

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

Stakeholder ID 2131 Name Richard Pedler

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:

You do not need to build the number of houses proposed to enhance the quality of life etc for the people of EFD. It is not appropriate to build houses to attract more people to the district who will not necessarily work locally or support the local economy. Many of the proposed sites are not appropriate in terms of the protection the Districts green belt and environment. There is inadequate information in respect of the necessary infrastructure to support an increased population or how it will be funded.

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:

Whilst it may be appropriate to maximise development around Harlow it seems that Epping, North Weald and Theydon Bois have been allocated an excessive proportion of the proposed dwellings which would be detrimental to their "village/ market town " environments and unnecessarily destroy green belt land.

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

Stakeholder ID 2131 Name Richard Pedler

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Agree with the principle of more housing for Harlow but not as "mass expansion" at the expense of the Green Belt which appears to be the case. Community facilities should be provided or enhanced regardless of the location of the development and not just specifically related to Harlow.

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

Epping?

Yes

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:

The St Johns site in Epping requires further definition in terms of its composition and the suitability of such to the need of Epping residents and the local community generally. Its character also needs to suit the local environment.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Agree with making the best possible use of existing employment sites. However this should not mean building residential on existing business sites (as has already happened). Proposals to build residential on existing business sites seems contrary to policy if the aim is to promote employment and business development.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Whilst certain sites may be "available" they may not be "suitable". Each site should be considered on its individual merits rather than its availability. Also as previously noted they may not be suitable due to their environmental impact and the loss of Green Belt land. As a general comment there is confusion on the numbers of proposed dwellings and the composition of the type of dwellings to be provided on each site.

Dwelling type / density has a direct impact on current and future infrastructure requirements and the surrounding environment and green belt.

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 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:

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

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

We note the Council recognises the delivery of infrastructure to support future growth is important. However it is not only important but essential as elements of the current infrastructure are already inadequate for the current population let alone future growth. The Draft Local Plan does not include an infrastructure delivery plan. Details should be provided for consultation as to what infrastructure is to be provided and where and at what and whose cost. Certain comments in respect of current capacities at doctors surgeries and rail travel appear unrealistic. Epping is currently already subject to severe traffic issues due to the high volume of through and commuter traffic which is exacerbated by the traffic light junctions at both Bell Common and Palmers Hill causing long traffic build-ups and blocking adjoining road junctions. Local residential roads are already overburdened with commuter parking to the detriment of local residents.

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

No comment at this stage.

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

As a general comment we note that an increase in population of Epping and the surrounding district will add to the already present strain on existing services and infrastructure. There will be additional traffic and parking issues caused by more commuters to the Central Line, further school and recreational facilities will be required, there will be increases in the demand for medical facilities and an additional strain on the central line capacity. Further information is required on all such aspects of infrastructure for consultation before any Plan for additional housing is approved.
