

Appendix 1

EPF/1696/25 – Russell Cottage.

Resident One – Addressed the committee for clarity on the number of dwellings to be built, as the briefing note 1 submitted with the application indicated 20 dwellings. It was confirmed that the application was for permission in principle only and if the applicant decided to increase the number of dwellings than a further application would need to be submitted.

Resident Two - The neighbour of Russell Cottage – read a statement.

The below is our comments for both EPF/1696/25 and EPF/1691/25 as the same concerns apply should it be 3-5 dwellings or 5-9 dwellings.

We are a neighbour of the applications.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Without further detail on potential block planning, street scene and with confusion on the number of dwellings being proposed, as a neighbour of the proposed site/s we have serious concerns and believe this application should be rejected with a view to getting a full application which may provide reassurance and clarity on the planned development. The application is for 3 larger or 5 smaller dwellings (or 5 larger or 9 smaller dwellings) but the briefing note refers to circa 20 residential dwellings of 2,3 and 4 bedrooms.

Also note the letters regarding this application received from EFDC refer to a deadline of the 16th January 2026 and the planning portal online refers to a deadline for comments of the 13th January so it may be possible some residents miss the deadline due to this administrative difference.

We have concerns that the potential location of the new properties may have significant impact on our privacy with the topography of the site sitting higher at the rear allow for direct views both into our garden and also our main living spaces.

We also have concerns that without seeing a full block plan that the development could be excessively large or dominant and believe the new structure could make our property feel enclosed. There is no indication if the proposal will be sympathetic to the neighbouring houses and in keeping with the area.

We also have concerns with overshadowing as it would be possible the new development blocks sunlight to our property, reducing natural light to our garden and main living areas. We have had uninterrupted light for 20 years or more to our property.

We have further concerns around site access. Fluxs Lane is a very narrow road and has no pavement for pedestrians and no street lighting, with two cars passing there isn't safe space for pedestrians. In the briefing note there is mention of a "virtual pavement" and a image that is very out of date. The virtual pavement, which amounted to no more than a white line of paint, has not been present at the top end of Fluxs Lane for approximately 5 years. When Essex Highways re-painted the lines, they begun them much further up Fluxs Lane. Fluxs Lane is not a quiet road and this must be considered with this application. The road is a home to Coopersale Hall School which has recently expanded from solely primary to secondary, Epping Golf Course with both a full membership alongside being open as a public pay and play,

several industrial units reside on the lane which see a strong flow of commercial vehicles during business hours. There is also a scout hut which sees children walking from surrounding roads to attend beavers, cubs and scouts often in the dark during the winter months.

The junction of Brook Road, Stewards Green Road, Bower Hill and Fluxs Lane is already very difficult to cross requiring a pedestrian to look 4 ways before crossing, one of which is behind them. Our children walk to ESJ School and already find this junction dangerous. This doesn't also yet take into consideration SEMPA which will also see an additional road added for entry to the 400+ houses due to be built in the very near future. There was a recent fatal accident where a car crashed into a house at the bottom end of Bower Hill.

We would also raise the further concern of flooding. Fluxs Lane during the Autumn and Winters months floods on a regular basis with the drains unable to cope. This is with the current amount of ground for the water to dissipate with further development in this location and with the SEMPA builds to begin, this is something that requires attention.

We share the concerns we have heard many residents and councillors in the recent town and district meetings speak of serious concerns around the traffic problems that the SEMPA alone may create in the Brook Road, Fluxs Lane, Ivy Chimneys roads, and with the additional application made by Pigeon Developments for a significant development on Stewards Green Road, the East of Epping at 600+ properties without mitigation can the roads and junctions cope and therefore should we approve more applications that will potentially exacerbate the traffic and potential danger to pedestrians.

EPF/2477/25 – Land East of Stonards Hill.

Resident Three – Stated this site is green belt land, with ancient woodland attached and gas mains underneath. The land has been ploughed with no community benefit, and the neighbouring properties outlook would be the back of houses should this development proceed.

Resident Four - The Neighbour to the site read a statement

- Accessway to the site
 - High-speed access: The proposed access is on a national speed limit section of Stonards Hill, and the applicant's own Road Safety Audit acknowledges an increased collision risk.
 - Unsecured mitigation: Any speed limit reduction would require a separate Traffic Regulation Order and this is not secured through the application, so the safety case relies on measures that may not happen.
 - Steep gradients: The road falls away to the south and rises to the north of the access, which can increase approach speeds and stopping distances and makes turning movements less forgiving.
 - Pedestrian safety: There is no continuous footway nearby and the proposals rely on an uncontrolled crossing; the Road Safety Audit raises concerns over alignment, visibility and vegetation.
 - Width of room – as a semi-rural road two HGVs or larger vans can't pass each other safely without slowing significantly. The applicant's submission shows that refuse vehicles need to use the full width of the road (and even over-swing onto the new kerb and opposing verge) to get in and out of the proposed development. They haven't assessed other size vehicles (cars and

vans), which is a gap in their assessment. Given our experience at Old Pastures we would expect larger vans to need to use the full width of the road.

- Junction queuing: While the TA suggests only a small increase in traffic flows at the Stonards Hill/B1393 junction, local experience is that it already queues at peak times, and additional traffic could worsen this.

Policy conflict: Overall, safe and suitable access has not been clearly demonstrated, which conflicts with the NPPF highway safety test and Local Plan transport objectives.

- Transport assessment – their assertion that the site has excellent accessibility to travel by bus, train, cycle and for journeys on foot is incorrect. The underground station is a 20 minute walk away at best, buses are infrequent on the high street (a few hundred meters away and only twice an hour at best), cycling on a 60 mph narrow road is dangerous and there is no pavement for access on foot. If the development went ahead nearly all the occupants would need to rely upon cars.
- Ancient woodland – the applicant hasn't undertaken a tree survey and fully assessed how their proposed changes will impact the ancient woodland.
- Green belt to grey belt analysis – we don't believe the test has been met. This site makes an important contribution to the setting and characteristic of Epping, which is characterised by ancient woodland and rural landscapes surrounding the historic town centre. The site has both ancient woodland and rural landscapes.
- Ecology – our ecologist thinks there are a few areas of weakness in the application. This is particularly to do with Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation, bats, dormice, breeding birds and great crested newts.
- Type of application – it is not appropriate to have an outline planning application for a sensitive site in the green belt with ancient woodland. It is also questioned whether an EIA should be sought to understand the impacts on local infrastructure and services given the amount of other housing proposed in Epping.
- Use of the land – the applicant may have successfully lodged a Landowner Statement to stop the local community securing the perpetual right to use the land as a town green. However, the land is still regularly used by the public for walking, particularly with dogs, despite the applicant's efforts to try to stop them. It has been used as such since the 1960s. Therefore, the proposed "offer" of public access to the site as a public benefit is inappropriate.
- Consultation process – they say they leafleted lots of local residents. They didn't do this themselves. They instead relied upon the Epping Society to notify people. Given the significant number of reserved matters in their planning application, if the application is granted the public engagement process on the reserved needs to be stipulated.

Visibility – the site is highly visible from Old Pastures, where my mother lives. Croudace suggest that with some additional planting they will be able to “respect[s] the privacy and amenity of adjacent dwellings”. The information contained in the outline planning application provides no specific information to give us comfort about this planting. They also suggest that it will take 15 years post planting for the benefit to be properly established. If planning consent was granted, we would like a condition put in place that the applicant has to engage with us to agree a suitable temporary and permanent planting arrangement that they will implement at their cost to ensure our privacy is maintained.

Mr Charlie Geddes from The Epping Society - further supported the fact that this site is currently listed as Metropolitan Green Belt land, and the site has never been part of the Local Plan.