

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	Craig		
Last Name	Nichols		
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: No

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.

South Epping does not have the capacity for a '450' new homes and the number of new residents this would bring to an already full community. Furthermore, there is no mention of improvements to infrastructure most notably roads. Ivy Chimneys road is already an exceptionally busy road with constant traffic given the local school and how narrow the road width is. Furthermore, the the parking permit bays make giving way and traffic build up constant in its current format, without the addition of new homes and cars. Traffic backs up from Ivy Chimneys to Bell Common and around Coopersale School everyday, additional homes would only compel an existing problem, given additional cars (electric or not) would be forced onto existing infrastructure. How do the council / developers foresee a construction site with multiple lorry's and tradesmen accessing the site from congested narrow roads leading to the proposed site? Furthermore, Ivy Chimneys school would need expanding to accommodate new children in the area, but very little detail is given around a new school or expanding of existing or a new GP / Health hub. A new school and GP surgery should be compulsory given the number of new residents at least 450 new homes would bring on already stretched facilities. The central line will also see further pressure at peak times, meaning more crowded and longer journeys for the existing community.

Plans are meant to improve areas not damage the existing community, but the lack of thought with regard to infrastructure will only burden the town we currently call home.

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.

Severe lack of thought with regard to infrastructure and existing pressures and demands within the current community. The Brownbelt should also be preserved as per previous government policy.

Signature: Craig Nichols Date:
20/09/2021