

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

Stakeholder ID 2671 Name Lynne Forty

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 draft local plan does not protect the Green Belt and Green Belt boundaries will be lost forever. How can this be aligned with the vision that seeks to ensure an enhanced quality of life for residents of the district? The proposed increase in housing stock of c.25% in Theydon Bois can in no way represent natural population growth, it will just encourage migration from elsewhere, especially as house builders will seek the easy option of building in pretty villages on open spaces which will give them maximum profit for little effort, with no thought for the necessary increase in infrastructure needed in support. The proposed sites have been nominated by the landowners, with no attempt of being part of a rational development plan, so the vision cannot be achieved.

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:

An additional 360 new houses in Theydon Bois cannot be justified and invasion into the Green Belt has not been properly thought out. The local plan has completely ignored the size, infrastructure, open space, employment opportunities etc of each settlement in the district and has just allocated housing wantonly around every settlement. This completely contradicts Central Government and Epping Forest policy which requires local planning authorities to consider sustainable patterns of development when deciding Green Belt boundaries. It is illogical to distribute housing development everywhere, it needs to be concentrated on towns which already have good infrastructure and have the space to expand further.

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

Stakeholder ID 2671

Name Lynne

Forty

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Development within existing towns may be more logical, however it still represents unwelcome invasion of the Green Belt.

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Shopping areas in the larger towns are logical, but should not be to the detriment of local facilities located in the smaller villages. The local plan should support shopping areas in the larger towns by allocating new development nearby to ensure ongoing support for these areas.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

New employment development needs to be prioritised in favour of larger sites within/near existing towns which are looking to expand. New sites for employment will be restricted by Green Belt regulations so will likely be limited to sites allocated to housing.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Four of the sites are in Green Belt land and already identified as suffering from significant harm if allocated for housing. Development will encroach into the countryside and irreparably change the rural nature of Theydon Bois which is the very reason it is loved by its residents and admired by others. 360 new houses around Theydon Bois is a completely disproportionate allocation and the sites are only available because they have been nominated by landowners and are not part of a sensible development plan. An increase to the village approaching 1/4 will destroy the present character and cannot be supported by present and foreseeable infrastructure, eg: - I currently have to wait 3 weeks for a Doctor's appointment. The Doctors themselves are most apologetic about this, but cannot speed this up. The surgery is only open part-time and subject to unforeseen closure.Redacted....Redacted.... For the amount we pay in tax, the service is not acceptable, so how you expect to provide a service to residents in another 360 homes is beyond me! -Redacted.... A lot of the time we are packed in like sardines, and there are a very limited proportion of trains which run all the way through to Epping. It is not unusual during the evening rush hour to have just one in eight trains running to the end of the line (most go to Hainault via Newbury Park with others terminating short at Loughton or Debden) requiring a considerable wait, especially when it's so busy that you can't board the first Epping train. There is a very restricted bus service through the village, so if the Central Line is not running, residents are quite cut off from travelling elsewhere. This will only be exacerbated by another 360

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

houses and present infrastructure cannot support this, and as I understand it, the Central Line cannot be upgraded further to accommodate more trains.

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:

Infrastructure requirements have been generalised and are difficult to quantify for a new development. What can be quantified are the current infrastructure shortfalls (see previous comments to the last question!) and these need to be addressed in the first instance.

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 dispersal of development in/around the large and small villages of the district. Transport links in Theydon Bois are already fully stretched and I know personally that the underground is well over capacity at peak times and that the station is poorly served by existing buses and roads. This overcrowding on trains and around the station will only become worse with the proposed new development. A large increase in the number of residents in Theydon Bois will result in increased reliance on larger settlements (eg Epping) for schools, doctors, employment, retail etc, which will give increasing congestion on the roads especially given the poor bus service. Urban open spaces should be used more effectively to limit use of sensitive Green Belt land for development - this is recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal, especially in relation to villages in the district. Housing numbers are not classed as a very special circumstance for Green Belt development, therefore all clear, defensible boundaries should be maintained.

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?

The local plan needs to have more detailed policies for management of development to give certainty to all parties (residents, developers etc). A consistent approach is needed at District level on policies, eg disproportionate extensions in the Green Belt are not defined and there is no clarification on what is meant by 'materially larger'. Many of the allocated sites in Theydon Bois are separated by the railway and its embankment, so there is a lack of link visually between the current village and the proposed sites and therefore how can the local character of the village be respected? There is no parking provision to be found within the policies of the local plan. How can applications for housing on the new sites be prevented before the grand plan has been published for the sites?
