

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

Stakeholder ID 3049 Name Philip Evers-Buckland

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:

Whilst the Draft Plan suggests possible suitable sites within Nazeing for development it makes no provision for how such growth will be supported by improvements to or additional infrastructure. The creation of any development requires road improvement, sewage disposal, schooling, provision of medical support etc. I see no proposals here.

2. 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 2:

The Council may have considered a number of sites but appears determined to develop Green Belt Land. Once built on- lost forever and totally against existing legislation passed by Parliament to protect the Green Belt. There are existing Brownfield sites that appear to have kicked into touch with little imaginative thought.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The term 'around Harlow' is far reaching and non specific. In fact I suggest any area around Harlow with the exception of Brownfield sites is Green belt land and therefore sacrosanct. The expression 'comprehensive

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

Stakeholder ID 3049

Name Philip

Evers-Buckland

planning' sounds grand but in reality requires huge investment and I see no indication as to how this will be funded. Development 'around Harlow' runs the very real risk of Nazeing becoming part of Harlow.

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:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Let me highlight one area in Nazeing that has suffered 'employment development'.Redacted.... Just one business has caused huge controversy with its activities. The company allegedly processingRedacted.... Very few employed but the area is an eyesore and attracts constant HGV visits which are obliged to use a road not suitable for any large vehicle. There are limitations on HGV access to Nazeing but the wording is ambiguous - "except for access"- and in any event totally disregarded by drivers and to my knowledge never policed. Nazeing has become a short cut between Waltham Abbey (M25) and Hoddesdon for vehicles at the maximum weight limit and servicing the large distribution depots in Essex Road. Any future increase in vehicle weight/capacity will result in such vehicles ending up on local roads totally unsuited to their use. All major local businesses are serviced now by such vehicles i.e. the greenhouse industry. And you want more.

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:

220 proposed new properties plus the 80 already approved. It is not unreasonable to assume that 300 properties will provide 600 vehicles all of which will want to use the existing roads. What enhancements and or changes to the local infrastructure will be made to support this. It can barely cope now. And when something goes wrong then Nazeing becomes a nightmare. For example the repair of Dobbs Weir bridge and the impact that had on village life. One over weight HGV damages underground services and we are subjected to lengthy delays with traffic light controlled repairs with little evidence of expediency.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

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

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:

The old adage 'actions speak louder than words' must have been designed for this question. 'Full of rhetoric but no substance.' This in my opinion sums up Epping Forest approach. There are many existing problems with regards to infrastructure within the village that the Council has been unable or unwilling to get to grips with. And that is before any further development. One example: water dispersal in St. Leonards Road following severe weather. To develop without first providing proper infrastructure and services is foolhardy. And as for the ARUP assessment then whoever composed that must have done it without ever having visited Nazeing. One example : Local school does not have vacancies.

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 have lived in Nazeing for over 35 years. Throughout this time we have remained a true village in that we are surrounded by open land and farming albeit the western side with the close link to Broxbourne is tenuous. Of course there have been developments in the village and I am sure that some were, at the time, controversial. However I feel that the present plans create the biggest threat to the village it has yet encountered and if allowed then the very fabric of the village will be lost forever. There are sites within the village that would support small development the so called Brownfield areas. But these areas cannot just be developed without looking at the greater picture. Take for example the derelict area at the rear of Nazeing Parade shops. Whilst simply erecting a number of houses on this site may solve an immediate problem, from the plans that I saw, no one seems to have addressed the question of access to the site. Is the existing roadway at the western end of the parade to be used ? If that is the case it is totally unacceptable in that it is not wide enough and traffic flows would clash with motorists entering the parade from the main road. And that is before any other problem is considered.

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

My comments in answer to the previous question probably cover this one. I do not want to see the nature of the village change in essence. I do not believe that Epping Council have considered all their options and appear to be hell bent on developing Green Belt Land. Furthermore, I cannot see any evidence that if development on whatever scale is approved the underlying problems that this will create will be attended to beforehand. Act now think later appears to be the order of the day.

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

