Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Miss	
First Name	Sharon	
Last Name	Spicer	
Job Title (where relevant)	Global solutions consultant	
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: 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 Planto be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

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

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.

Originally additional vehicle bridge was planned to aid the heavy additional congestion new developments brings to the area. Bridge road and Ivy chimneys already has congested traffic due the road being narrow, additional traffic with 450 will over populate the area, traffic congestion, increased air pollution and no alternative traffic routes to an already congested traffic area. Council must seek alternative roads to enter the site other side as well to aid the increased inspected traffic.

Original plans also had healthcare facilities to be added which will s now removed, we currently do not have enough empty spaces on Epping healthcare for existing residents let alone more people 450 houses bring. Without extra health facilities or schools the existing facilities in Epping will be stretched too far and fail residents of Epping.

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.

We need proper infrastructure to support the creation of 450 new homes, effective roads and bridges for alternative routes, healthcare facilities and an additional school m, all of which will be needed as there currently not enough space in Epping's existing healthcare providers

REPRESENTATION

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

MM no: 28

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 Planto be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

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

Mixtures of houses and flats should be created to ensure Epping community culture retains to be in mixed proportions

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.

Plans for mistime of accommodation and local shops to support 450 houses

REPRESENTATION

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

MM no: 24

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 Planto be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Justified, Consistent with national policy

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.

We need more green spaces around new developments to ease pressure on Epping Forrest itself

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.

Parks, green spaces and trees required

Signature: Sharon Spicer Date: 15/09/2021