

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

Stakeholder ID 2467 Name john Enoch

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:

Although the principles sound fine, the draft plan does not reflect them. It majors on the destruction of the Green Belt to please developers, ignores alternatives and would not support the local economy. On the contrary, it would lead to a severe reduction in the quality of life for those who live in Nazeing.

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 'limited release' of Green Belt would mean the destruction for ever of the essential green lung around Nazeing, replacing it with greater congestion, an overburdening on local services, reduction in the pleasure for residents of the beautiful surrounding green belt land. No proper consideration has been given to the alternatives, such as renovation of derelict areas throughout the district. I have no comments on Harlow specifically, as I do not live there.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The plan involves the wide-spread permanent destruction of Green Belt land, contrary to the stated aims of the plan, instead of taking advantage of brown site alternatives. The proposals are based on wrong statements

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

Stakeholder ID 2467

Name john

Enoch

on the current infrastructure situation - e.g. that Nazeing School has capacity and that there are no traffic jams at peak hours. Have the plan authors never seen Nazeing Crossroads in rush hour or at school drop-off times - it can take half an hour to get from Broxbourne station just to the other side of Nazeing as it is. Development should take place in Harlow if that is what is wanted, or on its periphery, but not in Nazeing.

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

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Insufficient consideration of traffic impact.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The new sites SR-0151 and SR-0580 are in Nazeing, in Hoe Lane, a very narrow, hilly lane where a lorry and car already have difficulty passing. Additional heavy traffic movements would be dangerous and impracticable. As a minimum, it requires weight-limits that are enforced, but the council has a very poor record on this.

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:

There are several sites in the Green Belt. Destruction of our limited green belt land would be criminal and obviously irreversible. This is destroying the environment and the legacy for our children. There are perfectly viable alternatives for new housing elsewhere, including fill-in and brownfield sites, but developers find those less profitable than simply building on large blocks of pristine land. Much of the green belt land in question is also currently in agricultural use - destroying this is vandalism and again bad for the environment. The proposed number of homes would put unsustainable burdens on the infrastructure, including the roads, which can already barely sustain what there is. The plan is wholly deficient in respect of consideration of the

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

green belt environment, the impact on infrastructure and the funding of this development. You will put up new homes in a lovely area, thereby destroying the Green Belt heritage that we have. The idea of 'new jobs' is fine in theory, but in practice those are already largely migratory, cf. all the greenhouses recently grossly over-expanded. Genuine Nazeing residents will not find any job opportunities.

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 disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The Arup assessment is **WRONG** in its statements on present infrastructure status. Where is the plan detail on developer levies? If you are going to allow the destruction of Green Belt land, selling off our children's heritage, then you need to impose extremely high developer levies as 'compensation', as well as insisting that they fund all the required improvements to local services and infrastructure, including health and school services. You also need to have a complete rethink about Nazeing Crossroads. Just tinkering with the phasing, as happens every couple of months has minimal and often negative impact. You need to provide an alternative or, more realistically, accept that there is simply no road capacity for the extra volume of traffic that your plan will generate.

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

The Draft Local Plan does not establish the case for building on Primary Green Belt land. Contrary to the National Guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the plan prefers building on Green Belt land to previously developed / derelict land. The plan would result in a highly negative impact on the character of our village life, the landscape, the environment and the wildlife. Our quality of life will suffer.

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

I am utterly opposed to the Green Belt destruction proposed for St. Leonard's Road, both in principal and because there is simply not the capacity to absorb the additional traffic/residents in Nazeing. This is being proposed at the behest of developers, in the face of major, consistent local opposition. The opposition is not based on nimbyism, but on a genuine understanding of what the true position is in Nazeing. The plan needs to be reworked to provide the additional homes in other non-Green Belt parts of the district and/or in and surrounding Harlow, and to remove the threat to the environment, services, infrastructure and way of life in Nazeing.

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

