

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

Stakeholder ID 3089 Name CAROL Staff

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:

I do not see how this vision can hope to enhance quality of life for the existing residents of Epping Forest District and it certainly does not protect the district environment with the loss of valuable green spaces. It is likely to draw more people into a district that is already at, or close to, full capacity in terms of infrastructure for the existing residents i.e. roads, healthcare, emergency services, schools etc.

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:

I would definitely support a new garden village approach over locations within existing settlements. This would avoid the over development and irretrievable loss of character of our district's towns and villages.

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 3089 Name CAROL Staff

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Obviously new jobs will be created by the new retail park in Langston Road which is a good thing. However, due to unbelievable shortsightedness on the part of local town planners, a golden opportunity has been lost to create any additional housing on this site. The national trend is that people are reverting back to local shopping centres that they can walk or take a bus ride to thus avoiding these oversized retail parks which contribute to air pollution by their reliance on people visiting in motor vehicles.

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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

When I first heard about the plan to take away Loughton's green spaces for housing I thought it was a joke. I was totally unaware that this was proposed until somebody told me about the public meeting at Murray Hall on 17 November which I subsequently attended. I still have not received any mailing about the draft local plan from the district council although I have since received mailings from the LRA and Loughton Town Council. It was extremely forward thinking of planners of the time to provide these beautiful open spaces for the use of local people when Debden was conceived post WW2. They are valuable and should be given a monetary value

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

to reflect their worth as a district asset. Epping Forest itself makes the district distinct from other areas surrounding the City of London, however, it is not as accessible as the green spaces of Loughton for many reasons. Jessel Green and the other amenity open spaces at threat of development are much loved, much used and can never be reinstated once lost. There has been reference to evidence of "under utilisation" but I really would urge you to carry out a review of this evidence as I do question the methodology relied upon to arrive at this decision. Jessel Green in particular has a long history of community use and is a major contributor to the amazingly strong community feel that Debden has. Such is the strength of ownership and feeling for Jessel Green and Sandford Avenue/Westall Road green that local people will be left grieving for its loss should this ridiculous plan be allowed to go ahead. I cannot think of a more destructive action to strike at the heart of this community and fully understand why "Don't Dump on Debden" has been taken up as a battle cry locally. It just goes to show how much planners' and politicians' view of our landscape may differ radically from those of users. These spaces are outdoor community centres and should be recognised as being essential to our emotional, cognitive and psychological well-being (Ulrich 1984, Verderber 1986). They are not just for physical activity they also provide solace and respite from the stresses of modern everyday living. A host of studies have examined the use of public spaces with limited or moderate vegetation located in the heart of metropolitan areas (Altman, Zube 1989; Francis 1987; Jackson 1979; Taylor 1979). These studies have described the power of the urban park or plaza to reduce stress, act as a social facilitator and encourage community cohesion. They play a significant role in the lives of urban dwellers with less access to the more

vegetated landscape and provide societal benefits not available to those using areas where social contact is dispersed (Brill, 1989).

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

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

No opinion

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:

A technical feasibility study for the delivery of infrastructure should definitely have been commissioned BEFORE identifying land suitable for development. This does not appear to have been done and if it has I, for one, have not seen it. The district council is putting the cart before the horse. It has no powers itself to actually deliver the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Private developers can submit in their plans whatever they need to do just in order to get their plans passed in principle. If later on it becomes clear that the "proposed" infrastructure cannot be delivered for whatever reason it will be too late as the land will by then have been marked for development.

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

Quoting from the appraisal: "utilising open space within settlements where this would not adversely affect open space provision within the settlement and make the best use of existing land without compromising local character". I suggest that the loss of our greens in Debden WOULD clearly adversely affect provision. Retaining 25% is just a ploy to make us feel grateful that we have not lost it in it's entirety. I find this disingenuous and the only outcome local residents would accept is 100% retention. Local character WOULD indeed be compromised and to suggest otherwise is to show complete disregard to the strength of feeling local people have for the community that is Debden.

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