

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

Stakeholder ID 2526 Name Timothy Wadey

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

We moved to the area because of its rural feel, village life and proximity to a range of towns and London. That said we need to continue developing all aspects: new housing, amenities, recreational facilities, schools and transport links. These must be supported by appropriate infrastructure - utilities, sewerage, telecoms etc. This plan focuses on expanding the built environment and makes no hard commitments to match this in terms of amenities. Indeed it recommends tearing down our local sports centre to create space for more homes without an expansion of the necessary support. The proposal to build new houses on Green Belt when offered by the land owner, sets a new precedent. A number of land owners will no doubt look to maximise return, regardless of the amenity which has previously had very strong protection. I am surprised that more local brown field sites could not be identified.

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:

Whilst there is some merit in the statement, the volume of considerations in the study occlude the real local issues, and opportunities. Looking at the local proposal for Fyfield, the high density "Template" applied is both out of keeping with the remainder of the village and contrary to previous planning decisions. The village has grown organically and sympathetically over a number of years with good quality, village style developments including Elmbridge, the farmyard at Fyfield Hall and Dacres Gate. These developments are at the correct density, blend into the village and the rural setting and support aspects such as the level of car ownership required to sustain a family where the public transport provision is at best scant and constantly under review to be removed subject to the vagaries of Chelmsford traffic and Council grants. A visit to the recent high density developments in Ongar reveals a series of compromises, particularly the lack of adequate

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

Stakeholder ID 2526 Name Timothy Wadey

parking that do not look like village housing. This proposed density of housing in a village setting will significantly alter the balance of the village (between old and new housing) and will increase the traffic and parking requirements substantially. In addition this development would add 20-25% to the number of dwellings in the village - Indeed the Walker Avenue area - roughly twice the area of the proposed development looks to have fewer than 60 residences, and is short on parking too. The last application for Gipsy Mead was rejected on a couple of grounds, the Sewerage system can not cope with current demand and the 18 dwellings would have added 100 road movements daily, turning onto the B184, deemed to be dangerous.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

We need employment to sustain the housing development.

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:

I disagree with use of the Sports Centre site for housing. This will deprive the new school of local access to a swimming pool and the whole community to ready access to the sports facility. It will destroy a number of small businesses based out of the centre. It will reduce parking flexibility for the Ongar Health Centre, which utilises the sports centre parking. This strikes me as a desperate move focused on cashing in on the value of the site to the public sector owner, without the wider considerations of the community. It is about as rational as closing the secondary school in Ongar, only to build a new one and allowing the area around Ongar station

to be developed such that if the line ever reopens (as suggested in the last Essex structural plan) then it has no access or parking.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

Looking at the local proposal for Fyfield, the high density "Template" applied is both out of keeping with the rest of the village and contrary to previous planning decisions on the adjacent "Gipsy Mead" site. The village has grown organically and sympathetically over a number of years with good quality, village style developments including Elmbridge, the farmyard at Fyfield Hall and Dacres Gate. These developments are at the correct density, blend into the village and the rural setting and support aspects such as the level of car ownership required to sustain a family where the public transport provision is at best scant and subject to the vagueries of Chelmsfords traffic and Council grants. A visit to the recent developments at high density in Ongar reveals a series of compromises that do not support their current level of home ownership and do not look like village housing. In addition this development would add 20-25% to the number of dwellings in the village - Indeed the Walker Avenue area - roughly twice the area of the proposed development looks to have fewer than 60 residences, and is short on parking too. The last application for Gipsy Mead was rejected on a couple of grounds, the Sewerage system can not cope with current demand and the 18 dwellings would have added 100 road movements daily, deemed to be dangerous. I feel that appropriate density (like Elmbridge

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

Gate) development of both the proposed site and Gipsy Mead would allow the village to grow coherently and would not flood a relatively small community with a mass of new residents. This would need fully committed infrastructure (Water, electricity, telecoms, sewerage etc) and serious consideration of road safety issues around the Ongar Road, Morton Road junction. In addition the ongoing commitment to public transport needs to be underwritten by the District and County Councils. Some form of safe footway along all the surrounding roads also connecting to Ongar to allow safe cycling is also essential. There remain many opportunities for infill within the village ensuring a more organic growth, sympathetic to the community. On reading the detailed report, it is not accurate, for example stating that GP and Secondary School provision are differing distances away, whereas in fact they are identical. If such errors pervade the entire study its validity has to be questionable.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Much of the infrastructure is not in the gift of the Council, and is not committed. On moving here in 2002 we were pleased to see the proposed rail link via Epping and Ongar to Chemsford in the Essex structural plan. I fear the ideas in this report to absorb the new homes and residents will have the same fate.

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

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