

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

Stakeholder ID 2684 Name PETER Mott

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 plan is ill thought out and shows little or no imagination other than providing the number of new homes demanded by Central Government. It fails to address, meet or deal with the major problems and issues the District faces which have been ignored. In essence the draft local plan fails in many areas/aspects: Quality of life will in no way be enhanced in fact it will be made worse. There is no or little plan or evidence that new employment will be provided - it is assumed that employment for increased population will be met by London with additional pressure placed on an already totally inadequate road and public transport facilities/services. Infrastructure/public services in the District is are/insufficient and declining and unable to deal. cope with current let alone increased demand. Green Belt is not being protected. Introduction of new homes and the consequences of stresses and pressures will in no way protect but will be detrimental and dangerous to the environment.

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:

Existing settlements have grown considerably over recent years and are threatening to destroy the identity of towns, villages and the District. The growth of existing developments needs to be halted. Any new development should be away from existing developments with a clear and large green break between any new and existing development.

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

Stakeholder ID 2684 Name PETER Mott

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

There is a complete lack of evidence detailing the provision of local centres, community, education, transport and health facilities etc. of the type and size required and how these are to be funded. General view/feel is that build the homes increase the population and then worry about how the local population will be supported/serviced afterwards. This should be the other way round - there needs to be a detailed plan in place/agreed with funding in place/committed BEFORE new housing and proposed development is undertaken. This should be the case in all areas of the District..

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Lack of parking, continued and increasing traffic and congestion are having a very real and detrimental effect on the High Street(s) and consequently retail business. Thought and action needs to be given to how to make high street/retail business easily accessible and importantly safe.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Proposals in no way go far enough - there is very little or scant information regards the provision of new employment in the District with the assumption being that increased/new population will be expected to remain in existing employment positions and commute accordingly which will place increased strain on already failing, inadequate and struggling transport network. In those areas where public transport is non existence, there is expectation that residents will jump in their cars and travel to underground stations where there is no parking capacity and no plans to increase parking facilities. Employment areas/new business parks and

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

infrastructure (roads/public transport) need to be put in place prior to new residential development and in order to attract new business to the area/District. Also corporate business need to have been approached, incentivised and a commitment obtained that they will provide NEW, LOCAL and LONG TERM employment positions across the District. Once the type, size etc. of new Business and employment opportunities is known/committed then location of new housing areas can be considered and planned accordingly.

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:

Chipping Ongar as has been raised and accepted previously requires a by pass. This would remove HGV and heavy traffic from a congested SINGLE FILE High Street designed for a horse and carriage. A bypass could and should support the Hallsford Bridge Ind, Estate which is becoming increasingly busy - Lunnon Waste Management continues to expand - heavy plant is queuing daily:- Lunnon and BTG plant passing through the High Street daily. With a new by pass, new housing could be planned and arranged adjacent to the bypass and the Industrial Estate with suitable green break between new and existing development. Proposed development in Ongar is on Green Belt - Green Belt should and needs to be protected. Ongar has seen substantial housing growth over recent years without any development or improvement in its infrastructure/public services - in fact these have declined and deteriorated over recent years. Ongar is unable to support additional housing/population in any locations for the reasons outlined throughout this questionnaire. Ongar needs to maintain its identity - that of a market town - it has slowly been losing this identity - further development will mean any identity will be lost. If there is any new development in Ongar Area, once infrastructure and services are in place then there needs to be a defined and large green area/break between any new or existing development. Density of housing proposed is totally out of keeping with existing. Covenants in local deeds states density of 8No. homes per acre - no where in the Plan is this mentioned or recognised or

accepted. Vehicle access to proposed sites has not been considered and is very questionable. An additional junction onto A414/main roads will cause additional problems and congestion and be potentially dangerous.

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 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:

Most certainly NOT. Specifically to Ongar but comments are also pertinent for all areas across the District. A. Public transport is wholly inadequate - there is no public rail service- tube line having been closed a number of years ago. Bus service is very poor and unreliable. Traffic on roads which can't cope as it will therefore increase. B. Roads are gridlocked already without increased pressures. Ongar High Street has single file traffic and sees regular long tail backs/delays. Heavy plant HGV's continually pass through the High Street just not designed or suitable for it. It is DANGEROUS. Lunnons on Hallsford Bridge Industrial Estate are expanding and

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

volume of heavy traffic through the High St is increasing. Traffic and pressures need to be relieved not made worse. C. The GP surgery in Ongar can not cope/deal with existing patient numbers let alone more - clearly highlighted by the length of time you have to wait for an appointment - this if you are able to get through on the telephone in the first place - the surgery is totally under resourced to deal with its existing patient base. Similarly hospital and accident and emergency services in the area are under pressure and can't cope. D. Police : WHAT POLICE?? Ongar and Epping stations have now been closed - hardly conducive with the Plan's proposals to increase population and demands on a non existence Police Service. E. Education - Despite comments made in plan local schools are not able or in a position and do not have capacity for a large new intake. C, D and E above - Bottom line is these public services are stretched to breaking point, Existing facilities are inadequate and there is no proposal and no funding to improve these to the levels required. There are insufficiently trained doctors, teachers to fill any new posts created (There will be NO new posts created in any case) and Police Force are reducing numbers and there is no sign this trend will be reversed. F. Water, Drainage and Sewage - Current systems are failing and promised Capital Works project works to address problems/issues have not been delivered. Systems can not cope with existing demands/pressures let alone new and increased ones. A week does not go past in Ongar where mains water pipe has not burst and sewage/drains systems are not having to be rodedd/jetted.

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

This no way goes far enough. New housing/The District can only be sustained if adequate and efficient public services and infrastructures are in place to support, accommodate and service it. Public Services/infrastructure is inadequate and failing and will deteriorate further with additional pressure. BEFORE any new/additional housing is planned on any scale therefore EFDC/Central Government must deal and address this issue and put in place a cohesive, suitably funded policy and Blueprint that will ensure first class, fit for purpose public services and infrastructures are put in place BEFORE contemplating any housing and population growth. NOWHERE In the Plan, consultations, meetings and documentation have EFDC provided assurances and guarantees in this respect - until such time as they can then no additional housing and pressures should be considered or approved. If this means EFDC going back to Central Government stating that they require more funding to introduce/deliver on new housing commitments then so be it.

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