

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

Stakeholder ID 2674 Name Susan Spanton

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 understand and agree that the area needs new homes, jobs etc, but it seems as though the easy route has been chosen in many cases. This is by amending the Green Belt Boundries, and choosing to develop 'easy, clean land'. I had thought that one of the main principles was to keep the rural green aspect of the area. Should we not be developing previously developed land as a priority, and not ruining the small villages. The infrastucture of the small rural villages, with regard to roads and amenities cannot cope. Expanding existing towns should be the priority where there are adequate road and rail links.

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:

Whilst I agree with the building and extension to Harlow, I cannot agree with the smaller settlements having to cope with such large amounts of extra housing that will not be sustainable, and resulting in a large amount of Green Belt land being lost. How can you state that the release of Green Belt will be the last consideration, when this does not seem to have been the case. Should we not use derelict/Brownfield land first?

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

Stakeholder ID 2674

Name Susan

Spanton

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The planned development around Harlow would be on Green Belt Land, and this is not compatible within the aims of the Plan. Also Harlow have stated that they will not allow building to the West and South. How can you be suggesting such a large development that has not been agreed with the neighbouring councils?

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

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:

The new sites SR-0580 and SR-0151 are in Hoe Lane, which is a very narrow country lane and totally unsuitable for any large vehicles I agree with trying to increase employment opportunities and to create much needed jobs, but this cannot be detrimental to the area concerned. There should be more restrictions placed on HGV movements in the area of Nazeing. On numerous occasions, I have had to nearly mount the pavement to accommodate the passing of large articulated vehicles in the narrow roads.

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:

All the proposed sites SR-011, SR-0300 (a,b & c), and SR0473 are currently in Green Belt. The EFDC appear to have ignored all derelict and Brownfield land and only chosen prime Green Belt. It appears that the consultation with Nazeing residents previously has totally been ignored, and nearly all the sites chosen are in the areas that the local people did not want. I had thought that the new Local Plan was with the 'support of the local people' I had also thought that the idea was to maximise the opportunities for developing previously developed land within the settlement. There are many disused derelict 'glasshouse' sites in the village, that would be much better used by proper development. - eg SR-0010, SR-0246. It seems that areas like this were

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

not chosen due to 'possible' contamination, or possibly because the current owners did not want to develop? So instead sites of beautiful countryside have been chosen that are next to the village, instead of unsightly broken greenhouse sites within the village. Even the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority have objected to a previous application on part of SR-011 (EPF/0937/16) on the grounds that it would adversely impact on permanence and openness of Green Belt and compromise the landscape setting of the Regional Park. The infrastructure of Nazeing is not sufficient to accommodate and extra 220 houses along with the extra housing already approved in the area. The main problems in the area are flooding, poorly maintained sewers, road safety, lack of GP's, poor electricity supply, severe lack of public transport, and roads incapable of supporting an extra possible 600 cars, lack of school spaces. I would like to question how some of the other sites have been rejected and these sites approved. It would appear that there has been strong promotion of these sites by developers showing that they can deliver a 'quick fix' by building on a 'nice clean' green field. The fact that SR-011 and SR-0473 are on a hill is going to detract from any 'rural feel' to the area whereas some rejected sites would not even have been able to be seen from any roads. I would like to suggest that the following sites be looked at again, in place of the selected: SR-0583 SR-0064 SR-0427 SR-0010, SR-0246 The Draft Local Plan also states that there is only one community hall in Nazeing and there is need for new facilities. There are actually 5 halls that are available for hire and a football pitch. There are numerous young peoples sports clubs, and Scouts, Guides etc. There are a large number of outdoor activities available in the area, including sailing, horse riding etc. I do not see the need for a large Sports Hall and extra football pitches. This will increase the burden on local council tax payers, by having to up keep these sites that will be rarely used.

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:

The infrastructure should be a priority and managed prior to approval of any developments. It seems to be the policy to just charge potential developers with a levy to put towards items like roads and schools. How can any development be approved without sufficient roads, schools, child care, public transport, doctors, sewers, drainage etc. These are things that should be sorted before any sites are even confirmed. If the general infrastructure of a village is not viable for increased population, then the extra housing should not be approved.

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

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

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