

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

Stakeholder ID 4707 Name Gillian rouse

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Without knowing where the evidence is from it is difficult to judge.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

In that i agree the Green Belt should be protected.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Will the development around Harlow lead to jobs in that area or result in more comments into London?

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

Stakeholder ID 4707

Name Gillian

rouse

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The loss of local shops e.g. bicycle shop, laundrette would reduce our facilities.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There is not enough information to make an information decision.

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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Roads near where proposed sites can already be congested. For example, Brooklyn Avenue, Loughton at 11am Friday 2nd Dec was at grid lock. How can extra road users be accommodated?

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

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:

One point against the development of some of the proposed sites is parking provision. That is lack for the new residents and from the commuters and illegible, whose space is removed. Will new car parks be placed underground creating the extra space needed? Many of the flats already built recently in Buckhurst Hill e.g. Old Mother Hubbard site and the petrol station on Buckhurst Way, have resulted in more street and pavement

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

parking. Four wheel parking on pavements is to be discouraged as it reduced space for pedestrians and makes pavements more dangerous.

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

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:

Local roads will be under strain. How can this be prevented. Improvements to major roads often result in faster, busier roads which can be more dangerous and may dissuade many people from using them.

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 would be interesting.

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

The plan cites the importance of a 'good quality of life'; I didn't notice a definition of this. In my view the council's ability to deliver on this is constrained by government and county council policy. The proposed number of new dwellings is, presumably, dictated by government. It is their policies, or lack of policies, which, have resulted in many of London's problems. Less social housing, at a time of rising poverty and high private rents, with people spending two-thirds of their salary on rent, and fewer homes in London being affordable for average earners. Average house prices in London are now 9 times average salaries. Average salaries have fallen by 10% since 2008. The building of very expensive, often empty homes and offices has not

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

been discouraged. More people are therefore moving further from their jobs. Similarly there is no effective government policy to spread economic development from the congested, expensive South East of England to the rest of the country. Is this where some of the demand in Epping Forest is coming from? Already our quality of life has been diminished in recent years. How will EFDC safeguard and improve our current quality of life? The council's plans are likely to exacerbate the situation. These are some of the local issues that may arise. Pressure on public transport, which is currently underfunded, will increase. The Central Line runs at capacity for most of the day now, let alone at peak hours. More trains, more efficient trains and more track are needed. The bus network has stagnated. An easy link from Buckhurst Hill station to Chingford station would be useful as would an outer orbital bus system, say linking the 167 at Buckhurst Hill to Enfield to take pressure off the Central Line. Will the council be able to influence improvements? Congestion on all roads will worsen. Even at 11am, Brooklyn Avenue in Loughton has been at gridlock. New homes in Buckhurst Hill/Loughton/Debden will increase traffic flows, increasing pollution and accidents, particularly on main roads, like Loughton Way, Buckhurst Hill. As it is potholes are left for many months, risking injury to pedestrians, vehicles and drivers. How will this improve our quality of life? Action to fit all cars with speed inhibitors and mobile phone disablers, to install safety cameras at crossing points, may help reduce the negative effects of increased road usage, but needs government action. Pressure to 'improve' trunk roads will result in lost farmland and areas important to wildlife, increased traffic, pollution and accidents. The Department of Transport has been heavily criticised for removing the hard shoulder from sections of the M25, M1 - they have not considered safety only traffic flows. These roads will be more heavily used with an increased population, what actions will the council take to improve the safety of trunk roads? Pedestrian safety is paramount, for many it is vital for maintaining an active life. Many pavements are already in poor repair, difficult to navigate for wheelchair users and others. Will new developments include safer pavements and road crossings? Will the council take responsibility for our pavements? In response to government action Essex County Council cut street lighting hours, thus reducing our quality of life. Despite, a survey to the opposite, this action has made walking or travelling in the more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians, and drivers. Cheaper LED lighting would help protect residents, would EFDC push for this? Current new housing is often of a lower standard than previously, smaller rooms, less space, less storage, less sound proofing. Will the proposed new homes improve on these low standards, improving quality of life? Will our local health services be able to cope with demands of a larger community? A population whose quality of life is likely to fall, and that will become more stressed as commuting time increases while family time diminishes. Will local schools and colleges have space for extra students, while maintaining an important personal relationship with them? Does losing local shops, on Lower Queens Road, improve or diminish our quality of life?

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