

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

Stakeholder ID 2785 Name Roger Barratt

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

whilst i agree with the stated vision of the plan, i strongly disagree with the way it has been carried out. Rather than have plans that are compatible with the aims of prioritising brown field and previously used nursery sites it seems that previously unbuilt on Green Belt land has been chosen for development. This is also against the responses in previous consultations by residents, where the highest priority was to protect the GB. the infrastructure plan did not appear in the plan until late november, but was dated Sep 2016. Rather than inform us how the implementation of necessary services eg roads, education, health flood defences, the plan seems to be a description of what should happen. together with vague ideas as to how it may be financed. mostly assuming that developers will pay for it all. the vision, as presented to us, as "our plan" does not match the stated aims of 'enhancing the quality of life for people in EFD, but has the potential to ensure a deterioration in our environment for years to come.

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

Stakeholder ID 2785 Name Roger Barratt

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:

I do agree with the idea of having a significant amount of development within Harlow, as I understand that, the town is due to undergo a major regeneration. This seems a good idea as the area and character of Harlow will be equipped to absorb the necessary infrastructure needed to go with it. However, I do not agree with the substantial amount of development proposed on the outskirts of Harlow, this is GB land. Maybe it would be a better idea to build new settlements in other areas of the district, that would cost more initially, but be more sustainable over time. Much of the proposed development for residential sites are 'add ons' to small rural areas, where there is not the capacity to install the necessary infrastructure eg traffic volume control, new roads, due to the limitations of the environments

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I disagree due to much of this development will be on GB land. The approach in building within an area such as Harlow has the advantage that it can be given the necessary infrastructure as it progresses, rather than adding on to the smaller more rural settlements that cannot absorb the necessary infrastructure

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:

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

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I object to the following sites identified for Nazeing re employment (SR 0580) SR 0151) ELR 0099) unless restrictions are i place to prevent the expansion of industry that needs to use HGVs. the road network for Nazeing is not suitable for these vehicles. and the volume of traffic generated the main industry for Nazeing is glasshouse, horticulture. and packhousing. Owners prefer to have ever larger enterprises,in a area that is not suitable for this type of activity. large businesses carrying out packhouse/ distribution should be located near to main road networks, motor way links the majority of glasshouse / horticultureRedacted.... Additionally, i am not sure as to the contribution this makes to the economy of Nazeing

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:

I do not agree with the sites selected for residential development in Nazeing. All are on previously unused GB land, that is also Grade 1-3 Agricultural land. This is against the aims of the plan, the views conveyed in previous consultations by residents, and govnt policy. (NPPF para 12, 17, 80) which state that preference should be given to previously used land for development, unless there are 'very special circumstance'. GB sites have not been assessed in a robust cogent transparent way. criteria such as 'outside the settlement buffer zone' have been used to filter out sites in Nazeing that would otherwise be identified for housing. This criteria has been applied to rigidly, when weighed against the loss of GB land, if the true purpose of the plan is to

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

protect GB as far as possible. Additionally, the methodology used to assess GB sites is biased towards choosing GB sites to start with, as it does not use all the 5 factors of the (NPPF para 79,80) the special options for Nazeing are also against the stated aims of the plan in terms of GB protection and respondents views. Options for growth have been chosen where harm to GB land will be greater than needed. Some sites in the selection process are also subject to 'growth areas not consulted on' how can we give an informed response if significant information is withheld? The vision for Nazeing is to maintain its rural character, but the sites chosen for housing will ensure that this is destroyed, by creating urban sprawl on the edge of the settlement in an unsustainable location (SR 0011 SR 0473). Unsightly derelict land has been unsatisfactorily assessed in favour of unused GB land, when the opportunity is there for changing the unsightly derelict sites in Nazeing. It is noteworthy that, in his report (2012) the Glasshouse Industry, in the DLP, Gould recommends EFDC using compulsory purchase orders to use these sites for affordable housing. Nazeing is also a flood risk area, particularly the sites chosen for residential development. This has not been adequately considered.

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:

villages such as Nazeing are not compatible with the absorption of the necessary infrastructure due to its traditional layout and no scope for changing this in terms of absorbing high levels of traffic, water services. Flooding issues. The assessments carried out by ARUP do not seem realistic eg capacity of local school in 2019 - 20 where the figures are in contrast to those supplied by ECC for a recent planning application in Nazeing. Similarly, traffic impact comments assess that there is no impact at peak times upon area around any of the assessed sites, when there obviously is! Most sites identified for Nazeing are in an area that is not sustainable in transport terms due to there not being any sustainable commercial bus service from 2017. This will result in even more people using their cars

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?

DP10 Nazeing

Not enough research seems to have taken place into producing the local plan for Nazeing. Our ...Redacted... could have been more proactive in making it possible for local residents to discuss their views and ask questions about

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

the plan. there needed to be a meeting arranged that was properly advertised in good time for the plan alone. given the importance placed upon it the structure and presentation of the plan is vastly complicated with much of the evidence not easily obtained. People often give up when faced with these obstacles. also, many older people or those not computer literate have not been able to obtain copies of the paper questionnaire,

DP P10 Residential sites

there should be a re assessment of all the derelict/ previously used nursery sites in Nazeing, with a view to residential development. eg (SR 0160) (SR 0427) (SR 05830) consideration could be given to locating a community hall at clayton hill park, where there is abundant parking, space that does not encroach upon GB openness, This area could also be used by the local school, which would free up land around the school for expansion / re building. ,and is already within a recreational park area. Alternatively, build a new school on land behind Langely Green, and use the current school land for housing. This would protect the sites ((SR0011) SR300,a b c) 9SR 0473) which are valuable GB land
