

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

Stakeholder ID 1940 Name Jacqueline Margetts

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

There is NO information on infrastructure or funding. It contains details on proposed builds but it is essential that infrastructure is addressed before developments. Parcels of land appear to have been put forward by Developers who are interested in making money and are not necessarily concerned with cohesive approach. Plan is not necessarily for local people. You cannot artificially create jobs. Some Areas that have been designated for agriculture have been derelict for years so who is going to suddenly come along and set up business there? No detail of `joined up' approach.

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:

Little information or priority appears to have been given about regeneration and use of existing land that could, with thought and imagination, provide housing. All too easy to release GREEN BELT land which equates to DESTRUCTION of GREEN BELT land. The original idea of designating GREEN BELT [first proposed by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee in 1935 and established by The Town and Country Planning Act 1947] had a real purpose and need but seems to be used as a `quick fix' as Councils are pressured into providing Local Plan. GREEN BELT only covers 13% of land overall so why destroy it!?

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

Stakeholder ID 1940 Name Jacqueline Margetts

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The development round Harlow is on GREEN BELT land and until a true overview of EFDC Local Plan is published on impact and need it is difficult to comment. However there are large areas for industrial and retail use which could possibly be developed in such a way as to provide housing and link in to existing infrastructure. In its current form it is not compatible with the stated aims of the Plan.

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

This is for areas outside Nazeing for which I do not feel qualified to comment. If I had put no opinion on them which I wanted to I would not have been able to explain why

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Nazeing has narrow lanes and is unsuitable for heavy Lorries and is also heavily used by HGVs and LGVs from existing industrial areas outside Nazeing on their way to and from the M25. Employees in the nurseries and glasshouses are migratory and have no need for permanent housing. Nazeing is a 'dormitory' village.

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] and SR-0473 are GREEN BELT land. No Brownfield or derelict land has been put forward as part of the proposal. The GREEN BELT land put forward for DESTRUCTION has been put forward by Developers seeking to enhance their business and as a money making scheme without thought to the overall need. Major infrastructure needs must be addressed as currently there are serious problems with flooding, sewers, volume and weight of traffic, lack of transport [i.e as from January 2017 NO buses but with only one bus to Chingford on Saturday], It is essential to have detailed information as to how these needs are to be addressed together with a timetable which establishes funding and responsibility before the

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

commencement of any development. Developers are only interested in building houses for profit but EFDC must firmly establish a timetabled way forward to address the needs of the community before and after any development. The current infrastructure in Nazeing is already 'creaking' and any potential increase is of real concern! Planning has already been granted for 80+, just how many more can we absorb? No serious consultation has taken place by Nazeing Parish Council with the Residents of Nazeing. They publish their Agendas on a notice board but have not actively sought to engage the Residents in dialogue and when asked if they would advertise and hold a meeting to address the Residents and explain the Local Plan they said they wouldn't because 'they would be shouted at'! There is no confidence that Nazeing Parish Council express the views of the residents as they have not conducted a robust survey. Neither have they been transparent in their approach.

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:

It is essential that the impact on infrastructure is properly addressed as many services like sewage, flood prevention and drainage need upgrading. This MUST happen before any major development is undertaken. It needs to be highlighted and timetabled as to expenditure, funding and responsibility which must be published and rigorously monitored before any plan is adopted and individual development approved. There needs a commitment from EFDC that levies received from Developers will be used to mitigate the impact on Nazeing and improve services for all before any major development. The current ARUP assessment needs updating as there are inaccuracies e.g there is huge congestion on the roads around peak times and also whenever there are problems on the M25 when roads in Nazeing are used as a 'rat run'. Also school does not have vacancies as many of the children are taught in portacabins. Since the use of satellite navigation systems there are even more vehicles, especially heavy lorries increasing and exacerbating existing problems.

-
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 go far enough and does not justify or clearly demonstrate the need to build and destroy GREEN BELT land. Preference should be given to derelict or Brownfield sites and also to any areas that can be modified and enhanced to be redeveloped economically and be incorporated in current infrastructure. Not enough information has been provided regarding the impact on the environment, nature or character of village and landscape. There is also the threat to wildlife and the destruction of land currently used to produce food.

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?

The information was very difficult to follow and in attending the meeting at Waltham Abbey Town Hall whilst the planning officer was very helpful, to be just directed to come after come to `find the answers' took much detective work to find, or not, the answers to questions. There appears to be an inadequate amount of research and investigation into the development of Nazeing and its effect on the Community. Developers have been keen to build on GREEN BELT land for some time and this has come as a timely opportunity for them to `pounce' and are already acting as if the GREEN BELT land will automatically be released. These developments have already been supported by the Parish Council with the Developers saying that infrastructure is the responsibility of EFDC and/or Essex CC. This is NOT my understanding of the Local Plan! This is why it is essential that there is a properly researched co-ordinated approach with the possibility even that some villages are just not able to sustain large developments!
