

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

Stakeholder ID 2695 Name Neil Donald

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I have no objection to new homes nor improving the infrastructure and would emphasise that this should be done as you have stated whilst protecting the Green Belt.

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

Should there be a need to release Green Belt land, consideration should be first given to Green Belt land that is already built upon. Namely Old Glasshouses. Redeveloping these sites could well reduce commercial traffic which is blighting the Lower Nazeing area.

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 2695

Name Neil

Donald

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Sensible expansion of current developments such as Industrial Estate seems sensible, however, consideration should be given to infrastructure and road networks that may or may not cope with such expansion.

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 opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

The plan has overlooked a quite sensible site behind Nazeing shops. A developer has already consulted with the community. However, the impact on infrastructure in the area for any development will be immense. A relief road/by pass for commercial vehicles should be considered as with traffic as it stands, it is only a matter of time before someone is killed by a speeding lorry jumping the traffic lights. It is seriously dangerous and adding more houses will kill this village. I've also attached my thoughts on the proposal of building more houses in St Leonards Road, ...Redacted.... If we have to build in Nazeing, please consider Glass House sites first as I would prefer more cars and less lorries on the roads around Nazeing. Neither option is ideal.

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

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:

Insufficient clarity on what will happen in respect to increased flood risks caused by building new homes on green belt land in South Nazeing. Developers should be made to pay for infrastructure projects such as renewing the Victorian sewerage system to compensate for removing natural drainage. No plans for school expansion in Nazeing. Nazeing Primary is full to capacity presently. Regular power cuts are a result, like the increased flooding risk of continued small building projects without infrastructure thoughts or reports from developers that there will be minimal impact. Minimal impact over the years has now caused this situation which the Shambolic Parish Council and EFDC are to blame.

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

I can not understand why EFDC considers that building upon agricultural fields (Green Belt) is a solution before considering reusing Glass House sites. Obviously, for a developer it is cheaper to build on land that they do not have to demolish buildings, hence, the applications for building on land on St Leonards Road. I am also very confused as to why EFDC has not considered the Stallan Group Ltd New Homes for Nazeing suggestion. This has so many more plus points than the St Leonards Road option. It would reuse an old Glass House site. It would reduce Articulated Traffic in the area (agreed it would increase cars but that is better than more Lorries). It's sensibly sized and does not include any unwanted buildings such as another Village Hall and more football fields, which is clearly a Parish Council wish that is out of touch and driven by personal situations that I believe is a conflict of interest. The Parish Council has already demonstrated their abilities in local management of the area. The management and purchase of the old Total Petrol Station is a prime example of total incompetence with none of the Council's taking responsibilities and stepping down, nor any apology. Hence, everyone I speak to has lost any faith in their ability to manage the Parish Council.

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

I understand what the Local Plan is trying to achieve and appreciate that there may well be a need to additional housing. I dispute the actual number of new houses as this analysis is now outdated. In respect to Nazeing. There are a number of sites that should be considered prior to using Prime Green Belt land. These sites are Glass House site and were even mentioned in the last Local Plan. There are sites in Hoe Lane, which

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

is the last place you would want to send articulated traffic for Glass Houses. Why not consider small housing plots there. Fernbank Nursery behind Nazeingbury Shops. The developer has put forward a well thought out, sensible plan to convert some old Glass Houses in to housing. Unlike the plans in St Leonards Road. That's a start. Nazeing Glass industrial estate is another longer term plan. In summary, I can't see the need to use Prime Green Belt land in the longer term. Where ever developments are considered, serious consideration to Nazeings Victorian sewerage system, improving flood defences, improving the electricity supplies, traffic calming consideration, wider pedestrian areas and a bypass to balance the additional traffic.
