

From: [mailto:]
Sent: 26 January 2018 16:20
To: LDFconsult
Cc:
Subject: Re: South Epping Plan EPP.R1 and EPPR.2

Dear Planning Policy Team

I have come into the Planning Department at the Civic Offices today. I was told at reception that the Planning Office closes at 1.00pm and to put any representations in the post box provided at the Planning Department on the 2nd floor. This postbox has not been provided. I and a member of Council staff searched everywhere - no box provided. What's going on, have other people had the same problem?

My name is Gary Levy, of .

Kind regards
Gary Levy

-----Original Message-----

From: LDFconsult <LDFconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk>
To: ' ' >
Sent: Fri, 26 Jan 2018 14:57
Subject: RE: South Epping Plan EPP.R1 and EPPR.2

Dear Gary,

Please can you provide a postal address if you'd like your comments below to be treated as a formal representation to the Local Plan as this is a legal requirement.

Kind regards,

Planning Policy Team

Planning Policy | 01992 564517
Epping Forest District Council | Civic Offices | 323 High Street | Epping | Essex | CM16 4BZ

From: Derek Macnab
Sent: 25 January 2018 11:03
To: '
Cc: Maya Cullen
Subject: RE: South Epping Plan EPP.R1 and EPPR.2

Dear Mr Levy

Thank you for your e-mail regarding the above two sites, which have been included in the District Council's Submission Version 2017.

Firstly, you will appreciate that I am not in a position to comment on what Mr Church is reported to have said at the recent meeting you attended, having not been present in person. However, I can confirm that Mr Tony Church, whilst previously being an elected Member of Epping Forest District Council, has not been a District Councillor since he did not stand for re-election in May 2016. As such, he has not been a member of the Planning Authority for some time. However, Mr Church is an elected Member of Epping Town Council, who are responsible for producing their own Neighbourhood Plan, and perhaps this is where an element of confusion may have crept in. However, I am speculating on this point.

With regard to Sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, I can confirm that they were subject to the same site assessment methodology that was consistently applied to all sites put forward by their land-owners. This involved, not only desktop analysis, but also site visits. I can confirm that the Epping sites were walked and this included the Council's Landscape Officer. With respect to the issue of flooding, I can also advise that the Council, as required and validated by the Environment Agency, has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. As a result, the Council has only allocated sites that are within Flood Zone 1, the lowest flood risk category. The sites to the south of Epping are within this category. However, in accordance with any Development Management Application, a developer will have to produce a bespoke flood risk assessment in relation to any application, outlining how they would mitigate any flood risk issues.

The Council has developed an infrastructure delivery plan to assess, not only what infrastructure is required to support growth, but also to confirm that there is sufficient land value to support the necessary infrastructure. It is not public money that will be used to provide infrastructure, but rather the onus is put on developers through mechanisms such as S106 agreements, to fund the necessary community infrastructure in relation to transport, health, education etc.

It is worth noting that to achieve the required infrastructure, there is a requirement within the Submission Version (P117 South Epping Masterplan Area attached – also available on the Council's Website), to produce a Masterplan which will need to be endorsed by the Council as planning authority. Any form of development will need to be in accordance with the Masterplan, which you can see, has a list of specific requirements which hopefully address many of your points on your list of concerns.

I am assuming that you wish your concerns to be considered as a representation on the Plan and have forwarded to my colleagues in the Planning Policy Team for inclusion.

I hope this information is useful.

Regards

Derek Macnab
Director of Neighbourhoods &

Deputy Chief Executive

From:]
Sent: 23 January 2018 10:00
To: Derek Macnab
Subject: South Epping Plan EPP.R1 and EPP.R2

Dear Mr MacNab

I have read with incredulity that ARUP have assessed the land EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, and after considering all planning merits have selected sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 the best to comply with the Council's agreed strategy.

I have been advised that in your position in management of the Planning Policy Team, your team have produced the Local Plan. I would presume that a list of the merits of the land EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 has been compiled?

I have recently sat in a meeting wherein Mr Tony Church, describing himself as a EFDC Councillor, told the meeting that Epping Councillors acted in the existing residents best interest as the Council had no alternative other than to enter this Green Belt Land otherwise the Government would impose planning on other Green Belt sites in Epping and would double the amount of houses to be built, I was dismayed. Mr Church urged those attending not to complain about the sites EPP.1 and EPP.2, this was obviously a scare tactic. To confess that the Councillors voted for an unsuitable site in order to avoid development on other more accessible and healthier Green Belt sites is disgusting.

You are well aware of the huge negative response by local residents to the proposal to build on EPP.R1 and EPP.R2, but I would remind you that it is also future residents lives that should be considered. It would nice to know if any of your team have actually walked the periphery of the site? If you had you would have realised that the terrain is totally different to how it looks from the road.

I can list my concerns:

1. Having lived at the [redacted] at EPP.R2 for 30 years, I can confirm that this land is always waterlogged, This land was the site of 5 natural ponds which have been filled in.
2. Site constraint the site boundary is the M25 and the junction of the M25/M11.
- 3 The central line railway line runs through the middle of the site.
4. It is a 20-25 minute strenuous uphill walk to the station for a fit person.
5. It is a 30 minute strenuous uphill walk for a fit person to the town.
6. It is a 50 minute walk for a fit person to the Limes Medical Centre.
7. Due to 4,5, and 6, new residents would no doubt need to use a car (we can assume cycling uphill would be equally difficult) We could probably assume this would cause an extra 1500/2000 cars on the already congested roads of South Epping.
8. The land contains 3 high voltage pylons.
9. No infrastructure is in place in the surrounding area to cope with the amount of new households in one confined area, no senior school in the area, no doctors, no leisure facilities and existing roads unable to cope.
10. Restricted access to the EPP.R1 site via Ivy Chimney's.
11. Restricted access to the EPP.R2 site via Fluxs Lane.
12. The restricted access from Bridge Hill to Brook Road.
13. No access joining both sites.
14. Noise/Air pollution for new residents of EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 is very high. Although we live on EPP.R2 much of the land to be developed is much closer to the M25 and junction of M11. However, the motorway is very loud from our property.
15. Due to the hilly terrain of the sites, the land falls down below M25 on EPP.2.
16. The removal of Green Belt south of Epping would be 'High Risk'. Other potential sites (land east of Orchards/North Weald Golf Course) is low or medium risk.

This land was supposed to have been considered against other sites in Epping, I cannot believe that land not bordering the motorway and within walking distance from railway station, walking distance from the town, walking distance from the Medical Centre and walking distance to senior schools could have been deemed less suitable?? Not only do the other sites have the benefit of being closer to amenities, but the other major benefit is that the infrastructure is in place. **The major point must be that other sites would not require these enormous costly improvements to make them viable.** Also the junctions at Ivy Chimneys/Theydon Road and Fluxs Lane/Bower Hill, these would be the only points of access to the sites and cannot be extended, has the impact on surrounding roads ie Bower Hill and The Bell Common junction been properly assessed?

To make the sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 workable I have heard some of the suggestions put forward by your department are:

- a. The erection of barriers along the M25 to shield the land from noise and air pollution. As this land is very hilly and the land drops down below the motorway, housing close by would be like being in a prison and as the land goes uphill the barriers would probably be useless half way up the hill.
- b. The building of a relief road/bridge over the Central Line or under the Central Line. This is an enormous task and would be extremely costly.
- c. The rebuilding of junctions at Ivy Chimneys and Fluxs Lane.
- c. The building of another school and doctors surgery.

All of the above work will need to be completed to make this South Epping Plan feasible. Can you please advise local residents of the merits of the sites which would make EPP.R1 and EPP.R2 more favourable than others. I cannot understand, as a layman, how your team thoroughly considered the sites and came to the conclusion that the site that requiring 10-20 million being spent on infrastructure improvements before making it viable for building on is the most favourable.

Can you also advise local residents, who will be footing the bill for the infrastructure works of 10-20 million for the sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2? It seems to me that not only does your department intend years of disruption for the residents of South Epping, you also possibly expect them to pay for it! Either through council tax or government collected income tax. Please clarify?

I look forward to receiving your response.

Regards
Gary Levy

DISCLAIMER

This email is for the use of the intended recipients only. Any opinion or advice it contains is that of the sender and does not bind the authority in any way. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete the message. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email.

We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise that you carry out your own virus checks on an attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Internet email is not a secure communication medium, and we advise that you observe this lack of security when emailing us.

Epping Forest District Council

Postmaster@Eppingforestdc.gov.uk