

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	Ben		
Last Name	Charlesworth		
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: 77

Supporting document reference: L. South Epping Masterplan Area Capacity Analysis (Sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2), March 2020 (ED120/ EB1421)

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

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

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

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' means lots of additional residents. ADDING ALOT of extra traffic, congestion and people to Road, local facilities etc, that are ALREADY over streached.

Originally, a vehicular bridge was included in the plans, which would ease congestion. In the current Main Modifications consultation, this has been removed - WHY? Cost saving?

The existing roads are narrow, bendy and congested and cannot cope with the current traffic. South Epping must have the necessary infrastructure to cope with additional traffic. This is particularly so for emergency, delivery/waste disposal/operational vehicles.

The current proposals say that 'appropriate' community and healthcare facilities must be provided. The existing GPs cannot cover the current population. A GP/health hub is an absolute must at South Epping, particularly given the site's location at the bottom of a steep hill, away from the current healthcare providers.

The current proposals say that a new school must be provided. Ivy Chimneys is already at capacity. A new, additional school is an absolute must for this site.

The necessary green Infrastructure must be provided to support not only the South Epping development but also Epping Forest.

If South Epping does not get the necessary infrastructure, this will put additional pressure on the whole Town and Parish in terms of oversubscribed doctors, dentists, school places, road congestion and air pollution.

Have your say. Send in your comments to Epping Forest District Council and make sure that we get the infrastructure needed for this development.

Other issues you may care to mention:

Housing: must be a mixture of tenures, not just flats. (Add ref MM28 to these comments.)

Our Green Spaces must be protected. Highlight any that deserve protection. (Add ref MM24 and MM53 to these comments.)

We need more green spaces in and around developments to ease pressure on the Forest.

Historical assets: must be protected by independent professional reports and assessments, not appraised by developers. (Add reference MM55 to these comments.) Much of the content is vague. There needs to be more definite facts included. The Inspector of the Local Plan needs to hear your comments.

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.

Signature: Ben Charlesworth Date:
23/09/2021