

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

Stakeholder ID 2694 Name Margaret Manton

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Since moving to Thornwood in October 2007 it has had 8 houses built in Upland road on the site of the Rugby Club. It is also about to loose the building of its last remaining public house and restaurant due to gross miss management of the business to be replaced by 3 houses and is soon to loose its Garden Centre and Cafe within it for 18 or 19 houses. Neither of which is shown on the draft local plan. The plan then adds 124-130 (Depending on which chapter you look at P11 or SP2) planned houses to be built on designated green belt land with only lip service of what infrastructure will be included as this has not been planned yet. Where are all the additional vehicles that this development is going to add to the hamlet/village going to park and go to? The old A11 High Road struggles to accommodate the local traffic from Thornwood and surrounding areas as it is, especially when there are problems on the M11, M25 and A414. There seems to be little or no consideration taken from past mistakes such as the development on the Blacksmith Arms site where garages are too small for present day car width and parking is hazardous to both road users and pedestrian. In Church Langley, Harlow there is only one exit onto the main road causing gridlock for residents exiting their homes during rush hours and again when there are problems on the M11.

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:

The amount of housing proposed for the Parish of North Weald which includes North weald village, Thornwood and Hastingwood is unacceptable " Some 24.29 per cent of the proposed housing allocation for the Epping Forest district, detailed in the draft local plan, would be within the North Weald Bassett parish." Again the main Roads out of these areas feed into the old A11 to Epping and Harlow and the A414 to Harlow and Chelmsford. The proposed development of both North Weald and Thornwood is unacceptable. In order to

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

Stakeholder ID 2694

Name Margaret

Manton

accommodate the increase in traffic caused by such developments will inevitably mean more loss of Designated Green Belt Land. Last month a short trip to High Wych to pick up a friend from The Rivers Hospital took one and a half hours round trip. There was no waiting at the hospital. Traffic was jammed back to before Rye Hill road. Back roads were manic and Harlow itself in grid lock because of an accident on the M25/M11 intersection.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

My concerns again are for where the traffic is going to go when it hits the main routes in and out of Harlow and Harlow Expanding outwards to swallow up nearby villages as has happened over the years/decades with London which has caused untold problems which are still being researched for a solution with little or no progress just traffic jams, pollution etc. Traffic through Thornwood has increased massively in the 9 years we have lived here. Relatively short journeys have doubled, tripled and on occasion quadrupled because the roads are no longer fit for purpose. While I appreciate the council is under pressure from the Government to build more homes for the country but in the not to so distant future Epping and its surrounding villages are going to be swallowed up and joined to Harlow, Chelmsford and ultimately London will spread across Essex. Redbridge, Waltham forest, Chingford etc are already joined through Woodford, Buckhurst hill, Loughton, Theydon Bois, Ivy Chimneys, Epping. Then close to Coopersale, Thornwood, North Weald. Where does it stop? Bethnal Green, Hoxton, Walthamstow, Chingford etc all used to be villages but are now well and truly engulfed by London. Mistakes keep on being made with development resulting in massive consequences for the people living there and for the environment/planet. These mistakes are made but nothing is learned from them and the same mistakes keep on being made.

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

Epping?

No

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:

I have put no for Epping as I have struggled to understand all of what is on the map but despite that I can't see how Epping can expand as a successful shopping High Street until Parking and traffic through the town is addressed. Being at the end of the central line a large percentage of parked cars is for the station with commuters and visitors from surrounding areas/villages filling up the station car park by 7.30 am Monday to Friday. The present car park is to be developed for housing. Where are all these cars going to park while this development goes on and in the future? Even if the car park is to be underground and houses on top, are there going to be more or less spaces and where do the residents park there cars in the newly developed houses? The long stay car park at the beginning of Epping is full all day from early morning. On Market days to get parked in Epping is a challenge which impacts on local business and the market traders. Shops are being developed into flats. It doesn't matter how good the shops are, if the shoppers can't access them they don't shop there and the High street Dies.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I disagree with this proposal as it seems to say in A) The council seeks to retain and where necessary enhance existing employment sites and premises but then in B) the change of existing employment sites or premises to uses other than those for which they are designated will be resisted unless the applicant can demonstrate through evidence, including marketing of the site that there is no longer a reasonable prospect of the site used for the existing or designated employment use... The last remaining public house in Thornwood after 100 years of serving as a pub and then a pub / restaurant is soon to be demolished for 3 houses to be developed. The owner of the site grossly mismanaged the pub/restaurant business by alienating local residents and telling them they were not the sort of clientele he was looking for. Again miss management lead to massive fines against the business, to name just 2 reasons. The Garden Centre and Cafe has also been given planning permission , I understand, for housing and appears to be two thriving business now given over to Housing.???

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):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

As explained in previous questions my concerns of traffic flow. How is adding more housing with its inevitable cars and lorries to problems already snarling up Epping High Road and surrounding streets/roads going to help the traders, residents or visitor or those just passing through? The station is working at breaking point at rush hours am and pm just by the volume of people who either work or visit London by tube already

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

The number of development planned is excessive for the area and as mentioned in previous question concerns for traffic flow, parking and use of green belt land is a massive concern. Nearly 25% of the council's allocation

of new housing to The Parish of north Weald Bassett which includes an increase of 50% or more housing planned for Thornwood. (Map of Thornwood)

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

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:

As I only work in Theydon my reasons for ticking the no box is really the same as been said in other question but also the provision of school places for the village. With the proposed increase of house a significantly larger school or additional school would need to be built to accommodate local children.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

The proposed development site is on designated green Belt and is too large with too many houses. Too larger increase in housing for such a small hamlet/village, especially as planning has already been passed for 3 houses on the old Carpenters Arms Public House site and a further 18 or 19 houses on the Happy Grow Garden Centre and cafe site, to name but two known developments already passed. There is no guarantee that the bus service will improve through Thornwood as one company out prices the other. People don't use the buses because they are so infrequent and expensive. The infrastructure proposed for Thornwood and the 124-130 planned homes has not been planned yet so how can we make an informed answer to what we may or may not get if we accept the draft proposals? D1 is just words of an ideal of what we may gain. Planned area on the map shows approx 50% increase in land use of the existing village which is totally green belt land.

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

I can't give an opinion one way or the other as there isn't really any detail as the council is in the process of developing an infrastructure plan. What reassurances do we have that planned infrastructure is all put in

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

place. Developments often go over budget. What happens if the money runs out before the projects are completed? 124 extra houses in Thornwood have the potential to add 248 more cars exiting onto the high road (Old A11). Some residents will only have one or no cars but in this day and age most houses/flats have two or more cars to its occupants. Some may be retired or work locally but a significant number will either work or visit London and its suburbs. How will they get there? With additional shops, schools, Health centres and employment comes additional traffic including delivery vans etc. How are the main access roads going to cope?

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 encroachment onto greenbelt land is to the advantage of the landowner who has bought land knowing that it is Designated Green belt and has paid a lower price because of the constraints associated with green belt land and development of dwellings and now stands to cash in and make huge profits for their own benefit by being allowed to flout the rules laid down. By allowing this to happen doesn't benefit the council or the taxpaying public who only foot the bill for the mistakes made. Copious conditions are put in place to alleviate foreseen problems at the planning stage but does the council have enough inspectors to make sure all these conditions are met?

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

With reference to planning development, It is our experience that often little or no consideration to the opinion of the Parish council and local residents, who are affected the most, are taken into account when final decisions are made. While I appreciate that the council is sandwiched in the middle of public opinion and Government constraints. It often feels like residents and parish councils opinions carry no weight at all and that often consultations are a means of ticking a box to prove that we have been consulted but actually the council or The Government can override any or all with policies under the umbrella of compulsory purchase act. To fit the criteria and have all their boxes ticked. Mistakes made in the past seem to keep a re-occurring theme over time and nothing is learnt by those mistakes and no-one is held accountable either. The traffic congestion and pollution problems in London are getting significantly worse not better. The traffic volume and gridlock incidents in Our Councils remit have increased significantly in just 9 years. Why are councils being forced into making the same mistakes as London? Eventually England's green and pleasant lands will have disappeared and replaced by traffic jams and smog. Killing off the planet in the process. It is hard to agree to a plan when only half the planning process is completed. How can we comment on and agree with a plan that only covers part of the whole development. Without the specifics of what infrastructure is going to be put in and where I can only assume that the worst will happen. That Epping High street (and its surrounding villages) will loose its character and charm as a market town and That the openness of the Green belt will be harmed and the parishes which serve Epping Forest Council will be come one Housing Estate with huge traffic and exacerbated parking problems that stop the area thriving and to loose its rural feel. Green belt (United Kingdom) "From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia For other uses, see Green belt (disambiguation). Designated areas of green belt in England; the Metropolitan Green Belt outlined in red In United Kingdom town planning, the green belt is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness. The Metropolitan Green Belt around London was first proposed by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee in 1935. The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 then allowed local authorities to include green belt proposals in their development plans. In 1955, Minister of Housing Duncan Sandys encouraged local authorities around the country to consider protecting land around their towns and cities by

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

the formal designation of clearly defined green belts.[1][2] Green belt policy has been criticised for reducing the amount of land available for building and therefore pushing up house prices, as 70% of the cost of building new houses is the purchase of the land (up from 25% in the late 1950s).[3]" As I understand it the green belt is a policy which is put in place to stop London swallowing up more towns and villages. To date from The city of London has spread and engulfed what was once villages like, Bethnal Green, Wanstead, Walthamstow, Chingford to name but a few. Redbridge, Waltham Forest and Chingford (now London Boroughs are already joined to what I guess were isolated villages such as Woodford, Buckhurst Hill, Loughton, Theydon Bois, Ivy Chimneys and Epping.(Chigwell, Hainault etc.) While green belt land is slowly but surely being eroded away through development we will all merge into one massive Urban sprawl. Where does it stop???? Yes there is a need for more housing but when will the Government realise that there must come a time when we are full to capacity where housing is concerned.
