



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

Stakeholder ID	2952	Name	Sam	Bullman
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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I do not feel that enough thought or process has been produced within the plan for the development of brownfield sites. With the apparent need for housing in the district why was the Langston Road Brownfield site permitted for commercial and not residential development? There is ideal transport links there with Debden staion and M11 on its doorstep, good employment in the immediate vicinity with companies like Kier, BMW etc. not to mention Loughton High Road and Loughton Broadway. The retail park will put nor pressure on independent retailers in those areas and increase congestion from visitors outside the district. I feel more emphasis thoughout the plan should be directed towards identyfying and developing brownfield sites and to aares with existing infrastructure able to cope with such rapid expansion.

2. 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 2:

The transport links (road, rail, bus) healthcare, educational and retail infracstucture in and around Harlow are far better suited to additional residential devlopment. Similarly there are far more employment opportunities and suitable service infrastructure for new homes. There is no encroachment or erosion of the green belt. Harlow clearley provides a much more suitable alternative in terms of the social and leisure needs of the proposed additional population.

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





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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow provides a much more suitable site for additional residential development. It has excellent transport links (road, rail and bus) healthcare, educational and leisure facilities. It is has far more employment opprtunities for residents and is close to Stansted airport being within the LSCC. the greenbelt would not be affected and the electrical and sewerage infrastructure is modern.

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Nο

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Epping, Chipping Ongar and Waltham Abbey are medieval market towns and their historical value should be preserved. More thought should be given to careful planning in those towns with regards shopfronts and development in line with that principle. They are also small shopping centres with limited parking. Loughton Broadway would be the most suitable option with excellent transport links and with the new retail park being built in Langston Road expansion of the shopping centre would compliment that development perfectly.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Additional residentail development should only be considered in areas that provide suitable employment prospects for the residents. 360 new homes proposed to be built in a village with the only employment prospects being 2 pubs a small metro supermarket with 3 parking spaces and 8 independant retail shops (3 of which are restaurants) seems farcical to me.

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





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:

Chiqwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

In my opinion the location of the proposed new homes in Theydon Bois will encroach on green belt land which should be valued above all else. With so much commercial and residential development nationwide green spaces are disappearing. They provide an essential role in the health and wellbeing of the community. The development of the greenbelt and/or arable land could lead to an increased risk of flooding and an additional risk of carbon release normally stored within it. The erosion of the greenbelt will also irrecoverably harm the charm and character of the village of Theydon Bois. The proposed addition of 360 new homes to the village of Theydon Bois is also disproportionate to the size of the village and the infrastructure within. Theydon Bois has only a satellite GP surgery unable to cope with the population at present. It is often closed as there are no GP's available. Residents then have to try for an appointment in Epping with 2-3 week waits the norm. Theydon Bois primary school is already heavily oversubscribed with 2 reception intakes and has to operate mixed age and split years to facilitate the amount of pupils generated by the current population. An additional 360 homes will put incredible pressure on a school just about coping at present. I have reservations as to whether the current electrical infrastructure is sufficient to support the proposed number of new homes, the village suffers from regular power cuts and the addition of such a number of new dwellings without significant investment in the electrical supply will cause huge problems. I am aware that the sewerage system at Theydon

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





Bois is already at capacity in areas having received little upgrade since its installation last century. The village has grown significantly since then but unfortunately no thought has been given to the utility infrastructure supporting it. The main area proposed for the development alongside the railway lines goes against the quidelines set down protecting against ribbon development with the Abridge boundary being so close, if this development goes ahead the 2 villages will almost be joined. In addition this area is on a slope which will mean any new houses built being are clearly visible by surrounding properties by day. The light emanating from them at night will undermine the dark skies policy for which Theydon Bois is well known and which the villagers have sought to protect for decades, further damaging the aspect of the green belt and charm and character of the village of Theydon Bois. Another issue with the amount of dwellings being proposed would be the additional pressure on the car park at Theydon Bois Station. During weekday office hours there is never enough parking available at the station. Passengers are forced to park their cars in the village which has led to the need for double yellow lines and now I understand permit parking will be introduced in some roads. I find it incredible that a station car park which is already far too small for the amount of passengers arriving and parking by car is being considered for development. 360 new homes proposed to be built in a village with the only employment prospects being 2 pubs a small metro supermarket with 3 parking spaces and 8 independent retail shops (3 of which are restaurants) seems farcical to me. In my opinion development of this size would be much better suited to brownfield sites within more urban areas of Epping Forest where the green belt, charm and character of a village will not be compromised and that has service, healthcare and educational infrastructure able to support it.

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:

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:

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Although mention has been made for the imporvement of infrastucture in line with development there seems to be little substance to support this within the invidiual outline plans for each area within the district. Additional residential development of this scale without the necessary infrastructre spend and implementation will ultimately lead to a breakdown in the existing services for the residents already living there and those moving in. Carrying out service improvements retrospectively once the dwellings are built will be difficult if not impossible in some cases.

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.

Once again I draw your attention to the proposed development in Theydon Bois. Building houses on green open spaces, arable land and encroaching on the greenbelt seems to me the direct opposite of a sustainable approach.

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

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