

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

Stakeholder ID 2848 Name Catherine Hammond

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:

I strongly disagree that these plans support the overall vision. Much of the development, especially those on sites SR-0132Ci, SR-0069/33 and SR-0113B is on existing green belt land. These fields are well used by the local community including myself for walking and recreation. In addition site SR-0069/33 is a nesting ground for a large population of skylarks. Sites SR-0069/33 and SR-0113B have the potential to seriously disrupt quality of life to the south of Epping. Bridge Hill and Brook Road already suffer from traffic congestion owing to the lack of parking for existing houses along these roads and the lack of suitable passing places. There are frequent blocks along Brook Road that brings traffic to a standstill, especially under the railway bridge. Traffic congestion outside Ivy Chimneys Primary School is also very bad at school dropping off and closing time. Cars struggle to find places and frequently cause blockages. There has been an accident here involving a child being hit by a car before and this level of risk is likely to increase with the increased amount of traffic associated with the new residential developments on sites SR-0069/33 and SR-0113B. Traffic from these sites will only be able to join the existing roads, Brook Road and Bridge Hill to the North as the Southern Boundary of these sites is limited by the M25. The building of houses on the site of The Spotted Dog public house has already increased traffic problems in this area due to more parking on the road making it almost impossible to get through at certain times of day. There also appears to be no plan for increasing existing infrastructure at the school, or with local medical centres to support substantial increases in population. The waiting time for a non urgent appointment at the High Street surgery is currently 4 weeks and at the Limes Medical Centre it is up to 6 weeks. If Ivy Chimneys Primary has to increase in size, this may cause further impact on the green belt land surrounding it. The ARUP report on the Draft IDP says 'the forecast capacity figures show that current infrastructure will be under significant pressure to accommodate the growing pupil population' Without a clear plan about how the school infrastructure will be improved it will be irresponsible to compromise the educational prospects of the District's young people by going ahead with a housing development plan that is not supported by adequate school provision. I strongly object to the plan to develop site SR-0132Ci. This will take away three sport and recreational facilities from the people of Epping including the cricket, tennis and bowls clubs. Along with the site SR-0347, currently the Sports Centre being taken

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

Stakeholder ID 2848 Name Catherine Hammond

away, there will be very little opportunity for community of Epping to take part in sport and healthy recreational social activities in their own town. Clubs such as the tennis club have formed an important part of the social fabric of the town for many years. With an ageing population to plan for and support, it is of utmost importance to keep smaller scale, local, accessible sport and social facilities to help a community live well and age well.

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:

I disagree that these are the most appropriate new areas for housing. The bulk of new development is concentrated to the south and west side of Epping, where as detailed in my response to Q1 the existing infrastructures of roads and schools is least able to accommodate the increase in traffic and population. The existing roads in this area, especially Bridge Hill and Brook Road are narrow and houses have no off street parking which leads to congestion and traffic blockages, especially at peak times.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I disagree with this element of the plan as I think it is important to maintain Harlow's green spaces. I am also concerned that the level of planning for associated infrastructure for these sites does not appear to be matched in the planning for sites near Epping.

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Further clarification on plans for the St John's Road site would be helpful in order to make a more informed decision about the likely impact of the Local Plan.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Employment sites such as the Sports Centre and Epping Laundry site are earmarked for residential development, which seems contrary to the proposal to make best use of existing employment sites. Without the results of the detailed work to identify specific sites for allocation it is hard to comment properly on this statement.

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:

I disagree with the proposed sites in Epping as at the moment there is insufficient detail regarding the number of properties proposed for each site, and the character of the dwellings, in order to be able to make a fully informed decision about the likely impact of development.

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 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:

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

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:

I strongly disagree with this statement as there is no clear statement of infrastructure provision in the plan - Chapter 6.3 states that this is in the process of being developed, therefore the rest of the plan is impossible to comment on effectively without the full picture regarding infrastructure being made clear here. Broad principles and ideas are referred to with no detail of how they will actually be achieved.

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 is impossible to comment without knowing where to find this document and what its contents are.

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

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