

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

Stakeholder ID 2162 Name McMullen & Sons Limited McMullen & Sons Limited

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

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:

SP2 Concentrating new development in the more sustainable locations is admirable, but the district has a distinct settlement pattern with Harlow to the north and the outer reaches of Greater London to the south, with a myriad of smaller settlements in between. Chapter 5 sets out a settlement hierarchy, with four tiers ranging from Town to Hamlet. It is not readily apparent why visions, objectives and in some cases, allocations are proposed for some of the named and listed settlements and not others, but thankfully SP2 does at least list the proposed allocations clearly. Comparison of this with Figure 5.1 shows a lack of representation for the swathe of settlements which make up the 'middle' of the district. Concentrating development in the southern towns and seeking to assist with the economic revitalisation of Harlow is sound planning and commendable. The expansive rural area and the viability and vitality of the facilities and service therein is, however, also a planning consideration and one recognised as being necessary to cater for in the NPPF 2012. It is contended that development in the form of specific allocations of the objectively assessed housing need does not, as proposed, trickle down far enough and should include the hamlets of High Beach and Sewardstone (see Q6).

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

Stakeholder ID 2162

Name McMullen

& Sons Limited

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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:

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 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 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

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:

For the reasons advanced in disagreeing with proposed Policy SP2 above, it is contended that more recognition should be given to the smaller and more dispersed rural settlements situated between the district's southern towns and Harlow. Whilst "remote" in the context of the district, they are not isolated in any objective or absolute assessment. They contain valued local services and facilities and some limited development would help to maintain their vitality and viability and provide housing for people who work in the rural areas, whilst still enjoying easy access to the nearby towns for higher order facilities and main roads and rail links to places further afield. Two examples of sites which should be considered for inclusion under Policy P12 are: 1. LAND ADJACENT TO THE OWL PUBLIC HOUSE, LIPPITTS HILL, HIGH BEACH IG10 4AL High Beach is a dispersed settlement situated at the edge of Epping Forest. It has 3 pubs, a church, various leisure/recreational facilities (including the Epping Forest Visitor Centre) and Lippitts Hill is the location of a Police Training Camp. The suggested site is adjacent to a longstanding residential caravan site and owing to its size (circa 1.5h) and disposition it would be suited for affordable housing and lower density market housing. It is centrally located in the expansive rural area roughly equidistant from Waltham Abbey, Loughton and Chingford. The railway station at Chingford is approximately 3 miles distant and the underground station at Loughton approximately 2 miles away. A location plan and Google Earth aerial image is attached showing the site, although it was flagged up in an earlier call for site consultation. It is commended for consideration. 2. LAND ADJACENT TO THE PLOUGH PUBLIC HOUSE, SEWARDSTONE ROAD/MOTT STREET, SEWARDSTONE, CHINGFORD E4 7RJ Sewardstone is a listed hamlet and, further, it is considered at page 171. The vision for the hamlet is to support the nurseries and horticultural industry and tourism-related opportunities but, this notwithstanding, no residential sites are proposed to be allocated. In this regard, consultation feedback is summarised as not wishing future development to continue the current 'ribbon development' along the Sewardstone Road (A112). At paragraph 5.196 it is clear that a site was considered which would have done this. The site shown on the attachments for consideration lies behind the ribbon of development on the main road, with frontage onto Mott Street. Its development in part or whole would not continue the A112 ribbon, but rather put to beneficial use a site largely bound by built development of one kind or another. It could help provide affordable and market homes for local people, sustain local facilities and provide housing for people engaged in those facilities (tourism - there is a large hotel nearby, horticulture, etc), which the plan seeks to support. The hamlet also straddles an A road and has easy access to Waltham Abbey and the M25, the Lee Valley and Chingford railway station, which is approximately 2.5 miles distant. It is contended that this site is compatible with the aspirations for Sewardstone and its development should be considered.
http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/Q6-Location-Plans-and-Google-Earth-Images.pdf

-
7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

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?

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

