

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

Stakeholder ID 2644 Name Juliet Orchard

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:

If we have to have more building then I agree that it should meet the needs of the district, whilst protecting green belt land. The plan you have presented does not do that - it will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the people who live here now.

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 existing settlements do not have the infrastructure to support the quantity of housing proposed. eg: the increase of 20% housing and population cannot be supported by current infrastructure of Ongar. This appears to be a way of avoiding taking responsibility for transport, health and schooling for the new developments. As developers will pay piecemeal contributions for infrastructure, at no point will there be sufficient extra income generated for the creation of new roads, or support for public transport.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I do not know Harlow well enough to comment on the location of development, but will the the community centres be built alongside the housing?

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

Stakeholder ID 2644

Name Juliet

Orchard

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

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?

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Re: SR-0848 and SR-0067 : land to the west of Ongar, and Bowes Field. There is a real problem here regarding flooding. **Redacted** Every time we have heavy rain, the Cripsey Brook floods up into the field, and into the bottom of the gardens of the houses in Bowes Drive. This then has a knock-on effect as the Cripsey runs into the River Roding which also runs through the town, and which also floods regularly. If you build a total of 208 new homes at the top of this field which is where the two sites are located, not only will there be a loss of biomass which currently absorbs water and prevents more run-off reaching the Cripsey Brook, but there will be a huge increase in runoff from hard landscaping and buildings. This goes directly against EPDCs statement in the Draft Plan (p.105, 4.197 A) "The council will ensure that all proposals for new development avoid and reduce the risk of flooding to future occupants and do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere". It would simply not be possible to destroy acres of biomass to build 208 homes at the top of the hill, without creating additional flooding to that already suffered on a regular basis by residents close to the Cripsey Brook and the River Roding. Due to its direct access to the A414, I can see that the strip of land running alongside the A414 would be one of the least intrusive areas to build in Ongar. HOWEVER, 208 is far too many homes as it is not possible to ameliorate the double problem that you create by reducing biomass AND creating more surface run-off. If you leave the existing hedge in place between the field and the new development, and dig a swale on the field to catch initial run-off in storm conditions; then plant the field running down to the Cripsey Brook to replace the biomass lost from the development site, it might be possible to ameliorate some of the increased flood risk. This would entail buying additional land which might then make the site financially unviable for potential developers. It would certainly not entirely ameliorate the increased flood risk from 208 new homes. Run-off from houses built on the Bowes Field would run straight down through the houses and gardens of Marks Avenue and Bowes Drive and would create immediate problems. This area should be kept as biomass to absorb run-off from the A414, especially if there is to be the proposed increase in building on the other side of the A414 around the Four Wantz. Remember that the Cripsey Brook turns to meet the A414 at the bottom of the hill, so it is already taking on all the run-off from the road. Given that there is currently no SWMP in place for Ongar, it seems even more unlikely that you have considered the flood risk implications of this part of the plan, and therefore you are in no position to propose development here. If it is decided to build on the site even if it is not possible to provide sufficient amelioration on the site itself, that would result in flood amelioration projects having to be constructed at the level of the Cripsey Brook and the River Roding which would come out of tax payers pockets. I am not prepared to endorse a situation in which I am contributing to the lining of developers pockets whilst losing valuable green belt land around this historic town. A second issue regarding these two sites is access. If the access is to be from the A414, that would not be a problem - although road safety issues would apply. Any consideration of access via Great Lawn, Marks Avenue or Bowes Drive would be impractical, and an unacceptable intrusion on the residents of those streets. It would

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

have a hugely negative impact on the quality of life of residents. These roads are very narrow, and are already often blocked if a delivery van, or builders are in the road. Bad parking and increased parking by users of Epping Ongar Railway also causes problems for waste disposal teams to access the road, resulting in them having to drive over and cause damage to kerbs. SR-0848 Ongar Leisure Centre site. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. To lose an integral part of the Ongar community which is available to the entire population of the town, for the sake of 24 homes is utterly ridiculous. Poor diet and lack of exercise is costing the NHS millions of pounds - why would you take this facility away from the community??? It provides a fitness centre within walking distance of most homes in Ongar, giving access to those who might not drive, or who do not have time to travel to a neighbouring town in order to exercise. It is also a centre of the community - many of the towns children learn to swim there, and many teenagers use the gym, whilst many adults go to the gym or fitness classes. It is a place where members of the community meet and chat and so enhances social cohesion. An additional 600 homes in Ongar = an increase of housing and population of 20%. This is excessive and cannot be sustained by the existing infrastructure. eg the High Street is in an appalling state of repair and has been for many years. After heavy rain, it is impossible to walk from the northern half of the high street into town without wading through deep puddles. As contributions to infrastructure will be paid piecemeal, as bits of development are carried out, at no point will there be sufficient funds for proper rebuilding of the road. This situation can only deteriorate as 600 more houses could generate 1200 more road users. All those walking into town from all the proposed development sites would end up wading across flooded pavements to get there. I would be grateful if you would publish the number of homes that have been built in Ongar since this planning process started in 2012. It must amount to over a hundred. This, and the number of houses going up on the Business and Research Park on the Fyfield road (?125 homes?) should be deducted from the total proposed for the town. You said in your information at the Budworth Hall presentation, that Ongar needed to build more houses to sustain the schools in the town, particularly the new secondary school. This is an anomaly - if the town didn't have enough children in the town to warrant a new school, why did they build it? I know that it is over-subscribed **Redacted** I am already being approached to prepare children for the **Redacted** aptitude test as they cannot guarantee a place there, even though they attend a primary school in the town. So you cannot use this as justification for building more houses here. You say you want the town to be self-sufficient. Well, it is now because we have a leisure centre, and a health centre. If you increase the size of the town by 28%, and remove the leisure centre, existing facilities will be unable to cope.

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)

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

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

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:

Payments from developers will come in piecemeal, as each bit of development is completed. This means that at no point will there be a large enough amount of money to do any of the infrastructure developments properly eg the rebuilding of the drainage and road system through Ongar High Street. Given the long term nature of the plan, how can we be sure that future EPD councillors won't change the terms of development over the course of the plan? The evidence is that very little has been done in terms of improving infrastructure alongside the considerable amount of building that has been completed in the last few years. When you consider the vast number of homes that have been built so far, particularly along the High Street, behind Tesco and the large new estate opposite the railway station; in addition to developments where the old school was, the Elmbridge Gate estate and Great Stony; and the fact that the High Street is still pitted with lethal potholes, pavements are uneven and in places regularly flooded. After the building of the sheltered accommodation opposite the railway, it was years before we finally got a zebra crossing to allow our children to cross safely to bus stops on the other side of the road, or to go to the Love Lane playing fields.

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?

DM15 Managing and reducing flood risk

Ongar needs an SWMP. Without it, you cannot allow development on any of the sites, as you cannot know the detail of the amelioration required to allow building that will not increase flood risk to new or existing properties. Flood amelioration should be calculated per house built before you finalise plans for the number of houses per site. You should bear in mind that Ongar is regularly badly flooded - to the extent that sometimes it is cut off as the Cripsey brook floods the A414; High Ongar floods; Langford bridge on the A128 floods, and the road to Passingford Bridge floods there and at Stanford Rivers. There is also flooding in places on the Chelmsford Road. It is also essential that this is put in place before the plans are finalised so that pressure is not brought to bear on EFDC to allow building where they have said it can go; even if it causes

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

flooding. And so that developers are aware of ALL the costs involved in developing any land. Amelioration plans should be an integral part of any allocation of homes on a specific site.

This online form is badly constructed as the comment boxes are too small to see a paragraph at a time as you write. ONGAR FLOODS - REGULARLY AND SEVERELY - you have not done enough research on this aspect of the plan to justify building large estates on the top of the hill around the Four Wantz roundabout and along the A414. This is irresponsible. The large estate planned on the Greensted Rd will create the same problem with a loss of biomass and increase in run off from hard landscaping into the River Roding. YOU HAVE IGNORED THE NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY by proposing vast swathes of additional housing, even when we have already had hundreds of new homes built here. Ongar is made up of mixed housing. Imposing vast estates of hundreds of homes is completely out of keeping with the inherent nature of the town. THE INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT COPE NOW - how would it withstand use by and additional 600 families? THERE IS NO RELIABLE PUBLIC TRANSPORT and NO EXTRA JOBS IN THE TOWN which means all new families will depend on car travel to get to work. As parking is going to be restricted at stations, where will they park? How will the roads cope when they are already in a state of disrepair AND ECC have just CUT THEIR HIGHWAYS BUDGET IN HALF? IT IS ILLEGAL TO BUILD ON GREEN BELT LAND.
