response:

Dear Sir/Madam, Thank you for requesting feedback on the Draft Local Plan. We are writing to express some general opinions on your questions 1&7 and to raise specific issues with the proposed site at Kingsmead House (Q6). The Green Belt and Infrastructure Q1 & 7 Your leaflet advertising the draft local plan acknowledges that the first priority of residents was to protect the green belt - and this would be our view. The draft plan proposes to release 1.5% of Green Belt land. We would perceive this proposition as inconsistent with protecting it. We read the plan as a decision that housing targets necessarily take priority over the concept of Green Belt which will now retain little meaning. The draft plan acknowledges the need for additional infrastructure in order to support new housing. Whilst very detailed work has been undertaken to identify the sites for building, the section on infrastructure provision appeared to consist of outline policies and aspirations. We could see no detailed reference to the provision of new transport links, roads, water & sewage, schools, surgeries, hospitals or leisure amenities. We understand that EFDC may be in an impossible position - required to plan for an ever expanding population but without the power to plan for the associated infrastructure needed to support it. We fear that the 11,400 homes will indeed be built but without any meaningful increase in necessary provision despite the existence of policies. We are afraid that the quality of life in this area will decline due to a lack of what was once referred to as 'joined up government'. So in general we are not in agreement with the overall vision or with the approach to infrastructure (Q1 and Q6). Our Specific Concern - SR-0197(Q6) We have enjoyed living in Roydon village for the past 27 years and we recognise the picture of strengths and weaknesses depicted in 5.149. We are pleased that the development plan will preserve the essential nature of the village. We are concerned with the proposals for the site SR-0197 - removal of green belt status allowing approximately 10 new houses to be built in the grounds of Kingsmead house. Kingsmead House is an Edwardian Great house which has stood in its own gardens for over a century. Described by estate agents as a 'fine example of the arts and crafts house' the property might be considered as non-designated heritage. Kingsmead currently has planning approval for conversion into flats but the owners have not proceeded with development. The site comprises both green belt land previously considered strategic green belt required to maintain the identity of Roydon as a village. Kingsmead house has a long history of contentious planning applications and proposals for modest extension of the house have been refused in the past in order to preserve the Green Belt (EPF/0137/07). We supported limited development of Kingsmead in 2007 as we thought the proposals were in keeping with the site and we can also understand that conversion of the Great house to flats may not be profitable without some development. At that time it was also a pleasure to work with the developer who was prepared to consult local residents. We believe the building of 10 houses in the grounds of Kingsmead would result in a high density housing estate in a section of what was once a garden. The Great House would surely be swamped by the surrounding buildings and the new estate would severely impact neighbouring properties. We cannot

### Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	1367	Name	Neil and Carol	Moonie
----------------	------	------	----------------	--------

see how such an estate would be consistent with maintaining the semi-rural character of the whole village. We understand that the current owners of the site originally proposed to convert the house for people over the age of 55 years but once Green Belt status is withdrawn we foresee that that the site could be used for any type of housing. There is no pavement at this location to facilitate pedestrian access to the centre of the village. Public transport links are poor and the site is almost a mile from the local railway station. An estate on this site may well meet the needs of people who wish to commute by car to the wider London region, but this development cannot be claimed to be benefit to people residing in Roydon or the immediate area. Whilst it might be possible for limited development to take place without destroying the historical character and natural environment of this green belt site, we believe that ten houses in the grounds of the great house will detract from the natural and the built environment in this village. So in summary we do not agree that SR-0197 is a 'lower performing Green Belt site' - this was not the view taken by the inspector in 2007 when the decision to refuse planning permission was appealed. We do accept that some limited development could take place whilst preserving the natural and built environment. We note section 5.154 States that: 'the Council will be undertaking further work to enable more detailed guidance and holding dicussions with promoters'. We also hope development and the sensitive nature of this site. Yours sincerely ....Redacted...