

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

Stakeholder ID 1613 Name Paul Brown

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](mailto: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 as stated however the impacts of the suggest plan are not compatible with the vision, see comments within this submission on specific issues. The overall impact of proposed action will substantially negatively affect much of the population and cause changes to rural & semi rural areas beyond comprehension; increased demands on services, support facilities & welfare; substantially increase the demands on roads & transport networks causing greater congestion, delay & chaos without ensuring the necessary counter balances are available & put in place. E.g. unless people can access Epping easily and in a timely fashion rather than attracting people and enhancing trade & business they will go elsewhere therefore the impact will be negative rather than positive. Working with partners with a hope of meeting future demand is building to fail! Known increases in demands etc must be met with tangible and viable options & action, not hope that other services i.e. bus companies will meet the desires of EFDC & needs of its population.

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:

A limited release of Green Belt Land' may be statistically & grammatically correct but the locations and impacts of such releases are such that their impacts are far greater than the wording suggests. Proposed developments around North Weald e.g. SR-0003, SR-0417, SR-0158A, SR-0036, SR-0195B & GRT\_N\_06 are all on good quality green belt land with the majority currently farmed producing much needed crops to feed our nation. The impact of these large developments along with other proposed development sites around North Weald will close to double the footprint of North Weald pushing it more towards a town rather than a rural environment and totally changing the profile, character & psyche of the village. Those who live anywhere on the outskirts of the village and benefiting from a rural or semi rural outlook & existence will have that

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

Stakeholder ID 1613 Name Paul Brown

experience decimated and not by just a additional street but by estates with many hundreds of properties in virtually every suggested location; not the situation the current occupants desired or indeed paid for. The developments either side of the A414, principally SR-0036 and backed up by SR-0195B and aspects of SR-0158A are not only green belt land but have special significance within relevant legislation as it divides two distinct rural environments - North Weald & Tylers Green. If building were to take as planned it would not only virtually double the size of North Weald but also produce a built up environment spreading from the airfield on the Epping Road, beyond Tylers Green and towards Magdalen Laver. Using North Weald as an example Council should seriously reconsider such large developments around villages. Because of the infrastructure needed at such developments and the negative impacts on existing environments, transport, roads and the lives of current occupants. The creation of a completely new village, if necessary using compulsory purchase orders would avoid all the negatives of building within already saturated environments and with good planning potentially using less green belt land.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is a 'New Town' and it was/is designed to absorb a growing population and employ them.

---

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:

These centres already exist & if developed further will better serve the local populations thus reducing the need to travel to 'out of town centres' or to towns further afield enhancing a greener environment by reducing vehicle movements and the carbon footprint as well as increasing local employment. However access must be easy, any form of obstruction or obstacle i.e. lack of visitor parking will produce a negative impact to the visitor and business alike thus defeating well intentioned plans. Epping is a major local transport hub and already suffers from associated difficulties & challenges. If proposed development plans go forward commuter

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

numbers will increase dramatically. Remembering many of the commuters are EFDC residents and possibly Epping shoppers they should be assisted & aided as much as possible as this tactic is liable to improve Epping & its businesses. If parking facilities at Epping Station and in Epping are reduced rather than increased congestion caused by commuter parking is liable to substantially increase. If restricted street parking is increased throughout the town this will negatively impact on residents, visitors & shoppers therefore reducing business development.

---

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Local employment is to be applauded. Specific sites need to be identified before further comment.

---

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Proposed developments around North Weald e.g. SR-0003, SR-0417, SR-0158A, SR-0036, SR-0195B & GRT\_N\_06 are all on good quality green belt land with the majority currently farmed producing much needed crops to feed our nation. The impact of these large developments along with other proposed development sites around North Weald will close to double the footprint of North Weald pushing it more towards a town rather than a rural environment and totally changing the profile, character & psyche of the village. Those who live anywhere on the outskirts of the village and benefiting from a rural or semi rural outlook & existence will have that experience decimated and not by just a additional street but by estates with many hundreds of

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

properties in virtually every suggested location; not the situation the current occupants desired or indeed paid for. The developments either side of the A414, principally SR-0036 and backed up by SR-0195B and aspects of SR-0158A are not only green belt land but have special significance within relevant legislation as it divides two distinct rural environments - North Weald & Tylers Green. If building were to take place as planned it would not only virtually double the size of North Weald but also produce a built up environment spreading from the airfield on the Epping Road, beyond Tylers Green at the A414 and towards Magdalen Laver. Using North Weald as an example Council should seriously reconsider such large developments around villages. Because of the infrastructure needed at such developments and the negative impacts on existing environments, transport, roads and the lives of current occupants the creation of a completely new village, if necessary using compulsory purchase orders would avoid all the negatives of building within already saturated environments and with good planning potentially using less green belt land. The road network around North Weald is of single carriageway design with only two primary exit routes - towards Epping or the A414 towards Ongar or Harlow with the principal traffic flow heading towards Harlow & the M11. During ever extending commuting times travel is already extremely busy to dreadful. If, as often happens, this is exacerbated by congestion on the motorway system then the roads gridlock. The proposed developments will substantially increase the number of commuters in the immediate area thus adding to an extremely poor and worsening situation. Parking in the vicinity of North Weald shops, Pharmacy, Post Office and Village Hall is already congested and regularly impossible to find. The impact of more housing, people & vehicles will only make the situation worse and will lead to inappropriate parking that in turn will cause danger to other road users & pedestrians and produce disputes between motorists, pedestrians and home owners in the immediate vicinity. The local school is already close to capacity and over many years access & parking by parents has been the subject of considerable discussion and regular dispute. Growth in the number of school children must be anticipated which will put the school under considerable pressure and possibly push it through breaking point as well as increasing traffic in the immediate area which can only be a recipe for disaster. There is a small doctor's surgery in North Weald but the principle surgery is in Epping. Currently appointments are very difficult to obtain and patients regularly have to wait 10 days or more to see a doctor. Due to the location in Epping the majority of patients have to travel in one fashion or another exacerbating their challenges & discomfort, potentially spreading germs if travelling by bus and increasing the carbon footprint. Once at the surgery parking is often difficult leading to drivers abandoning vehicles on the verges & other inappropriate locations. Developments in North Weald, Epping & surrounding villages will substantially increase demand on the surgeries which already find it hard to cope and do not satisfy those who wish to attend. If development of North Weald is to occur medical facilities must be improved considerably but this is not in the gift of the Council therefore if development in the quantities suggested occurs it will have a direct negative impact on the health & welfare of the current occupants of North Weald as well as those who will occupy new premises.

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:

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

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The demand & need for infrastructure such as schools, GPs & transport are acknowledged within the draft plans but definitive detail or undertakings are not given. The document often refers to developments in partnerships with others. Considering the overall impact of proposed developments over the EFDC area this situation is not sufficient or appropriate. Because of all the negative impacts developments of the sizes proposed infrastructure in all its styles should not be left to hope or chance and should be a fixed part of the plan with failure to achieve accountable on those who pushed such plans through to completion. In his autumn statement (2016) the Chancellor acknowledged that development to increase established locations puts huge pressure on existing infrastructure and consideration should be given to the creation of a new settlement, built with adequate infrastructure. Vehicle movements are an ever increasing issue and challenge; new developments will increase vehicle numbers & movements considerably. Unless major changes to the road network occur current bottlenecks and pinch points will only get worse and flow rates subside from an already poor situation. The draft plan suggests efforts will be made to encourage or increase movements by foot, cycle or public transport. If bus services are improved to meet proposed needs, draw motorists away from their vehicles and truly be a viable alternative to the car it will make very little difference if they are caught in traffic jams, do not operate at sufficient quantity or appropriate times & routes NB it is currently impossible to travel by bus from/to North Weald to Chelmsford to complete a working day. A further simple example is North Weald to Epping or Epping Station for onward destinations, any bus service must be reliable and achieve its goal i.e get to the station in a timely manner, not sit in traffic trying to pass through lights adjacent to St. Margaret's Hospital or through the town. The proposed developments in & around North Weald will substantially increase the numbers of school children by a considerable figure. The local primary school has little capacity, if any, vehicle access is very limited and often causes obstruction now and the situation can only get worse in the future. Children of secondary school age must travel several miles to Harlow, Epping or other locations to attend educational facilities; 6th form/college education is similar logistically. More children travelling to these locations put strain on current facilities & transport options, increase traffic flow and by default increase the carbon footprint. It would be better to either increase developments where facilities already exist (schools, doctors, transport etc), or improve facilities locally, the aim must be to reduce travel not increase it!

---

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

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

An independent appraisal of the proposed plans, their impacts both known & anticipated along with a true assessment of partner projects as to their viability i.e. increasing bus services sufficiently to reduce car movements, is a must before development is authorised or commissioned. If developments occur without such appraisals the Council will be building to fail all i.e. current occupants as well as those who occupy new premises. Appraisal independent of the Council is a must if those affected are to have any faith in the process producing changes that will impact on so many.

---

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