

Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 4753 Name Janet Ballard Roydon Parish Council

Method Survey

Date

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

•There is certainly pressure for additional housing across the entire region but it seems logical to focus development near to major highway networks like the M11 in support of the London to Cambridge development corridor. •The final plan must be rigorously supported by the necessary infrastructure and protection given to smaller settlements to protect their unique identities.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

•20% of all proposed housing for district is within the boundaries of Roydon Parish. The impact of urban extensions to Harlow will have a negative effect on the outlying communities particularly Broadley Common and Old House Lane. The Plan has an over-reliance on the Harlow urban extensions as a means to meeting the stated housing targets for the District. •Lobbying by other areas within the district, should not be allowed to increase housing allocations for Roydon Parish which is already being asked to take a large proportion of proposed development. Reason: To preserve the character of the village, its' surrounding hamlets and maintain the character of the landscape.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 4753

Name Janet

Ballard

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

•The proposals for urban extensions to Harlow, particularly at Sumners (which will encompass part of the Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area) and Katherines extend into Roydon Parish and will alter the Parish irrevocably. If the Plan goes ahead in its present form then protection of the various hamlets and communities on Harlow's borders, is paramount. •The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan highlights the need for a new M11 junction and improvements to various A roads where traffic issues have already been identified but none of these improvements will help traffic flows to the west of Harlow. As new development at Sumners and Katherines will be located some way from overground train services, pressure on roads which are already over used, particularly the B181, will increase as there is likely to be an over-reliance on London Underground's Central Line because it has cheaper fares. •The proposed extension to Katherines gives concern as the community of Old House Lane appears to be swamped by the development. An over-arching aim of the Plan is to preserve individual communities across the district but what is currently proposed will result in Old House Lane (including Epping Road), a very self-contained part of the Parish with housing and employment sites, losing its identity. Should the plan proceed, in its current form, then there should be a landscape buffer to separate, what should be, two very distinct communities. •Similarly Broadley Common, a named hamlet in the plan and sited within the Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area, has a very unique identity - the Sumners extension has the potential to coalesce with this hamlet unless measures are taken to protect it by providing the necessary landscape buffer.

4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

•Would only like to comment that sufficient parking should be available in towns along the Central Line not only for shopping but for onward travel into London.

5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

•Please see question 3 for comments about urban extensions to Harlow but within Roydon Parish.
•Residential Sites: Four development areas are proposed for Roydon, (Draft Policy P9) - all of which require the release of Green Belt land. The Parish Council does not agree with any MGB development within Roydon Village. SR-0035 - Permission has already been granted. SR-0197 - Conversion of the main house has already been agreed and development of the surrounding MGB land would, in our opinion, be over-development of a site with a poor access. Unsustainable site with no safe pedestrian access into the village. SR-0890 - Another MGB site with no safe pedestrian access into the village. SR-0169 - Part brownfield/part MGB site within the conservation area. Would consider supporting small scale development only on brownfield site. •Since the Plan start date of 2011, 20 houses have been built in the Village, 32 in Broadley Common and 6 in Dobbs Weir, a total of 58 for the Parish. If you add to this the 39 properties detailed in Draft Policy P9, then Roydon will have more new homes than the draft plan allows for during its 22 year life. For this reason extensions into the MGB are unnecessary and should not be included in the Plan. •Traveller Sites: The Parish Council objects to GRT_I_08 traveller site at Hamlet Hill (see question 9).

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

•The statement that the appropriate infrastructure will be provided is welcome but there are concerns not only about the delivery of this but that the problems facing rural areas of the district are not fully understood. The Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to be consulted on strategic masterplans for larger sites and would like to insist that this is specifically included in the Final Plan. •Education:- In rural village locations, residents expect their children to attend the local village school at primary level. This helps bond a community - in more urban areas there may be a number of different schools on offer to children. With rural schools, such as the one in Roydon which is already over-subscribed, any new housing in the village could result in children having to be taken out of the area to attend a school. Of course a new school located in a Harlow urban extension would be necessary but the infrastructure document does not clearly state that pupils from Roydon generally attend secondary schools in Harlow. •Health:- Roydon residents already struggle to secure health services - this is exacerbated by cross-border issues as GP services are generally provided by East Herts doctors. Sufficient capacity must be built in to meet the needs of expanded communities. •Traffic:- Most roads in the parish have congestion issues particularly at peak times - Roydon High Street and the B181 specifically. Urban extensions to the west of Harlow could exacerbate this particularly if traffic is not directed towards Harlow. Original plans for the Sumners extension excluded any exits onto the B181 and this should be the case for any of the western urban extensions. Developers will be expected to include road infrastructure within their plans but local roads, onto which new development traffic will exit, will be unable to cope with the additional traffic. The B181 is a prime route for accessing the Central Line for the west side of Harlow and local villages so western urban extensions would intensify use of this road. Additionally relying on public transport for these areas is unrealistic as has been shown in Church Langley, Harlow where commercial bus services have been withdrawn. •Traffic:- Development along the Cambridge - Stansted - London corridor, including in the EFDC district will increase rail traffic which may result in the level crossing at Roydon being closed more often as trains travel through and this could cause more traffic congestion issues. Possible four tracking of the line too could leave the crossing closed to traffic far more often. On street parking for the station is problematic now - any increase in commuter parking in Roydon will be difficult for a small village to absorb without parking restrictions being put in place.

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?

•Draft Policy H4 Traveller Site Development

STRONGLY DISAGREE The draft plan details concerns about an over-concentration of sites in Roydon and Nazeing but this policy proposes that over 61% of new traveller sites for the district should be located in the Parish (including the urban extensions west of Harlow). In addition to this, there are a number of temporary sites which, according to the draft Plan, may be granted permanent permission, subject to certain criteria. For this reason the Parish Council objects to an additional permanent site at Hamlet Hill GRT_I_08 and objects to any further permanent sites in the Parish. As an aside consideration should be given to locating separate sites for Gypsies and Travellers - they are different communities and generally wish to live separately.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

- Draft Policy E3 Food Production and Glasshouses

STRONGLY DISAGREE Roydon Village, Hamlet Hill, Tylers Cross and surrounding areas are severely affected by the activities of glasshouse businesses in the Roydon and Nazeing areas. HGV traffic on narrow rural roads is making residents lives a misery - there are accidents (vehicles being damaged, cars in ditches), environmental damage by HGV's using unsuitable roads and causing damage to verges etc. as well as pollution. Residents are also reporting that they are finding it difficult to exit their drives and are reporting many near misses. Some glasshouse businesses are in fact pack houses which import produce for onward distribution. This increases HGV movements and this type of business would be better suited to an industrial location rather than an area where almost all access is via rural roads. Draft policy E3 iv) is particularly relevant and the Parish Council would hope that applications which increase the use of inappropriate rural roads will be resisted at the planning stage by both district and county councils and would ask that this policy be detailed in a more robust way as Highway objections have, in the past, been extremely rare.
