

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

Stakeholder ID	2862	Name	terry	Blanks	None
----------------	------	------	-------	--------	------

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:

The Council appears to have acceded to the wishes of the more affluent areas within the district (Chigwell and Buckhurst Hill) who argued that they have no desire for any further development and that any increase should be in North Weald. For evidence see page 79/80 of the Cabinet meeting of 10 June 2013

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 first consultation took place in 2012 under the title Issues and Options. The two most significant and district wide responses were: 1. Protection of the green belt. 2. Adoption of Spatial Option 1 for growth being proportionate distribution. In the intervening period the leader of the Council has repeatedly and consistently stated that proportionality would be the hallmark of the Plan. As the number of new dwellings in the District is planned under Policy SP2 is 11,290 and North Weald Bassett is expected to take 1,580 in its centre and a further 1,180 on its northern part near Harlow this represents 24% of the Districts new homes and will more than double the size of the village. Hardly proportionate and totally unacceptable. For evidence see paragraphs 17 and 50 of the Cabinet report on the responses to Community Choices consultation to the Local Plan dated 10 June 2013.

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

Stakeholder ID	2862	Name	terry	Blanks	
----------------	------	------	-------	--------	--

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is keen on expanding and one developer has long propounded the view that approx 2,250 houses could be accommodated on the Latton Priory site. The established planning wisdom indicates that larger developments bring forward the greatest infrastructure improvements and would be more beneficial to the District generally rather than the piecemeal but extensive numbers planned for North Weald where infrastructure is severely limited. The simple replacement of Latton Priory in total rather than the 1,000 suggested plus all other North Weald sites would concentrate the infrastructure requirement via the developer and retain the Village vision and be a much cheaper option for EFDC and Essex CC. For evidence see your own planning advisors advice in a number of Local Plan workshops.

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

No, I do not agree with any encouragement of any further shopping areas in the district. May I remind you that there is already on the horizon the Epping Forest Retail Park which is well behind the original schedule and which is causing considerable traffic delays and congestion in the Debden area and I foresee, unfortunately, that the whole project will be a financial disaster. This being due mainly to its location and poor access from the Central Line and main roads. Any further escalation of shopping areas without adequate increased infrastructure - which is not in the gift of EFDC anyway - will be detrimental to residents and existing businesses. For evidence simply visit the junction of Langston Road with Rectory Lane at almost any time of day.

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

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Without appropriate infrastructure to support any type of business it would be almost impossible to attract business to the area. Unfortunately and crucially there are no proposals to increase access by new or improved road or rail connections in the draft plan. Indeed the draft plan is ominously silent on any infrastructure detail.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Harlow is keen on expanding and one developer has long propounded the view that approx 2,250 houses could be accommodated on the Latton Priory site. The established planning wisdom indicates that larger developments bring forward the greatest infrastructure improvements and would be more beneficial to the District generally rather than the piecemeal but extensive numbers planned for North Weald where infrastructure is severely limited. The simple replacement of Latton Priory in total rather than the 1,000 suggested plus all other North Weald sites would concentrate the infrastructure requirement via the developer

and retain the Village vision and be a much cheaper option for EFDC and Essex CC. For evidence see your own planning advisors advice in a number of Local Plan workshops.

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:

The section 6 devoted to infrastructure consists of carefully worded consultant jargon with which there is nothing to agree with or disagree - other than the fact that in essence it says nothing that has any detailed relevance to this specific plan. After an inordinate amount of time has been taken to produce what on one hand is a devastating depth of detail on increased housing throughout the district not one piece of new or improved infrastructure has been proposed. Significantly, the provision of infrastructure is not within the gift of EFDC to provide. Roads and schools are the responsibility of Essex County Council. Railways are the responsibility of the various bodies appointed by or sold franchises to by Government. Hospitals and Doctors are the responsibility of the Government via the NHS. etc. In addition it is unlikely that the Conservators of Epping Forest whose land abuts the roads linking North Weald to Epping would agree to any road expansion involving their land. Unless most of the detailed improvements in infrastructure are put in place before any expansion of housing takes place, such expansion will lead to greater congestion, greater dissatisfaction with schools, greater delay in achieving doctors appointments and access to hospitals and will likely ferment unprecedented public frustration and unhappiness. It was illuminating to hear one of the long standing EFDC consultants explain to an anxious mother concerned about the time it takes to collect her children from school

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

because of the existing road conditions that new or improved roads would not be built - because people would use them! I trust that the consultant never has cause to worry or concern herself with the time an ambulance or fire engine might take to reach her family.

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

It will be far easier and more effective to enhance sustainability if the vast bulk of North Weald Bassett housing expansion took place at Latton Priory. For evidence see your consultants' plans and experiences with other 'new towns'.

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

All of them

This is the second consultation that has taken place on this plan. The strongest conclusion reached by your own detailed analysis of the first consultation was that consultees wanted development in the District to be proportional. The leader of the Council has consistently endorsed this view in public and other meetings. Your consultants, at discussions after the publication of the Draft Plan, when asked for the reasons for abandoning this clearly stated opinion was simply that 'things have changed'. This is facile and gives me no confidence that this second consultation will result in a realistic presentation of the views and aspirations of the residents who will be forced to live with the consequences of their wishes being ignored.
