

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

Stakeholder ID 2500 Name Frank Gray

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:

While the vision states it seeks to protect the green belt, the actual plan fails to do this and will result in the loss of clear definable green belt boundaries

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 plan includes incursions into the green belt which is not supported by the evidence produced by EFDC with regards to sustainable development. There is no detailed justification for 360 new houses in and around Theydon Bois. It is poorly justified to distribute house across all developments as not all developments have the infrastructure required to support these. Development should be focussed where these exist and there is evidence that the existing infrastructure will support the new development.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

While its makes more sense to focus development around larger towns with better infrastructure, excursions onto green belt areas are not welcome. Additionally, access through Harlow to M11 is already a problem and additional options to access major highways would be needed.

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

Stakeholder ID 2500

Name Frank

Gray

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

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Traffic flow and congestion are bad for both Epping and Loughton which is putting a lot of stress on surrounding roads not designed for this. Additional shopping areas focussed here will exacerbate the problem causing damage to roads in the area and the environment. These are only sustainable following significant upgrades to existing roads to address these problems. Waltham Abbey may benefit from esters access via junction 26 of M25. It also appears the is a mismatch between aims of primary shopping areas and suggested additional housing. It would seems that focusing additional housing around primary shopping areas would help these aims.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Plans for employment development on green belt sites are not sustainable and will impact on existing transport links and infrastructure. Employment opportunities should be directed towards the larger allocated sites which are more able to expand in a sustainable manner.

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 Theydon Bois sites are in the green belt which have been identified as suffering high or very high levels of harm should they be allocated for housing. This harm results in encroachment into the countryside which will undermine the rural character and setting of our village. 360 new houses in the area is disproportionate amounting to a 23% increase in the size of our village which will destroy our present character and thus does not comply with EFDC vision. Additionally, following progressive increases in housing in the area, the current infrastructure cannot support current levels of use. As examples: While Theydon Bois is only the second stop on the Central Line into London, on a number of occasions now during peak times I have boarded the train and found no seating, with the train being crowded after Loughton (resulting in me utilising the tube less now) The primary school in the village is oversubscribed and there is the possibility that not all children in the villages may have a place in the school (this was the case this year). The traffic on Coppice Row has increased, it is heavy during peak times and a danger to parent and pupils walking to school. I have personally found it very difficult to cross the road on a number of mornings and have have seen

children endangered by poor driving. The crossing with Piercing Hill is especially of concern and is the site of regular accidents. It should also be noted that there is no permanent doctor surgery in the village.

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:

The plan lacks detail and the specific required and is very generalised. There is no provision to ensure infrastructure required will be completed on time. Also no plan to address existing infrastructure deficits. Currently the schools are oversubscribed, GP surgeries are at capacity, road suffer congestion, tube transport inadequate during peak times, bus routes and transport inadequate. Given past performance and lack of action it casts significant doubts on the ability of EFDC to meet requirements following further expansion.

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 the wide dispersal of development in and around the large and small villages in the district. With regards to Theydon Bois, as previously mentioned infrastructure already over subscribed with poor transport links. Increasing Theydon Bois' population will mean it will need to rely on larger settlements for a wide range of facilities. Resulting in an increase in car journeys, adding to congestions and pollution, while damaging roads. Additionally the sustainability appraisal states that use of green belt sites will give rise to sustainability issues, then states green belt sites will be lost which appears to be a contradiction and counter to the EFDC's vision.

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?

Policies are lacking in clarity. There are no detailed green belt policies to define disproportionate extensions or loss of green belt areas. No definitions of scale/size e.g. what is meant by materially larger. There is no detailed plan or mention of provision of parking facilities. Infrastructure upgrades need more detail and an identified timetable of improvements, also needs detail on how existing infrastructure deficits will be addressed.
