

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

Stakeholder ID	3101	Name	Jeffrey	Smith
Method	Letter			
Date	30/1/2017			

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

Letter or Email Response:

I believe the St Justs 1 Powell Road Buckhurst Hill site should not be included in the sites proposed for residential development in the Local Plan for a number of reasons and have the following comments. 1. The site is designated green belt and it is next to a Local Nature Reserve. The Local Plan does not constitute the exceptional need that would enable the designation to be removed and removing it would make such designations meaningless. Development of 31 homes so close to the Nature Reserve will inevitably adversely affect the Reserve. Trying to enforce conditions on development to protect the Reserve would be difficult if not impossible to enforce given the number of homes and therefore individual owners/tenants who might be responsible for breaches of such conditions. 2. The density of development of 31 homes (whatever is meant by the expression a home) on the site would be out of character with the surrounding area/neighbourhood, which is low density detached with some semi detached) housing and would conflict with the housing mix policy of the Local Plan. 3. Development on the same scale as the surrounding housing would result in approximately 5 detached houses being built on the site. If it is thought the site can be used for residential development, notwithstanding the green belt designation and other issues referred to in this letter, a development of this nature/density would be in keeping with the surrounding houses/street scene, make enforcement of planning conditions to protect the adjoining Nature Reserve more easily enforceable and preserve some of the existing use of the green belt land as garden. 4. The additional traffic that would be generated by 31 new homes, which will inevitably have more than 31 cars, is unacceptable. Roebuck Lane already has speed humps to try and reduce the speed and volume of traffic on it (they do not achieve this objective as only small or low cars are slowed by the humps) and the entrance to the site would have to be located in a potentially dangerous position just around the bend on the junction of Powell Road and Roebuck Lane. Vehicles approach and take this bend at speed, particularly from the High Road. 5. Parking restrictions were recently introduced on Roebuck Lane around the Little Pluckett's Way junction which has pushed cars previously parking in this area towards the site and Forest Place Nursing Home so that there is now a mixture of staff/visitor parking for FPNH and commuter parking as well as parking by dog walkers using the Local Nature Reserve. This narrows Roebuck Lane effectively to a single carriageway and would no doubt be repeated in front of the site if 31 homes were built on it, exacerbating the potential danger of a new entrance to 31 homes. 6. An application by McCarthy & Stone to build a care home on the site was recently rejected for a number of reasons. They included the proposal involved limited infilling in excess of that permitted as an exception under the National Planning Policy Framework and building a single large building would affect the setting of St Justs, which is listed. The former reason applies equally, if not more, to a development of 31 homes and the latter reason also applies, particularly if a block of flats has to be built to squeeze 31 homes on to the site.

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

Stakeholder ID	3101	Name	Jeffrey	Smith
----------------	------	------	---------	-------

