

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

Stakeholder ID 2479 Name Robert Griffiths

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:

While I'm sure the quality of life will be improved for those who purchase/private rent (their own choice based on their own opinion of the district once sites are completed) or are housed in the new homes (who wouldn't want a free or subsidised home?), I feel that little to no consideration has been given to the quality of life of existing home owners & businesses. The suggestion that budgets for infrastructure will need to be included by the builders of these developments will undoubtedly fall short of reality and the entire district will become a misery for those who lived there before works commence.

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:

Concentrating my comments around Ongar as that is where I live; there is currently insufficient public transport and facilities to support the people who live here. Placing an additional 600 homes will overwhelm an already strained and lacking system. Not to mention the current strain on doctor surgeries, dentists and other welfares. With the closure of the police station and no fire service for many miles coupled with the ambulance service at full stretch, I feel that an emergency would quickly become a catastrophe. Even if these fears are set aside, those services would struggle to meet their response targets due to the additional volume of vehicles using the road network around Ongar and other areas around the district. Resident's lives would quite simply be put at risk in my opinion.

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

Stakeholder ID 2479

Name Robert

Griffiths

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

While I disagree with the volumes suggested simply by the sizes of the sites due to the well being and quality of life of those who live there, I do believe that ensuring sufficient services is without question a necessary and positive thing.

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:

Many shops in Ongar are listed and to create a primary shopping area will either force closure and risk the existence of those buildings (because people will not choose to shop there) or will completely destroy the delicate and historic nature of this small town. There is no need to create another faceless, soulless, facsimile of many east London high streets just to provide provisions.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I do not work in the district so am unaware of the current situation. Nor do I feel that the allocation of new sites to be +ve/-ve

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

On the whole I regrettably accept that opposing the entire 600 homes for Ongar is futile. There is simply no way the town can accept any more without drastic alteration and risk to its personality, which it appears is not being considered at all. I moved hereRedacted.... for many reasons but the main one being - Ongar is, to us, semi-rural. With 600 new homes (and still at this stage it has not been made clear what a 'home' is - flat, small house, large house, high rise block etc) this town will quickly become anotherRedacted.... - hideously over developed and stripped of its once appealing character. With reference to sites SR-0184, SR-0185 & SR-0186Redacted.... my views are the following: 1) This land is currently agricultural greenbelt and therefore I strongly object to the developments using these three sites. 2) SR-0186 - proposal for approximately 12 homes is ludicrous given the size of the plot and also the existing homes to either side are large detached properties. Putting approximately 12 homes on this land would not only unbalance and ruin the street appearance but also affect drainage of rain water, eradicate wildlife and drastically reduce traffic flow onto the main carriageway of Chelmsford Road which can be very time consuming and dangerous to join in a vehicle, or cross by foot already. Approximately 12 homes on a site of this size would mean they would be need to be three stories or more in elevation, have little to no parking available, no gardens and outdoor spaces and be in complete contradiction to your own guidelines for acceptable private development. 3) Sites SR-0184 & SR-0185 - proposal for approximately 30 & 124 homes respectively - again placing this amount of homes on such small areas of land is ludicrous for the reasons above. The three storey properties of Great Stony Park can be seen from ground level by the three houses that will be dwarfed by these developments as well as those further along High Ongar Road. This many homes directly behind will have to be more than two storey by and large and be completely overshadowed, literally, by developments of this magnitude. The reduction in daylight from such developments would also be against your guidelines as would light pollution at night and noise pollution; not to mention the additional air pollution from the vehicles owned by the new residents which will be essential due to the severe lack of local employment and public transport in the town. The highway of Chelmsford Road which I must assume will be expected to take the full flow of traffic, is at a standstill during morning and evening rush hours due in part to the sheer load through the high street backing up to and onto The Four Wantz and also the massive increase in HGV use through the small streets. Expecting this road to cater for an additional 300+ vehicles at those times simply will not be feasible. There is no other feasible access/egress to these developments as the only other options would be to link to the now permanently closed bridge end to the east of High Ongar Road, or to the existing development of The Gables. Opening up access through The Gables would create a 'rat-run' for vehicles to avoid The Four Wantz roundabout and allow more passing traffic to be dangerously close to school children of The Ongar Academy and families around that area. To that end it must be assumed that full traffic flow will be out onto Chelmsford Road. Even with the provision of a roundabout at the junction with High Ongar Road, the network cannot take more vehicles. If anything we should be working together to find clever ways to reduce what we currently suffer.

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

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 disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

At this stage the acceptance of a draft local plan which includes all sites to be agreed without a full draft indicating exactly what is intended with detailed draft plans should be seen as unacceptable. You cannot have one without the other.

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

Nothing is sustainable until you know all the factors that are variable. For the vision of the district to be sustainable you would need to know (or assume, based on historic evidence) the number of people moving into and out of the district over a given time. When a central government instruction is given such as this, there is no way it can be sustainable. All that can be done is to 'over-provide' at a given time based on calculations of what will be needed at the time the next phase is reached.

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

I would like to mention the suggestion from a previous study named 'A Fresh Face For Ongar' which highlighted the need for a vehicular bypass to the east of Ongar. Were this included in the draft local plan then not only would it be appealing to the existing residents by removing a substantial volume of traffic (and therefore air, noise and light pollution; thus improving quality of life), but also provide much needed land directly and indirectly adjacent to it for these current housing needs. Further to this, new shops and facilities could be created for residents new and old, taking the burden away from the already overstretched services of Ongar and surrounding villages. The turnout at the council 'roadshow' which visited Ongar should show how upset and distressed the community is at having our pretty town decimated by huge developments. Also I can speak for some residents when I say that the only information I have received through my post about the draft local plan has been from other concerned residents. I have received NOTHING in writing from the council. Most of my information has come from social media urging me to visit the EFDC website to gain further information and pleading for assistance to oppose these developments. If the health and well being of existing residents is at all important to the council they should think very carefully before suggesting any development of multiple homes and also to the exact nature of what they consider a 'home'
