

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

Stakeholder ID 2985 Name Mary Dadd

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 disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

3.61 600 new houses for Ongar is 28% of its housing stock of 2,500 and far less than other areas. The infrastructure and services are not adequate now eg drains, school places, doctors capacity car parking. The increased traffic would not only harm the heritage buildings but cause congestion and rat runs along narrow country roads. There is not the employment to sustain it or the leisure and community facilities

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:

As above Ongar is only 7,500 pop and is not a self sufficient town, with little employment and no trains and limited bus services. New residents would rely heavily on cars. The historic character would change to the detriment with the effectively 3 large estates on the outskirts. We have already had a lot of new housing in the last 10 years but in small pockets and most has been gradual over the decades. The density of the proposals are also of concern as it would change the socioeconomic mix of the town

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I do not know enough about how this will affect Harlow

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

Stakeholder ID 2985

Name Mary

Dadd

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Draft policy E2 is platitudes. It cannot be delivered in Ongar, where there is virtually no brownfield sites or public owned land to provide all these wonderful amenities and facilities and no money to provide them

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There has been loss of employment sites in the past decade or so around Ongar, where it has been redeveloped for housing! I can see very little except for High Ongar (which is a bit out of the way from anything) Also part of Langston Road I think is being lost to make way for housing??

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:

There should be at least 50% reduction in the total number of homes due to the lack of infrastructure and public transport. 3 large sites are far too large and will change the character of the historic town. They will create major problems with access onto the busy road network, and some are too close to flood plains, whereby the loss of biomass and replacement with hard surfaces will add to the runoff problems and cause more severe flooding over a larger area. The high density suggestions would alter the socioeconomic mix for the worse and create more demand than average for school places and use of NHS services and social services. Ongar has few amenities and the loss of its leisure centre to housing would be a disaster for the well-being of the community. Car parking is barely adequate now and nothing planned and nowhere to put it! There are no amenities for the youth or the elderlyRedacted.... Policing is being reduced as is emergency services when they will need to be increased. The council will have no control as I understand it, when the landowners in question will put in for planning permissions. I can see no assurances that increased demand for school places, doctors and NHS facilities and car parking will be met in an appropriate time scale. Ongar has long needed a by-pass, but over the years this has been sidelined. Surely this is needed BEFORE any further development in the town. CILs are very vague. Would the developers have to provide any amenities and decent open green spaces with trees etc, because I cannot see that in the plan

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:

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

This is not deliverable in Ongar. Which developer is going to deal with improving the main drains it feeds into? Are they going to build new classrooms and find an additional doctors surgery and car parks? What about additional town centre carparking for the additional cars for the households they are building for? and what about improving the roads. ...Redacted...

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.

I would like the local councils and the residents to have full access to the body carrying out the appraisal. To date the consultancy process has been hurried and poor. Not many people really have the time to read through the whole of the draft Plan. Residents should have been given well publicised public meetings with the planning team presenting this properly to the residents and local councils. In Greensted I know of no one who has received the so-called EFDC leaflet about it and I understand that many residents in Ongar itself had no information. As I have just been co-opted onto Ongar Town Council (from 1st Dec2016) I am particularly interested in knowing every step of the process

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

SP5 Green Belt and district Open Land Policy 3.8-3.98

The NPPF only gives a framework and open to wide and differing interpretation. There needs to be a robust Local Plan to reinforce the needs of protecting the (remaining) Green Belt particularly so close to London. There have been too many instances of building in the Green Belt in unsustainable locations and not strictly adhering to the NPPF exceptions para 89. Other neighbouring councils are doing so eg Brentwood and Maldon. The residents value the Green Belt so it is hoped that the planners will support them by putting in a local policy and have proper consultation with interested bodies before it is finalised.
