

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)	
Title	Mr		
First Name	Roger		
Last Name	Rose		
Job Title (where relevant)			
Organisation (where relevant)			
Address			
Post Code			
Telephone Number			
E-mail Address			

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which Main Modification number and/or supporting document of the Local Plan does your representation relate to?

MM no: 78

Supporting document reference: A. Council's response to Actions outlined in Inspector's post examination hearing advice (Examination document reference number ED98), July 2021 (ED133)

Do you consider this Main Modification and/or supporting document of the Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Effective, Justified

Please give details of why you consider the Main Modification and/or supporting document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

450 new homes in South Epping as proposed in the plan without adding the required infrastructure would put unacceptable strain on existing services, local GP surgeries are at or above capacity and schools are full.

A new primary school and GP surgery are absolutely essential to make the development viable. (I notice the amended wording is changed from new primary school to "primary school and early learning places").

The proposed access roads would obviously cause more congestion (especially without the inter site road bridge which is now removed from the plan) in the Brook Rd./Bridge Hill area. The railway bridge is a current bottleneck and adding more traffic to this is ridiculous however you look at it, the road can't be widened or modified at this location and adding a new site access road to the mix would be absolute madness. Traffic lights would not work as any waiting vehicles on the Brook Road side would not leave space for Bridge Hill traffic to pass due to resident parking in the vicinity. Traffic calming has been required in Brook Rd. as long as I can remember and only now does it appear to be a requirement. Limited parking on the development could also lead to weekend visitors parking on Brook Rd. adding to congestion.

I think more INDEPENDENT traffic surveys should be carried out as evidence gathered previously was taken at what appeared to be carefully chosen times such as school holidays, overnight or very short periods at off peak times.

What appears to be at first glance to be a "prime" location for a new development becomes less and less viable as each potential problem is considered, too many promises are being made by those parties with a financial interest but there is no guarantee these would not be forgotten about or "bought out" at a later stage.

It's too big a responsibility for local councillors to have control over something this sensitive particularly where there is a conflict of interest over where development happens.

The current main drain in Brook Rd would not be able to take the extra capacity from 450 new homes, at times of heavy rain the drains overflow and the road floods.

Air Quality.

I fail to see how a development can be considered adjacent to one of the busiest motorways in Europe, the air must be polluted and I can't see what sort of mitigation policy would change this. We have seen in London the effect air pollution from road traffic can have on the health of residents. This must be surveyed by an INDEPENDENT body with no interest in the use of the site.

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification and/or supporting document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with national policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

More local infrastructure must be guaranteed (GP surgery, new Primary School) to make this a viable site, proper drainage from the site. A complete survey of the local drain and sewer network should be carried out to judge capacity and what is required to get it to the standard required. The proposed modifications do not go far enough to address the concerns raised by the government Planning Inspector and as such the development is not justified or effective as it stands.

REPRESENTATION

To which Main Modification number and/or supporting document of the Local Plan does your representation relate to?

MM no: 77

Supporting document reference: A. Council's response to Actions outlined in Inspector's post examination hearing advice (Examination document reference number ED98), July 2021 (ED133)

Do you consider this Main Modification and/or supporting document of the Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Effective, Justified

Please give details of why you consider the Main Modification and/or supporting document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Matter 15 Hearing Statement

A key consideration for development proposals in Epping, is to ensure that new development provides opportunities to access jobs, services, education and leisure opportunities through walking, cycling and public transport. This will include the provision of safe and convenient routes to key destinations, including to Epping London Underground Station. Measures should provide viable alternatives to private car use, and prevent the establishment of unsustainable travel behaviour."

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification and/or supporting document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with national policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Walking and cycling to the main facilities in Epping (shops, station, library etc.) is not easy, whichever route is taken there is a steep gradient to overcome. I can't envisage many people cycling to the shops and walking is equally difficult for anyone but the healthiest of us especially carrying shopping. I think people will choose to drive as the site has not been chosen with greener alternatives in mind. A frequent shuttle bus would add to both congestion and pollution therefore the development would not be effective and as such unjustified.

Signature: R C Rose Date:
22/09/2021