

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

Stakeholder ID	2828	Name	Richard	Bassett	District Councillor for Nazeing
----------------	------	------	---------	---------	---------------------------------------

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 agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

This has been a difficult process and without a strong local plan with a vision then it will be decisions by developers and appeals which would not lead to good decisions. We must accept the need for change but it must be planned change which leads to proper decisions which acknowledge issues and infrastructure and tackles how these can be addressed.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

I agree with this as these locations would be the most sustainable. However in saying that there will be major infrastructure problems especially traffic in many locations. I am also concerned that with the lack of public transport in rural areas developments in these area could cause new traffic issues. ie with developments around Harlow people commuting to London would come to Broxbourne station as it is a major intersection and could be the terminal point for Crossrail2. We need to agree a sub area strategy on traffic and road improvements with our neighbours such as have been written in the MOU with the coop and sustainability board.

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

Stakeholder ID	2828	Name	Richard	Bassett
----------------	------	------	---------	---------

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

With Harlow building new employment parks (Enterprise zone and Health England) there will be a need for housing for associated population growth. These areas are most suited to larger developments to achieve numbers without putting pressure on existing settlements. I am concerned on the impact with the other developments around North Weald and we need to create proper infrastructure to support this. I am concerned on any urban sprawl towards Roydon, North Weald and Nazeing by some of the developments being suggested as these would have major impacts on transport, public services, utilities and education with the sheer scale of developments. I have concerns that there would be pressure on the road network in commuters using Broxbourne Station for commuting as it would be a cheaper and easier accessible solution but the road infrastructure could not support this.

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

We need to support our Town Centres as there has been lots of pressure on them over the past few years. We need to have health vibrant centres as this keeps the local economy strong and attractive to residents. I would also state that we need to support the smaller parades of shops as many of these are vital lifelines to rural communities such as Roydon and Nazeing

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I think it is wrong to assume that all existing employment sites are okay to be expanded especially in the rural locations. In Nazeing the Birchwood site in Hoe Lane has proved very problematical with so many HGV vehicles

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

using a country lane that is totally unsuitable and also the type of employment has led to three major fires. Employment sites should be viewed with proper access and their impact on the surroundings. In the case of Birchwood as it butts on to residential and an obsolete glasshouse location it would be better to change its use to residential and then view alternate locations for industry such as the Sedge Green location (SR0212,3 SR426?) where there are several redundant sites including old glasshouse sites in a flood zone which Industry would be permitted to build but not residential. This would help to tidy up locations in the village to create a better balanced village What will be the impact of all the economic growth in and around Harlow i.e. Enterprise Zone on 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 have reviewed the policy P10 with the parish Council and we are of very similar opinions over the suggestions in the Draft Plan. These are that sites SR200a and b are in or near a conservation area and also tend to create a corridor out of the village towards Bumbles green and hence would tend to expand the village away from the centre and would be an unacceptable intrusion into the Green Belt. Site SR0473 is also not acceptable. As mentioned in the SLAA this site is marginal and I am concerned that it does really push the village out into a corridor down St Leonards road which would make it unacceptable green belt development. However in saying that I do support the SR0011 (EPF/2009/15?) which as per the vision provides as part of a

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

development a community centre which is vital for the long term vision of the village. The development housed are situated at the northern end of the development so it becomes very sustainable and also the sports facilities are needed in the village. I also support SR0300c as this would then become an infill backing on to an existing development. S I have suggested that we remove SR300a/b I would suggest that we revisit the sites SR0093 (No3 Nursery) and include part of Birchwood SR0151, (where the woodyard is sited) as with the upgrading of footpaths and pavements would be very sustainable and also would solve several issues with industrial use in Hoe Lane which is totally unsuitable for the HGV traffic that it currently supports. The SR0093 glasshouse is/has reached the end of it economic life and it has been damaged by 3 major fires on the woodyard site in 6 years. The site would not be suitable for an economic site as it is too close to residential buildings and I think this site could sustain about 50-75 houses. I also have seen letters from the school (I believe you have received a copy but I can forward one if you wish), expressing concern over the numbers attending the school and the fact that many local residents cannot get their children in the school. The school's infrastructure and buildings are also coming to the end of there life and there have been two temporary classrooms in use for longer than I can remember. I have been talking with residents and the parish and suggest a radical approach similar to what happened at St Johns School Epping. What I suggest is that the a new primary school is built on site SR0160 Fernbank Nursery which is sited in the middle of the village behind the local shops. This Nursery site is about to become redundant and I know some preliminary discussions have been held to try to site 50 houses on it but access would be tight. If a new school was sited there in a land swap for the existing school site it would help to fund the development of the school. I am sure that access issues could be solved as there is an access to the scrub LVRP land adjoining could be used. The site is more than large enough to build a bigger school and play areas. This would also help to support local shops, remove parking issues on the current school site in morning and afternoons plus would then free up a most suitable site on a housing estate which would be big enough for at least 50 houses and would link with development SR300c. A real Win Win situation With respect to G&T site GRT_E_07 then as has been stated Nazeing and Roydon contains 85% of GRT sites in the district and 15% of all those in Essex and hence any more sites/pitches cannot be allowed in this area as it is creating a social dominant grouping and we are already starting to see some issues with the high population of migrant workers also in the village. -

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:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/NPS-FINAL-LETTER-TO-EFDC-Nov-16-HS-signed.pdf

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Infrastructure is the main issue worrying residents. Traffic especially in the villages is reaching serious levels as more and more people are trying to avoid traffic hotspots and we are seeing HGV vehicles using villages as cut through which is totally unacceptable. I did a survey with Essex Highways in 2007 for the area which I have attached and the situation has got a lot worse than this now. As I mentioned in the previous question I have

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

concerns over the local primary school and have offered a suggested way forward. Also the local Secondary schools are all in Hertfordshire (Broxbourne and Hoddesdon) with the nearest one in Essex in Waltham Abbey of Harlow but they are over subscribed

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

None at this time

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

All comments on policies

We should explain that if there is not a policy then NPPF is the policy by default Page 31 - We need to explain to people the differences between Previously Developed, Brownfield and Green belt land as many people think all glasshouse sites are previously developed land and not green belt. We also need a definition of affordable, Starter homes and Self build houses and their relationship to creating an exception to green belt policy. Page 32 - There are statements like improve public transport and stop reliance on cars but this does not fit as Bus Operators are significantly reducing rural services and ECC is constantly reducing any subsidy (if any) for these routes. In Nazeing we have just lost all buses and are struggling to get any sort of service for people that rely on these services. We also need to be aware that Crossrail 2 is proposed to terminate at Broxbourne and what would be the effect on local roads and traffic. Page 33 - Policy SP1 We should also state that large developments should look at Transport and Schools etc. and we should define sustainable transport Page 34 - Para 3.39 We should include the new definition of Travellers Page 35 - Definition of Traveller above. Also the reference to the 2012 Laurence Gould report needs to be updated as things have moved on a long way since 2012. I am compiling comments from the Lee Valley Food Board Page 38 Para 3.54 sub-section 7 this refers to site SR0011 in Nazeing as this brings community benefit. Page 39 Maximum pitch size for G&T sites is defined later as between 5-10 yet we have many sites in Nazeing larger than that and we should say that Nazeing and Roydon should not have any more pitches. i.e. Site GRT E 07 is not suitable on page 167 Page 43 SP3.2/3 What would the traffic implications on Nazeing be as use of Broxbourne station increase. Any Master plan must include traffic issues both sides of the county/district borders. Page 45. Policy SP4 we need a better explanation of how LP relates to Neighbourhood plans and who takes preference. Page 50 -I assume it is acceptable to suggest alternative sites as per answer to question 6. What are criteria to overcome green Belt policy in new plan. Page 59. Policy H2- Affordable vs Starter homes definitions and explanations but where is Self-build in this equation. Page 61 Policy H4- This must also consider impact on settled community and same development Control rules applied to all application both traveller and settled communities. There was a suggestion of the council providing a transit site (J7 of M11 to enable illegal encampments to be moved on quicker. Also we should say that temporary permissions should not result in permanent permission at the end of the permitted time. Page 64 Policy E1 - Where sites are incorrectly located with a view to the business has outgrown site of the location is now unsustainable (Birchwood in Nazeing) then we should agree to the reuse of that site to a more suitable use which could be housing or starter units. This would include the reuse of unviable glasshouse sites. Page 67 Policy E3 - Consideration on existing E13 viable glasshouse sites should keep designation to prevent "hope factor". If the site is not viable then other suitable uses depending on land i.e. flood risk or contaminated land. Point C should only be for viable sites.

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