

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

Stakeholder ID 1986 Name Jeff POWER

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:

For those of us likely to be affected by the physical transformation of our community the plans will not result in an enhanced quality of life. Indeed our lives will be severely disrupted by building and infrastructure works and we will witness the destruction of one of our most precious assets. No details are provided as to the extent of such works or how they are to be funded.

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:

We have been provided with no figures concerning the possible numbers of housing units that could be provided by using existing derelict and brownfield sites. As such there is no comparison that can be made against the proposed use of Green Belt land for development. What investigations have been undertaken to assess the beneficial use of these sites before releasing Green Belt land?

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Since Harlow is the major urban centre and considered to be a potential economic hub for the district and the Stanstead corridor my view is that the development should be solely concentrated within its immediate

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

Stakeholder ID 1986 Name Jeff POWER

environs. It already has many of the community and educational facilities which the plan refers to so infrastructure costs should be lower than building on virgin sites.

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The sites identified as SR-0580 and 0151 are situated in Hoe Lane. This is a narrow country lane. Great care would need to be taken to ensure that the type of economic activity and businesses permitted on these sites would not lead to an increase in the passage of lorries or large commercial vehicles. These sites are located within a village and the outcome of increased traffic of this nature would be devastating. Much of the work force in Nazeing travel in from outside the area meaning that new business sites could lead to an increase in traffic as workers commute to and from their place of work. Are new employment sites really necessary in such a location as 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:

The proposed sites are situated on Green Belt land. The Council should be looking towards protecting this and not using it as a resource to be plundered whenever circumstances change. The vision as set out in the Plan states that it seeks to protect and enhance high quality and unique landscapes and proposals such as this merely set out to destroy part of our countryside for future generations. Such a large increase in housing would have a severe impact on infrastructure and local services such as education and health. There are already serious issues relating to drainage and flooding during periods of heavy or persistent rainfall, traffic congestion especially during peak periods, and poor and infrequent public transport. Given the lack of safe

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

and adequate pavement space and absence of cycle lanes it is inevitable that residents will be using the car to get around thus impacting on the environment. In addition the plans will encourage an increase in the number of heavy goods vehicles through the village. I am aware that a developer has already made several applications to build an estate on the sites identifies and on each occasion these have been rejected, primarily as I understand due to the fact that it involved encroachment onto Green Belt land. I must ask what has now changed that the Council seems prepared to surrender our heritage for ever? The offer of such a large plot of land must appear tempting but I would again go back to the point that I would like to know what alternatives have been fully explored in terms of existing brownfield sites etc in the area. The creation of so many additional houses in such a relatively small village would have a detrimental effect on the distinctive and attractive character of this settlement. I am somewhat baffled by the statement in 5.169 that reads " (The Council) will also be holding discussions with promoters, with the aim of entering into Statements of Common Ground". Who are these "promoters?". Could this be indicative of a deal having already been done? I am suspicious given the recent history of planning applications.

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The Council has recognized the need for detailed and comprehensive assessments of key services as this will be especially crucial in those areas where land drainage, sewerage, flood prevention are already major concerns. Prior to approval of the District Plan and any individual developments flowing from this, procedures and responsibilities for these assessments together with details on delivery must be in place. It is also important that any disruption to existing residents of an area should be mitigated. More information will also be required on the effect of developments on local services such as health, education and transport and how these are to be addressed in detail. Apparently the current assessments by consultants are unrealistic and fail to provide an accurate scenario of various aspects of life in Nazeing with regard to traffic and the local school.

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 local plan does not indicate with sufficient justification why it is now necessary to build on PRIMARY GREEN BELT. inadequate information has been provided on possible alternatives. The plan is contradictory in certain respects. For example it makes reference to "efficient use of existing infrastructure' when in many cases new or upgraded services will be required for these new housing proposed. Also it refers to maintaining the Green Belt and states that new developments will not compromise the distinctiveness and attractiveness of existing settlements. To suggest that such a large increase in housing units, especially in Nazeing, will not affect the distinctiveness of the settlement is unrealistic. In short this Plan does not safeguard the countryside

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

from encroachment and it fails to conserve the landscape. By encouraging further development in this area without proper investigation into alternatives the Council is inevitably creating the need for further infrastructure works with all the additional financial and other costs involved.

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