

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

Stakeholder ID 4730 Name Delia Ball

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

The idea is to protect the Green Belt, but the draft Local Plan certainly does not do this and will unfortunately result in the loss of many clear and definable Green Belt boundaries!

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

The incursions into the Green Belt have been badly thought out. There is no detailed justification for 360 new houses in and around Theydon Bois. None of the evidence produced by EFDC supports their new approach to sustainable development with regard to Green Belt boundaries and is not in line with Government thinking. It is not sensible to distribute housing allocation and other development around all of the settlements in the District. Development should be focussed on the towns in the District where they will benefit from strong existing infrastructure and facilities. (Illegible)

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

It is more sustainable to focus development on towns, but any approach that encroaches into the Green Belt is wrong and should not be allowed.

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

Stakeholder ID 4730

Name Delia

Ball

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:

Creating primary shopping areas should help focus retail development in these areas, but it should be implemented so as not to undermine existing local facilities that are found within the smaller settlements of the district.

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

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

EFDC's plans for employment development on Green Belt sites are not sustainable and will have adverse impacts on transport links, infrastructure and local job opportunities. New employment opportunities should be directed towards the larger allocated sites close to, and within the towns of the District and settlements which are keen to expand in a sustainable manner. "Sustainable development" is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

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)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Four of the Theydon Boise sites are in the Green Belt and these parts of the Green Belt have been identified as suffering a high or very high level of harm should they be allocated for housing. This harm will result in encroachment into the countryside and undermine the rural character and setting of our village. 360 new houses in and around Theydon Bois is a disproportionate allocation and amounts to a 23% increase in the size of our village, which would destroy our present character and would not comply with EFDC's "vision". Present and foreseeable infrastructure cannot/will not support this amount of growth - public transport, sewage removal, school provision, flooding, doctors = already heavily oversubscribed and overworked, water supply - meters are needed urgently! (illegible) In Theydon Bois we have a dark sky policy (no street lighting) this must always be considered and kept this way. I have found that (illegible), visitors, etc do not like the darkness in Theydon Bois at all. Perhaps people thinking of moving in the many new houses you are considering building

should be warned about this before finding themselves in an area they would prefer not to be and also many more buildings would not be a very good idea or viable option.

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

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:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

No the plan does not state what the specific requirements for infrastructure will be? This subject is generalised and difficult to quantify as part of a new development. There are no provisions to ensure that the infrastructure needed will be provided in the right place at the right time or even be provided at all!

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

The interim Sustainability Appraisal does not support the wide dispersal of development in and around the large and small villages of the District. In respect of Theydon Bois, the transport links are already at capacity and the underground is well over capacity at peak times (crowded!) The underground station is poor staffed, never anyone on duty to help passengers or help if anyone is in trouble or any trouble (i.e.) fights/accidents/complications occur. The underground station is poorly served by the existing road network and bus services, such that development designed and located to use this station will further add to the congestion and overcrowding already experienced around the station from the trains. The many cars parked around the station show the enormous usage by commuters of the Central line, mostly to London, but also other parts. Attachment.

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

Policies are severely lacking i.e. there are no detailed Green Belt policies to define "disproportionate extensions to properties in the Green Belt or say what "materially larger" means? How do we approach new development of previously development land in the Green Belt? What is needed is a consistent approach at District level and more detail regarding such policies as those on design and infrastructure. This should ensure that local character of villages like Theydon Bois are maintained and improved. How will you stop planning

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

applications for the new housing from coming forward, before a Masterplan has been produced for the site?
N.B. parking provision is not mentioned in the detailed policies of the local plan.
