

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

Stakeholder ID 2183 Name Susie Evans-Frank

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I agree with the vision in that we need to plan for the future, creating new dwellings and sustainable development, provide infrastructure and services for a changing population, whilst also protecting the natural environment. However, I think that the level of development proposed is untenable without substantial changes in character of towns/locations suggested, the supporting infrastructure plans are not adequately researched or discussed in detail and the greenbelt is being encroached upon.

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:

You are proising 1600+ dwellings for the town of Epping - this will substantially change the character of what is essentially a market town. You are also proposing 1500+ dwellings for North Weald - which is a short way down the road from Epping. Many people commute from both settlements into London and through Epping and a number of new residents will presumably do the same. There is already a strain on Central Line facilities as well as a huge amount of rush hour traffic through Epping. This massive increase in dwellings will further stretch the infrastructure - and unless you can widen Epping High Street (!) or persuade TFL to add more trains/extend Central Line - I don't see how this amount of development is sustainable. By contrast - Chigwell, which also has a Central Line station and Buckhurst Hill, also on branch of Central have only 430 dwellings and 90 dwellings in the plan you have put forward. Whilst there may be good reason for less development in some places - I don't see any detailed explanation of this disparity, so I don't see how this can be a fair distribution.

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

Stakeholder ID 2183

Name Susie

Evans-Frank

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

As long as the infrastructure is in place before the developments are complete I don't see too much problem with these sites; things like school places/transport provision must be provided in timely fashion for influx of new residents (not figured out after the fact).

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

It is imperative that retail use is encouraged in the district to promote a thriving local economy, too many shops/offices in the district are turned into flats.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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:

Some sites in the plan are acceptable; however, others are not. The problematic ones in particular are:

SR0229 - Epping Station Car Park This car park is currently full by 8am in the morning Mon-Fri, so this site should not be developed unless more spaces can be provided after dwellings have been built and an interim car park can be sustained through development. If dwellings are built above the car park, where will these residents park? Even though they live next to a station, many would still own cars - so this needs to be taken into consideration - as no spaces should be lost from Epping Car Park as it's not big enough now!

SR-0347 - Epping Sports Centre This site could be developed, but a new sports centre **MUST** be provided before old one is built on so there is no interruption in service. A new facility must be within Epping (and not in another local town). It is imperative that there are facilities within walking distance for Epping residents. A new sports facility would be an opportunity to add a much needed swimming pool to the town (something current residents responded they wanted in their neighbourhood planning questionnaire - and with all the new dwellings proposed, a larger facility is needed to replace old site - perhaps a multipurpose site with swimming pool, gym, library all under one roof - successfully implemented in neighbouring Redbridge, South Woodford).

SR-0348 & SR-0349 Cottis Lane and Bakers Lane Car Parks These are the two largest centrally located car parks in Epping - imperative to encouraging visitors to travel in and use our town/commuters to come and work in the High Street. If flats were built above the car parks, where would the residents park? Many will have cars and will take up spaces that would have previously been of use to visitors/commuters. Can underground parking be considered to increase the capacity? No capacity can be lost to any development as already the strain on local roads is ridiculous (people routinely park on pavements without a care for wheelchair/buggy users as they cannot get into the car parks in town). More parking is needed, not less. And with 1600+ new dwellings proposed, losing car parks seems to be counter intuitive.

SR-0556 - Civic Offices This could be redeveloped into a hotel, rather than houses/flats. Then The Bell Hotel could be looked at for redevelopment/houses instead. A quality hotel is needed as per local plan policies.

SR-0405 and SR-0404 Coopersale Cricket Club and Allotments Development on these sites deprives local residents of much needed recreation/leisure facilities and would be detrimental sprawl into greenbelt, countryside.

SR-032ci - Bury Lane Sports Club I don't agree with use of this site. This would set a precedent for sprawl to North of Epping. Bury Lane is incredibly narrow and with school traffic already there is a huge amount of congestion. Further development would put too much strain on that area. The flat land is most suitable for sports recreation - so

where would you propose to relocate cricket and bowls facilities with not much flat land available in Epping boundary?

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:

In general terms - 1500+ new dwellings across the settlement would nearly double the size of the town and completely change the character of the place. The roads are already narrow and heavily used - any development MUST be backed up with appropriate supporting infrastructure.

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 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

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

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:

I mainly agree with the approach to the infrastructure provision; however, providers/developers etc MUST be held accountable to any agreements. Also - with regards education places - it is imperative that the District and Council communicate openly and early - to ensure that delivery of places is assessed and acted upon (and developers are made to pay for any increase in places required / new school facilities). As a new family in the area, I moved to Epping in the knowledge that there were several local primary schools within walking distance and a large secondary school that my children were in the catchment for; however, with substantial new development in the town, we could now be sent to a school within driving distance out of the town boundaries - which is ludicrous. Also - I think it's worth noting that the Local Plan does not specify what mix the new proposed dwellings will be (houses/flats etc) on all sites, so it is difficult to respond accurately when there is so much potential fluctuation in how many people may move into Epping. GPs are already at capacity, schools are oversubscribed and parking is packed.

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

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

In the local plan it says that further sites may be added at later dates, after this consultation is finished - how will we get a chance to respond to any new sites? I would strongly disagree with any new/altered sites added to the local plan if residents were not given opportunity to feedback.
