

**From:** Richard Ley  
**To:** [LDFconsult](#)  
**Subject:** Supplementary Representation - Regulation 20 representation  
**Date:** 23 April 2018 10:55:33

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to follow up on the Regulation 20 representation in relation to the publication of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version ("LPSV").

I have been made aware via the Epping Society and various other local community members that some of the appendices to the site selection report had not been published prior to the deadline for us to make the original representation and therefore we were not able to comment on them. I would like to point out at this stage that I have received no contact from EFDC to make us aware of this opportunity and I have not seen any information regarding this anywhere in the local area.

Why were these Reports suppressed? They were not available ahead of the EFDC meeting on December 14th EFDC that ratified the Plan. They were in fact, only published several of weeks ago.

I have been made aware that EFDC are only writing to people who made specific reference to the 'missing' Reports in their original representation. Surely EFDC should be writing to everyone who made a representation, as how are people in the community possibly meant to know that important documents were not available. This is an example of low professional standards, and a failure to be transparent with the process which is increasingly appearing to have been conducted without the level of due diligence and care that something so important to our community deserves.

The newly uploaded documents show land east of the Central Line and parts of Thrift Hall Farm, amongst others in Theydon Bois, were not included because residents 'indicated that the site is less preferred by the community as a result of the scale of growth proposed.' – this doesn't sound like the evidence based approach we were led to believe was being followed.

Other examples in the Appendices B and C that do not seem logical or evidence based.

SR-0071 - **No on-site restrictions or constraints were identified** and it was considered that identified deficiencies in secondary school places would not adversely affect the achievability of the site; consideration of infrastructure requirements has been dealt with through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017). **Not proposed for allocation**

Yet... SR-0069, SR-0069/33, SR-0113A, SR-0113B - **On-site restrictions were identified**, but it was considered that these could be overcome, and it was considered that identified deficiencies in primary or secondary school places and GP surgeries would not adversely affect the achievability of the site; consideration of infrastructure requirements has been dealt with through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017). **Proposed for allocation**

SR-0347 – Epping Sports Centre (recently renovated at great cost). This site would surely fall into the 'indicated that the site is less preferred by the community..' The local feeling regarding this site is I would argue way beyond "less preferred". I have seen many people campaigning and receiving hundreds of signatures on their petitions and I have heard first hand messages of support for members of the community thanking

them for standing up for the feelings of the local residents.

Also, it is clear to note that Theydon Bois seems to have almost all of the proposed sites removed – and that the strain of the extra allocation is not being spread in anyway evenly across the district. I would like this to be investigated by the LPSV.

I am deeply concerned that the process has not been transparent and also consistent across the district. I also have serious concerns that the infrastructure will not be completed as so often happens with these plans.

I am aware of problems in Bishops Stortford where developers have failed to deliver the promised doctors, schools, road links as the money ran out once they'd built the houses they make a profit on. Being a resident of the South of Epping I have particular concerns around the feasibility of a bridge / road crossing the Central Line – I cannot understand how this could be considered versus the land east of the Orchards for example.

Yours sincerely,

Mr R D Ley & Mrs F Ley

