

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

Stakeholder ID	4854	Name	James and Barbara Waters
----------------	------	------	--------------------------

Method	Letter
--------	--------

Date	28/2/2017
------	-----------

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

Letter or Email Response:

Green Belt: The Council are to be congratulated that no alterations have been made to the Green Belt boundaries since 1998. However, the primary aim of this legislation is to prevent sprawl and 'releasing' extra land now will enlarge the existing holes in the Green Belt leading eventually to development cutting a swathe through the district and dividing it from Buckhurst Hill to Harlow. Thornwood Common: The proposed residential site SR-0149 for 124 homes at Thornwood Common is too big. It will impact on the 'Shrubbery' a fine building of character built by a local craftsman in 1898. It will also have a detrimental effect on the Thornwood Common Nature Reserve (est. 1996) by closing off the access/ingress to open countryside. Any development should preserve the field adjacent to the Nature Reserve and not link with Brookfield. Extra houses should be placed away at distance from the High Road, preferably following the line of the original Common boundary; otherwise the open aspect of the area will be destroyed. A good example of this is Forest Grove - replacing the Blacksmith's Arms at Woodside! I cannot see how the provision of such a large number of homes in Thornwood Common will help meet 'local need' unless the District Council actually own these homes and control the allocation to 'local people'. A good example is the recent development of eight houses on part of the UCRFC site in Upland Road. This was a typical 'free-for-all' sale with only one 'local' family successful in acquiring a home. Is this meeting 'local' need? Regarding the assumed weakness of the village by lacking 'a feel of a centre' -this is because industry sits in stark contrast to residential units opposite on the High Road. To add insult to this, the 'heart' of the village -'The Carpenter's Arms pub,' is about to be ripped out by a developer! Any further residential development within Thornwood Common should avoid the current trend of 'gated developments' as this further alienates the community from each other. Regarding the enhancement of local amenities -Thornwood Common's two petrol stations (Neals & ESS) also provide products similar to a village shop. Admittedly this is not convenient for residents living in the Duck Lane, Woodside or Weald Hall Lane areas. The Carpenter's Arms pub site would have been ideal to fulfil this role had planners had the foresight! Infrastructure: Having personal experience of the sewage works at Thornwood Common, I know it cannot cope with storm water at present. Should this SR-0149 area be developed, it would undoubtedly put additional strain on the facility. Not only with domestic waste but also additional run-off from roofing and paving that would otherwise soak into the ground. To help Thornwood Common become 'sustainable' there is a need for local jobs. There are many employers within Thornwood Common but with over 20 years of living here I only know of three people from Thornwood Common who found employment in the village. I had to commute to London for work. How is the council going to achieve this 'sustainable' model? Public bus services have improved over the last year and the provision of shelters are welcomed but there is still an almighty gap in highway infrastructure to support this. A classic example is the lack of a traffic island on the B.1393 to allow passengers to cross the road safely either to

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

Stakeholder ID	4854	Name	James and Barbara Waters
----------------	------	------	--------------------------

board or alight from a bus service. The lack of maintenance on the road surface of the B.1393 results in rivers forming in the wheel ruts of lorries during rain, which is then directed at pedestrians walking by the road. This may seem hilarious to the reader but I can assure you it is no joke being drenched by a 50mph 30-ton passing lorry! Regarding breaches of planning controls in the district and enforcement action. I refer to the 18/9/2014 decision on EPF/0868/13 & EPF/0877/13. Paragraph 6 states that, 'within 3 months of this decision a landscaping scheme was to be submitted for the replacement and maintenance of trees destroyed in the breach of planning controls regarding this site'. To date no compliance has been witnessed to this order by our residents.

Draft Policy Questionnaire Barbara Waters 37, Upland Road Thornwood Common Essex CM16 6NJ Email barbara.waters1@virgin.net My response; Draft Policy Question 1 (3.26 Chapter3) I disagree with some parts of the vision. A good quality of life for existing residents of rural locations will be difficult when rural locations are turned into urban ones. It is naive to suggest that communities can be created by simply increasing the number of people in a village. Thornwood has already got new developments, the inhabitants of which do not want to be part of the village community, they go to work come home and close the door. Some people consider the web their community. Sustainable locations are those with infrastructure in place before development takes place. Thornwood Common has some infrastructure but not sufficient to sustain an expanding population even some existing infrastructure is being removed to make way for new housing development. I agree that development of walking, cycling and public transport be a priority throughout the District. Question 2 (Draft Policy SP2) I agree that the use of land in the main settlements of the district and Brownfield sites are preferable for development rather than using the Green Belt. However the proposed sites for development in Thornwood and to the south of Harlow on Latton Priory both fall within the current Green Belt boundary. The Thornwood development will have a boundary alteration. Will that of Latton Bush? The Thornwood development will also restrict wildlife movement between the Thornwood Nature Reserve and the Green Belt, as the existing 'Green Corridor' will be developed for housing. Question 3 Draft Policy SP3 I disagree in principle that there will be development to the south of Harlow but I am delighted to read "the ridge line should not be breached" (3.67 Chapter 3 Strategic Policies of the Local Plan.) However I would prefer to read must not be breached. Also in Ch4 DM2 it is suggested that "techniques will be used to minimise the impact of development by taking in to account existing landscape features from the outset" If housing is built on the Latton Priory surrounding farm land there will be a loss of food production area. The remains of Latton Priory is also a Grade 2 listed building and in Ch 4 Dii it is suggested that the Plan would "permit development which would not cause harm to the significance of a listed building." Would 1,000 houses and related infrastructure not harm its significance? This area is also close to Parndon Wood which needs to be protected from incursion by buildings. Question 4 Draft Policy E2 & Section 5 Places I agree in principle that the proposed primary shopping area of Epping should be protected and retail use encouraged. However with the current rate of retail premises being rebuilt as accommodation there will not be many available sites for retail left. If the car parks at Bakers Lane and Epping Station are used for housing development, there will be no access for parking. The elderly shoppers who use Epping are unlikely to want to carry their purchases on foot any distance. Walking to Epping from Loughton or Thornwood Common is at the moment most difficult with narrow uneven pavements, fortunately the Forest paths are passable in dry weather. At the present time Thornwood has several areas, such as Upland Road, Duck Lane and the lay bys on the B1393, where commuters park their cars and then take the bus to the station, as this is cheaper than using the car parks in Epping. If the parking in Epping is restricted this will increase the street parking in outlying districts. It is not only residents of Epping who shop there especially on market day, providing a regular every 10 minutes bus service may help, also cycle lanes and well maintained pavements. Question 5 Draft Policy E5 I disagree with parts of the policy. On the map of Thornwood Common three employment areas are shown. There are also Brickfield Business Centre, Camfauds, Marlow Concrete Crushing in the High Road. There are also Units between 23 and 25 Upland Road. Employment sites of Arrow Garage and Total Waste Management are in Woodside. Thornwood is already supposed to be the most industrialised village in Essex. Enhancement of the proposed sites will increase the industrialisation of an Essex village. Many of the current businesses in the village of Thornwood Common are mainly staffed with people from outside the village who commute in and leave at the end of the day. People who can afford to move to Thornwood to live seem to already have employment in London or to be retired. The Woodside industrial area has outline plans to be increased in size by making buildings two storeys with car park space limited to areas in front of each unit. There will be a parking problem in Woodside itself as customers and staff will not be able to park inside. There are no pavements in Woodside and no direct bus service, people will have to walk either from the High Road or from the B 181. Residents of Forest Grove find it difficult to park safely due to over development and some residents of Woodside already park on the forest edge. This increased on street parking will impinge on the Lower

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

Forest opposite the units, including air pollution from increased traffic on the forests ecosystems. Question 6 Sites for Housing I disagree with parts of the policy. Thornwood As stated at 6.18 'the Council seek contributions from development of 10 or more dwellings to mitigate the impact on education facilities'. In Thornwood there was a large housing development built another has outline planning permission for 16 properties neither of these included infrastructure of any kind, perhaps this will now change. Hopefully as Chapter 6 DI part c states the proposed development of 124/130 properties will "clearly demonstrate that infrastructure can be provided." A recent report found that "affordable housing" was financially out of the reach of majority of young people when the mortgage deposit exceeded their joint incomes. There needs to be more properties for affordable rent with assisted options to buy. Access via public transport is at present inconvenient, cycling in any area of EFD is dangerous. The pavements between Harlow and Epping via Thornwood are uneven and dangerous. The fit as well as the elderly take their life into their hands trying to cross the B1393. There will be an increase in traffic emerging either from Brooklied or into the High Road. Coopersale The development of housing on the Coopersale Cricket Ground and Theydon Garnon Primary Playing field goes against the statement at Draft Policy 04 Ai. 'retain and maintain existing facilities which are valued by the community,' as well as against the statement at D2 B. The development of Allotments at Institute Road, Coopersale goes against the statement at D2 B. These are needed to supplement food production and create activity to enable a healthy life style and to encourage community cohesion.. North Weald The development of North Weald Airfield will curtail aviation not develop it. Residents already complain about noise pollution from the use of aircraft, with so many houses close by who will win aviation or residents? Development of the airfield apron by a new employment (SR01 19) will restrict the staging of the market which is well patronised and the other activities for which it used, lorry, bus and car driver training, Epping The proposed development of Epping Sports Club in Lower Bury Lane goes against the statement made in the Draft Policy at D4 Ai, 'retain and maintain existing facilities which are valued by the community,' as well as against the statement at D2 B. The site is well used by the local community and is an asset which should be retained. Question 7 Infrastructure I disagree with some parts of the policy. Chapter 6 DI part c states the proposed development of 124/130 properties in Thornwood Common will "clearly demonstrate that infrastructure can be provided." This has so far not been the case in Thornwood Common. There have been several developments, Forest Grove, housing on the Upper Clapton site, increase in buildings on the Woodside Camp but no increase in the sewage treatment works for the village. Neither has there been any development of retail sites, education provision, GP surgeries etc. If the suggested development is created without suitable infrastructure then it will not be self sufficient and neither will the village of Thornwood.

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