

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

Stakeholder ID 1678 Name Geoff King

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:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q1.pdf

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:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q2.pdf

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q3.pdf

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

Stakeholder ID 1678 Name Geoff King

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

Epping?

No

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:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q4.pdf

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q5.pdf

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:

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:

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

No opinion

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q6.pdf

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q7.pdf

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

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/11/Q8.pdf

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

SP1

Sustainability: This word appears to mean all things to all people; it is bandied around in the Plan endlessly, and is being used to justify anything. As such it is currently meaningless, and we have found nothing in the current draft of the Local Plan which could be genuinely described as a thoughtful, positive contribution to sustainability. If we take one definition : "Sustainable development is about finding better ways of doing things..." (Source: the Sustainable Development Commission), then it can be said that there is no hint of sustainability anywhere in this Local Plan - it is just more of the same-old same-old. If the word is to be used in future editions of this plan, then EFDC should give a clear definition of what they actually mean by it, and then show metrics and examples of how their Plan actually delivers it. In particular the sustainability metrics should focus on how much the Plan contributes, inter alia, to: •Improvements in the Forest environment and ecology •Reduced road traffic •Reduced congestion in Epping High Street •Reduced environmental pollution •Increased levels of cycling and public transport usage •Reduced energy consumption •Reduced on-street parking

SP5

Green Belt: We feel strongly that the Green Belt should be protected as a top priority, and that it is not acceptable to nibble away at it, or use weasel words such as "releasing" it. The proposed "policy" is therefore not remotely acceptable. As written it is in any case meaningless. EFDC must fight much harder to protect the existing Green Belt, rather than meekly accepting imposed quotas for new housing, and using this as an excuse to eat into the Green Belt. EFDC should be making a robust case for reducing significantly the housing numbers so as to safeguard the Green Belt we have now. Re paragraph 3.88, the draft Local Plan totally fails to demonstrate any exceptional circumstances which would justify eating into the Green Belt. That is because there are no exceptional circumstances.

H1

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

Housing specifics 1. Numbers: The housing numbers put forward for Epping in the draft are unrealistically high (particularly when the types of housing to be built are completely undefined). We believe that a very strong line needs to be taken on this, so as to get the number markedly reduced. 2. Types of dwelling: This is an enormous failing in the current draft Local Plan - it gives no meaningful information on, or justification of, the numbers per site, the types of dwelling, or the reasoning behind the proposed densities (some of which seem perverse). There is a world of difference between a multi-storey block surrounded by parkland and a former field full of bungalows ripe for future extension. These matters must not be left to the developers - in fact we propose that the Council itself should take control, and be thoroughly prescriptive over all aspects relative to what is actually built. 3. Who for?: There is no discussion in the Plan concerning who the new dwellings are for. We have been struck by the statistics which show how many people not currently living in the area want to move in. At the same time we are also conscious of the difficulty young people have in finding affordable housing, and of the importance of Epping not becoming more of a dormitory/ commuter town. We accept that some additional housing needs to be developed in Epping, but it is fundamental that this should be to the benefit of local people. We therefore think that at least 50% of it should be reserved for local people, and genuinely affordable for local first-time buyers. This type of approach has been developed in other parts of the country and there is no reason why it can not be applied here. 4. Element E of the draft policy: This must be a joke, given what EFDC has been permitting in recent times - numerous bungalows in and around Epping have been over-developed, with second storeys added and huge extensions of floor areas. For evidence of this, see Bower Hill and Lynceley Grange, and what EFDC has allowed there in the last 10 years.

H2

Who for?: There is no discussion in the Plan concerning who the new dwellings are for. We have been struck by the statistics showing how many people not currently living in the area want to move in. At the same time we are also conscious of the difficulty young people have in finding affordable housing, and of the importance of Epping not becoming more of a dormitory/ commuter town. We accept that some additional housing needs to be developed in Epping, but it is fundamental that this should be to the benefit of local people. We therefore think that at least 50% of it should be reserved for local people, and genuinely affordable for local first-time buyers. This type of approach has been developed in other parts of the country and there is no reason why it can not be applied here.

T1

Transport 1. Consideration in the Local Plan: The Plan is ridiculously unrealistic about current transport issues, and the consequential impacts in such areas as pollution and commuter parking in residential roads. It is fatuous to take the line that this can be considered as a separate matter, outside the context of the Local Plan. A joined-up approach is mandatory. It is patently obvious that building more housing must inevitably increase the pressure on local transport, notably of course the roads. However, the Plan says nothing creative or remotely helpful. Arguably this is out-and-out negligence. 2. Road traffic: There is no useful discussion of road traffic in the Plan. We do think that, given the traffic congestion already evident in Epping, and the level of traffic flow through the town - even early on a Sunday morning - it is not good enough to consider major development plans for the town separately from the traffic consequences of those considerations. If we look at current traffic levels and patterns, together with their environmental consequences, in our opinion that would be sufficient evidence to show that no substantial further development in or around Epping can be justified, nor could it possibly be claimed to be "sustainable"). 3. Car parking: There has been some useful discussion at various meetings regarding the idea of building on or over various car parks. We think the clear conclusion must be that whatever is done, the number of car parking spaces must not reduce, and in fact the opportunity must be taken to increase the availability of off-road parking. Also there needs to be rigorous planning of the building work to ensure that entire car parks are not put out of use while the work is done - notably of course those at Epping Station, behind the High Street, and at the District Council offices. Furthermore, the District Council must provide off-road parking for anyone working at their offices in Epping, whether temporary or permanent staff, instead of inflicting it on local residential roads. 4. Rail services 1: The point has been well made that it is nonsensical to have people from Harlow driving to and parking in Epping for the Central Line. We accept that this is not within the control of EFDC, but they do need to show serious

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

commitment to work actively for the obvious solution. 5.Rail services 2: In the same vein, EFDC should make it a key priority of the Local Plan to implement a commuter interconnect at Epping station with the Epping to Ongar line. This has been talked about for long enough. It must be delivered. This would be a concrete step towards getting traffic off the roads. 6.Sustainability: This word appears to mean all things to all people; it is bandied around in the Plan endlessly, and is being used to justify anything. As such it is currently meaningless, and we have found nothing in the current draft of the Local Plan which could be genuinely described as a thoughtful, positive contribution to sustainability. If we take one definition : "Sustainable development is about finding better ways of doing things..." (Source: the Sustainable Development Commission), then it can be said that there is no hint of sustainability anywhere in this Local Plan - it is just more of the same-old same-old. If the word is to be used in future editions of this plan, then EFDC should give a clear definition of what they actually mean by it, and then show metrics and examples of how their Plan actually delivers it. In particular the transport sustainability metrics should focus on how much the Plan contributes, inter alia, to:

- Reduced road traffic
- Reduced congestion in Epping High Street
- Reduced environmental pollution
- Better provision of road space for cyclists
- Increased levels of cycling and public transport usage
- Reduced energy consumption
- Reduced on-street parking

T2

The need here is for improved public transport provision, NOT the accommodation of additional road traffic, of which there is far too much already. The policy should embody positive measures to reduce road traffic and road traffic congestion, and in parallel to promote cycle usage. As it stands, T2 is just worthless waffle.

P1

Site selection 1.Sites identified in the current draft: In general we support the reasoning behind the approach of locating development to the South and East of Epping, subject to two overriding priorities: 1) Green Belt: the Green Belt should be protected as a top priority; it is not acceptable to nibble away at it, or use weasel words such as "releasing" it. The proposed "policy" is therefore not remotely acceptable. 2) Numbers: the numbers allocated to Epping must be significantly reduced. Achieving a significant reduction in the numbers will help to mitigate/resolve some of the other issues raised by the Local Plan. A further proviso is that the availability of a piece of land and a willing seller is by no means sufficient to warrant inclusion in the Local Plan. 2.Alternative development sites: (i.e. other than those proposed in the current Local Plan). There must be public consultation on any alternative which may be given serious consideration by EFDC, before possible inclusion on any future version of the Local Plan. There appears to be no provision for this in the current Plan timeline. 3.Sites which have previously been considered but have now been ruled out: We have been extremely concerned that publication of the Local Plan appears to be seen by some (including some Councillors) as an opportunity to put back into play sites which have been very clearly ruled out, with a complete lack of clarity as to rationale or justification. This is very disturbing. If any alternative sites are to be seriously considered it is essential that they are properly researched and consulted. Ad-hoc solutions which have not been robustly researched or objectively and openly arrived at would not be acceptable. There must be a commitment not to re-consider sites which have previously been under active consideration (i.e. some of the sites designated "EPP - ..." during earlier consultation rounds) but then have been ruled out in the current Local Plan. Developers and landowners and mere availability must not be allowed to dictate site locations. 4.Element B of the draft policy: The commentary here is laughable - like much of the document it is a wish-list only, indicating little or no serious commitment on the part of EFDC. To be of any value the Plan must include hard commitments to health provision, and recreational facilities and adult education, which are much-needed improvements on what exists today. The Plan gives us no confidence at all that EFDC will deliver on any of this. 5.Car parking: The consideration of car parking is wholly inadequate. There have been some useful discussions locally already regarding the idea of building on or over various car parks. The clear conclusion must be that whatever is done, the number of car parking spaces must not reduce, and in fact the opportunity must be taken to increase the availability of off-road parking. Also there needs to be rigorous planning of the building work to ensure that entire car parks are not put out of use while the work is done - notably of course those at Epping Station, behind the High Street, and at the District Council offices.

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

Furthermore, the District Council must provide off-road parking for anyone working at their Epping offices, whether temporary or permanent staff. At present EFDC is part of the problem, not the solution.

D1

This policy statement is far too generalised and provides no comfort that infrastructure development will proceed in accordance with new housing development. The plan and this draft policy are both grossly deficient in their treatment of the key provisions such as medical facilities, schools, adult education, recreational sites, and sustainable transport. The opportunity must be taken to provide these ahead of need, and to a standard significantly better than the present.

D4

Element A of the proposed policy appears to be another sick joke, when the plan for Epping clearly targets existing, much-used recreational facilities for housing. It has no credibility at all, especially when there is hard evidence - in the complete loss of adult education facilities in Epping - that the Council is not interested in alternative provision in Epping. We are extremely concerned that the proposed use of Epping's sports centres and sports grounds for housing follows the pattern of the closure and non-replacement of adult education centres in the area. With a High Street where estate agents offices are replacing shops there will be fewer reasons to spend leisure time in the town. The people of Epping are being called upon to make sacrifices so that developers may prosper. The current Local Plan is unacceptably woolly about the provision of replacement facilities when existing facilities are taken over for housing. The Plan would only be acceptable if there were binding commitments to replace with better, in Epping, before the existing facilities are closed.