

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

Stakeholder ID 1974 Name Brian Starling

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:

The plan outlines in detail proposed builds but as if often the case with local planning there is no account of the necessary infrastructure to support such major development or how it will be fully financed.

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:

The priority in development of the proposed type should be focused on derelict or brownfield sites, NOT releasing any Green Belt land to be lost for ever.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Such development round Harlow is on Green Belt land which should not be sacrificed and does not fit the Plan's focus.

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

Stakeholder ID 1974 Name Brian Starling

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Nazeing and its roads (especially in rural parts, namely Hoe and Betts Lane) were never intended for heavy goods traffic. Sites SR-0580 and SR-0151 are not equipped to deal with any extra traffic caused by more employment. Strict enforceable controls on movement on traffic and people are essential.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Proposed sites (SR-0011, SR-0300 (A,B & C) & SR-0473 are grade 1-3 Green Belt land. Suggested sites are merely pandering to developers. Again, brownfield sites ignored by EFDC. Huge pressures on Nazeing's

infrastructure (flooding risks, drainage issues, lack of water, full school and public transport and traffic issues already obvious in Nazeing without more pressures.

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:

Firstly, the ARUP assessment is not correct. The local school is currently overflowing (pupils being taught in portacabins) and peak hours are a nightmare now around the proposed development sites. Before the Plan is adopted and any development allowed, it is essential that sewerage and drainage systems are upgraded, flooding risks properly examined in detail and that EFDC clearly sets out funding requirements.

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

A common thread in my answers to the posed questions is that primary Green Belt Land does not need to be built on AT ALL as opposed to permitted development on derelict or previously developed land (as the recommended course of action in National Guidance in National Planning Policy Framework. Nazeing's wildlife sites, some of which MUST be protected by law, are under threat as well as its character and environment. Nazeing has already taken its fair share of development in the EFDC area - enough is enough!

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

My main concern is that the Local Plan has not tackled the impact on Nazeing as it is today with any real depth or proper analysis of the pressures inherent in such development. Infrastructure is paramount as are traffic, environmental, flooding, public transport and school/hospital provision issues. Most significantly, focus on developing brownfield and previously developed sites rather than Green Belt sites, of which there are many, outside Nazeing as well! Many in our village, especially the aged, have not received any info at all yet re the Local Plan as not all can get out to your offices.
