

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

Stakeholder ID 2539      Name Paul      Dunn

---

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](mailto: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:

There is certainly pressure for additional housing across the entire region but it seems logical to focus development near to major highway networks like the M11 in support of the London to Cambridge development corridor. That said, the final plan must seriously consider each local community in its own context to ensure over development is not detrimental in any way ... and MUST be rigorously supported by all necessary infrastructure and protection given to smaller settlements to protect their unique identities.

---

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:

If calculations are correct, around 20% of all proposed housing for district is within the boundaries of my local village Roydon. The impact of urban extensions to Harlow will have a negative effect on the outlying communities of Roydon & particularly Broadley Common and Old House Lane. The Plan has an over-reliance on the Harlow urban extensions as a means to meeting the stated housing targets for the District and this will radically have a knock on effect in terms of extended strain on infrastructure.

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2539

Name Paul

Dunn

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

It is quite clear that the proposals for urban extensions to Harlow, particularly at Sumners and Katherines extend into Roydon Parish and will alter the Parish irrevocably. If the Plan goes ahead in its present form then protection of the various hamlets and communities on Harlow's borders, is paramount and EFDC must put in as much effort not to shirk its responsibilities to these communities as it does to meet its housing demands as part of a local plan. The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan highlights the need for a new M11 junction and improvements to various A roads where traffic issues have already been identified but none of these improvements will help traffic flows to the west of Harlow. As new development at Sumners and Katherines will be located some way from overground train services, pressure on roads which are already over used, particularly the B181, will increase as there is likely to be an over-reliance on London Underground's Central Line because it has cheaper fares. Currently every short cut and rat run alternative route via villages is being used by current commuting drivers and this will become dramatically increase and this is not factored in or any solution provisioned in the Draft Plan to mitigate. Similarly, the proposed extension to Katherines gives great concern as the residents of Old House Lane appears to be swamped by the development. An over-arching aim of the Plan is to preserve individual communities across the district but what is currently proposed will result in Old House Lane (including Epping Road), a very self-contained part of the Roydon Parish with housing and employment sites, losing its identity completely. Should the plan proceed, in its current form, then there should be at the very least a landscape buffer to separate, what should be, two very distinct communities. The same can be said for Broadley Common, which is a named hamlet in the plan and sited within the Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area, and has a very unique identity - the Sumners extension has the potential to coalesce with this hamlet unless measures are taken to protect it by providing the necessary landscape buffer which should be a very high and obvious consideration.

---

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:

---

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

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There would seem to be a lack of detail currently on the Draft Policy E1 to allow a good understanding and constructive comment.

---

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

It would seem the four development areas proposed for Roydon will require release of Metropolitan Green Belt land, land that is paramount to the preservation of what Roydon actually is ... a village!! From the listing of 4 proposed development areas provided and research I have performed, 1 already has planning permission granted, the Kingsmead House conversion to retirement homes was already granted a couple of years back - not content with that the surrounding MGB on the land encompassing the house would be over development and no safe pedestrian access to the village. Another proposal is just along this site and this also is yet another MGB site with no safe pedestrian access into the village. The last proposal of the old coal yard is part brownfield/part MGB site within the Roydon conservation area - this proposal could work but on a slightly smaller scale. Looking at the figures of 39 allocation for Roydon, there seems to be a larger figure of overall development in this small parish area already if you consider that since the Draft Local Plan start date of 2011, 20 houses have been built in the Village, 32 in Broadley Common and 6 in Dobbs Weir, a total of 58.

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

This will mean overall (58 + 39) then Roydon will have more new homes than the draft plan allows until 2033 and our commitments are already being met.

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The statement that the appropriate infrastructure will be provided is very woolly it has not been proven or fully committed on how this will be achieved. The problems facing rural areas of the district are not fully understood and where the developers will provide certain infrastructure enhancements in what they are actually accountable for ie. the buildings, roads and small retail within their development but all the extra cars, school places, shopping demands, public transport demands will flow directly into the existing infrastructure which be expected to simply absorb it .. and it can't cope already! In terms of education, our village location residents expect their children to attend the local village school at primary level. This helps bond a community - in more urban areas there may be a number of different schools on offer to children. With rural schools, such as the one in Roydon which is already over-subscribed, any new housing in the village could result in children having to be taken out of the area to attend a school. Of course a new school located in a Harlow urban extension would be necessary but the infrastructure document does not clearly state that pupils from Roydon generally attend secondary schools in Harlow. Additionally, Roydon residents already struggle to secure health services - this is exacerbated by cross-border issues as GP services are generally provided by East Herts doctors. Sufficient capacity must be built in to meet the needs of expanded communities. When we consider the traffic topic further, Roydon and its parish roads have long since had increasing congestion issues particularly at peak times - Roydon High Street and the B181 specifically. Urban extensions to the west of Harlow could exacerbate this particularly if traffic is not directed towards Harlow. I recall the original plans for the Sumners extension excluded any exits onto the B181 and this should be the case for any of the western urban extensions. The B181 is a prime route for accessing the Central Line for the west side of Harlow and local villages so western urban extensions would intensify use of this road. When we consider the Development along the Cambridge - Stansted - London corridor, including within the EFDC district, will increase rail traffic which may result in the level crossing at Roydon being closed more often as trains travel through and this could cause more traffic congestion issues. Possible four tracking of the line too could leave the crossing closed to traffic far more often. On street parking for the station is problematic now - any increase in commuter parking in Roydon will be difficult for a small village to absorb without parking restrictions being put in place.

---

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

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

Nothing to add here.

---

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

#### Draft Policy H4 Traveller Site Development

The draft plan details concerns about an over-concentration of sites in Roydon and Nazeing but then contradicts itself where the policy proposes that over 61% of new traveller sites for the district should be located in the Roydon Parish - why if EFDC already have concerns??. It was also noted that there are a number of temporary sites which, according to the draft Plan, may be granted permanent permission, subject to certain criteria. This sounds like a quick win to achieve certain numbers as part of the overall Local Plan commitments - temporary sites not mean they should become permanent especially as we have 2 unofficial sites in the Roydon area already.

---