

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

Stakeholder ID 2991 Name Joanne Hurst

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:

I agree with the vision - but utterly disagree with the published plans on how to implement it, as they appear to be entirely contrary to it.

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:

Infill of pocket green spaces is a poor decision - densification will result in a very real lowering of quality of life for existing local residents, and a poor offer to new ones. Current infrastructure such as parking, transport, schools and doctors for example are already overwhelmed. Environmental impacts will also be severe. The new-town model is far more strongly preferred for all these reasons.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Immediate infrastructure is being considered, but the knock on effect to areas close to the tube (particularly Epping, Theydon and Loughton) will be enormous, including vast rise in traffic through the Forest. Most will take a route through Epping Green, hitting the main road at Creeds Farm/Bell Common which cannot cope with existing traffic burden. Roads close to tube have parking conflict through entire week and weekends with

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

Stakeholder ID 2991 Name Joanne Hurst

cars parking on dangerous corners and private lawns as there is nowhere else to go. Further development in these areas at the same time will exasperate further.

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Earlier comments re densification in areas already overwhelmed will change them beyond recognition. Loss of green spaces will have a serious negative effect on the quality of life of existing residents as well as providing a poorer offer to the new. Parking is already at crisis level and no net expansion at shopping centers or close to tube or transport hubs is being considered. Remaining open spaces are hilly, densely wooded or in private ownership - leaving no option for formal or informal recreation or sports. Net environmental impact to the Forest itself, which is already dying due to climate change, pollution and invasive species, let alone more direct human pressures (footfall, litter, etc) will be multiplied to levels that cannot be sustained. I oppose this

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

densification solution VERY strongly. A more holistic and sustainable model, such as a new town must be considered as an alternative.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Earlier comments re densification in areas already overwhelmed such as Jessel Green, Traps Hill and the Station car park will change them beyond recognition. Loss of green spaces will have a serious negative effect on the quality of life of existing residents as well as providing a poorer offer to the new. Parking is already at crisis level and no net expansion at shopping centers or close to tube or transport hubs is being considered. Remaining open spaces are hilly, densely wooded or in private ownership - leaving no option for formal or informal recreation or sports. Net environmental impact to the Forest itself, which is already dying due to climate change, pollution and invasive species, let alone more direct human pressures (footfall, litter, etc) will be multiplied to levels that cannot be sustained. I oppose this densification solution VERY strongly. A more holistic and sustainable model, such as a new town must be considered as an alternative.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

Earlier comments re densification in areas already overwhelmed will change them beyond recognition. Loss of green spaces will have a serious negative effect on the quality of life of existing residents as well as providing a poorer offer to the new. Parking is already at crisis level and no net expansion at shopping centers or close to tube or transport hubs is being considered. Remaining open spaces are hilly, densely wooded or in private ownership - leaving no option for formal or informal recreation or sports. Net environmental impact to the Forest itself, which is already dying due to climate change, pollution and invasive species, let alone more direct human pressures (footfall, litter, etc) will be multiplied to levels that cannot be sustained. I oppose this densification solution VERY strongly. A more holistic and sustainable model, such as a new town must be considered as an alternative.

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

I disagree with the loss of North Weald Airfield - this provides a source of recreation, enjoyment and education for families in many different ways as well as being a valued heritage asset and green space. Earlier comments re densification in areas already overwhelmed will change them beyond recognition. Loss of green spaces will have a serious negative effect on the quality of life of existing residents as well as providing a poorer offer to the new. Parking is already at crisis level and no net expansion at shopping centers or close to tube or transport hubs is being considered. Remaining open spaces are hilly, densely wooded or in private ownership - leaving no option for formal or informal recreation or sports. Net environmental impact to the Forest itself, which is already dying due to climate change, pollution and invasive species, let alone more direct human pressures (footfall, litter, etc) will be multiplied to levels that cannot be sustained. I oppose this densification

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

solution VERY strongly. A more holistic and sustainable model, such as a new town must be considered as an alternative.

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

This does not satisfy areas already at crisis point with parking close to existing tube stations - Kendal Avenue in Epping suffers all week round - with people parking on private lawns, dangerous corners and blocking in residents all week round. This is already insufferable, and will only be made worse. It is not in the councils power to improve health provision, which is already below satisfactory levels. Bus routes that bridge the London/Essex borders such as the 20 and 167 are already under fire (although saved for now), and will not cope. Any attempt to use the central line at 8am other than from Epping (start of the line) will demonstrate it is at full capacity, with carriages resembling cattle-trucks from as far out as Buckhurst Hill/Woodford and people unable to board beyond those stops.

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

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

I do not feel it fully appreciates the pressure on remaining open spaces, the loss of areas for formal and informal recreation and the health of Epping Forest itself. As I have detailed previously, pressure on transport are already unbearable - this is not addressed adequately.

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