

### B1.4.3 Summary of Community Choices Feedback

A report to Cabinet was produced for a meeting on 10 June 2013, which included a summary of the feedback received from the Community Choices consultation. The sections relating to growth locations/opportunity areas in the District are re-produced in the table below.

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
HAR-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the area is isolated from the existing residential area;</li> <li>• Concerns that development of the area could result in coalescence with Roydon and Jack's Hatch;</li> <li>• Traffic congestion is an issue in the area.</li> </ul>
HAR-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential regeneration benefits to the existing Sumners Estate area;</li> <li>• Potential for logical extension to Harlow in accordance with the original Gibberd Plan;</li> <li>• Site could cause coalescence with Roydon and Jack's Hatch;</li> <li>• Concern raised over traffic congestion and suitability of the surrounding rural road network.</li> </ul>
HAR-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favoured area for strategic development, but concerns raised over the size of the proposed area;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the capacity of the motorway junction (J7 of the M11) and the local road network;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the distance from the site to the Town Centre and railway line/stations.</li> </ul>
HAR-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area was not generally favoured for residential development;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the impact on the landscape ridge and Green Belt;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the impact on the transport links, particularly access to the A414.</li> </ul>
HAR-E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was raised that there is potential for bringing a second motorway junction from the M11 to serve Harlow;</li> <li>• Area could provide required housing development, along with supporting services and facilities;</li> <li>• Support for this area was frequently accompanied with a caveat that the area should be smaller and/or not include the section currently within Epping Forest District Council;</li> <li>• Concern raised over potential impact of development on heritage assets in this location.</li> </ul>
BKH-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern raised over the potential impact on the Linders Field Nature Reserve;</li> <li>• Concern raised over the potential negative impact on the character of the immediate area and the setting of a nearby listed building;</li> <li>• Concern raised over the potential impact on the proposed strategic Green Belt gap that separates Buckhurst Hill and Loughton.</li> </ul>
BKH-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal negative environmental impact on the immediate area as it is previously developed;</li> <li>• Close proximity to the underground station is a benefit;</li> <li>• Current traffic congestion issues around Station Way need to be addressed.</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
CHG-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concerns regarding the development of the area given the value of Green Belt.</li> </ul>
CHG-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns raised as the area is located within the Chigwell Conservation Area, and has the potential to affect its character and appearance, and the setting of numerous listed buildings;</li> <li>Close proximity to Dickens Oak (in the verge of Vicarage Lane), one of the district's Landmark Trees that fulfils one of the purposes of the Green Belt (i.e. preserving the setting and special character of historic settlements)</li> <li>A view that the area should be identified as Local Green Space;</li> <li>Limited support expressed for a small amount of development along the High Road frontage.</li> </ul>
CHG-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area contains 11 veteran trees and is an important wildlife corridor and area of wetland;</li> <li>Extensive development could harm the setting of the Chigwell Conservation Area and Dickens Oak;</li> <li>Vicarage Lane is narrow and already heavily used, and therefore cannot support additional traffic;</li> <li>Suggested that the area should be designated as a strategic Green Belt gap;</li> <li>Suggested that careful positioning, design and modest scale of development could overcome issues that would come with development.</li> </ul>
CHG-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area contains ancient hedgerows and veteran trees, and forms part of a wildlife corridor linking Brook Road Wood with Hainault Forest;</li> <li>The site in its current state it is important to the landscape and heritage of the village;</li> <li>Suggested that the area should be designated as a strategic Green Belt gap;</li> <li>Potential flood risk issue with Chigwell Brook forming site's northern boundary.</li> </ul>
CHG-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concern about dangerous access onto Hainault Road, and loss of car parking for Victory Hall;</li> <li>Significant concern about the loss of views of the countryside from Hainault Road;</li> <li>Concern regarding the potential adverse impact on the setting of listed buildings on Hainault Road, and the impact on the residential amenities of existing properties abutting or close to the site.</li> </ul>
ONG-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the area is too small for considerable development;</li> <li>Concern about the impact on traffic congestion in the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
ONG-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over impact on traffic, landscape and loss of the strategic Green Belt gap between Ongar and High Ongar;</li> <li>Some support received for enabling residential development to facilitate delivery of Ongar Academy free school.</li> </ul>
ONG-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over threat to strategic Green Belt gap between Ongar and High Ongar;</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding the potential negative impact on Great Stoney Park.</li> </ul>
ONG-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over the threat to the strategic Green Belt gap between Ongar and High Ongar;</li> <li>Concerns regarding the potential negative impact on Ongar Castle and the historic setting of the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
ONG-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised that development in this location would result in unsustainable sprawl to the south of the town;</li> <li>Potential identified for possible employment uses in this location.</li> </ul>
ONG-E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised that development in this location would result in unsustainable sprawl to the south of the town.</li> </ul>
ONG-F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concern expressed development on high value Green Belt land to the west of the town, and the impact of this on the setting of the Town Centre;</li> <li>Potential identified for new a "bypass" road if this area was developed.</li> </ul>
ONG-G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the impact on traffic and landscape;</li> <li>Some support received for enabling residential development to facilitate the delivery of Ongar Academy free school.</li> </ul>
EPP-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preference for development in this area to focus on improved leisure/community facilities, rather than retail.</li> </ul>
EPP-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area generally considered suitable due its central location;</li> <li>Concerns raised over the potential loss of the Sports Centre.</li> </ul>
EPP-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No feedback received.</li> </ul>
EPP-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for building on the industrial estate on Bower Hill to alleviate the problems of heavy industrial traffic negotiating the narrow railway bridge.</li> </ul>
EPP-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is used by residents for recreational use and is important for wildlife;</li> <li>Sensitive and attractive landscape on the edge of the town;</li> <li>Some support for development suggesting that the area would complete the form of the settlement and is reasonably close to the Town Centre;</li> </ul>
EPP-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is used by residents for recreational use and is important for wildlife;</li> <li>The area is adjacent to Ash Wood/High Wood. This woodland is a UK BAP habitat and should be protected.</li> </ul>
EPP-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the threat of flooding in the area, and potential impact on the nearby SSSI;</li> <li>Concerns over potential access to any new development in the area, and the impact on local traffic.</li> </ul>
EPP-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over potential traffic issues on Lindsey Street if the area is developed;</li> <li>Concerns regarding the impact on the adjacent Swaines Green Local Wildlife Site;</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is very large, and development would impact on services and facilities in town, but could potentially take a lot of the development needs of Epping.</li> </ul>
EPP-E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to local wildlife site Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys Ep81 and BAP Habitat lowland dry acid grassland. Some rare species off Grams Lane;</li> <li>Area used by residents for recreational use and is important for wildlife;</li> <li>Some support for development suggesting that the area would complete the form of the settlement and is reasonably close to the town centre and underground station.</li> </ul>
EPP-F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over noise and air quality from the M25;</li> <li>Concern raised over the distance from the Town Centre, with poor access roads;</li> <li>The area falls partly within a strategic Green Belt gap and should be protected.</li> </ul>
EPP-G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over noise and air quality from the M25;</li> <li>Concern raised over the distance from the Town Centre, with poor access roads;</li> <li>The area falls partly within a strategic Green Belt gap and should be protected.</li> </ul>
EPP-H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would reduce the Green Belt between Epping and Fiddlers Hamlet;</li> <li>Concern regarding increased congestion on poor quality roads;</li> <li>The area is within high quality Green Belt and should be protected.</li> </ul>
LOU-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over impact on the strategic Green Belt gap separating Loughton and Theydon Bois, and that the area is of high landscape sensitivity;</li> <li>Concern regarding negative impacts on residential amenity, and potential issues with traffic congestion.</li> </ul>
LOU-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the potential impact on adjacent Wildlife Sites, Broadfield Shaw and the adjoining grassland;</li> <li>Concerns regarding potential negative impacts on the strategic Green Belt gap;</li> <li>Concern regarding the proximity of the area to Loughton Hall Farm Ditch.</li> </ul>
LOU-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding the impact of additional retail facilities on existing provision on the High Road and The Broadway;</li> <li>Suggestion that residential uses may be more appropriate in this location, particularly due to the proximity of the site to Debden station.</li> </ul>
LOU-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding loss of playing fields in an area where such provision is already low, and encroachment into the Green Belt;</li> <li>Concerns regarding potential impacts from flooding.</li> </ul>
LOU-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding the impact of development on existing retail provision and traffic congestion.</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
LOU-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing car parking should be provided with any development in this area;</li> <li>• Immediate area already suffers from significant traffic congestion issues.</li> </ul>
LOU-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern expressed regarding the commercial development of this site due to the high level of existing provision on the Broadway.</li> </ul>
LOU-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional retail would not be required in any redevelopment of this area.</li> </ul>
LOU-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing car parking provisions should be retained in any redevelopment of this area.</li> </ul>
LOU-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding potential negative impacts on the existing character of the area, particularly the Roding Valley Nature Reserve.</li> </ul>
LOU -11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the impact on residential amenity and the character of the existing area;</li> <li>• Traffic congestion is an issue due to the narrowness of existing roads and proximity of the area to Oaklands School.</li> </ul>
NAZ-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns raised over the negative impact on the area's biodiversity and landscape;</li> <li>• Concerns raised over increases in noise pollution, and the potential negative impacts on local services and utilities;</li> <li>• Possibility that development may improve visual amenity of derelict sites, subject to appropriate scale;</li> <li>• Significant concerns raised over the condition and capacity of the local road network, in particular Hoe Lane.</li> </ul>
NAZ-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A view that development would result in the loss of designated Green Belt and parts of the Conservation Area;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the potential negative impact on local services and utilities;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding additional traffic where there are existing congestion problems on narrow countryside roads;</li> <li>• Concern raised over potential flood risk from the Lea Valley area;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding additional noise pollution generated by the increase of traffic movement;</li> <li>• Concern that loss of glasshouses would result in the decline of traditional industry.</li> </ul>
NAZ-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A view that development would result in loss of designated Green Belt and parts of the Conservation Area;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the potential negative impact on local services and utilities;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding additional traffic where there are existing congestion problems on narrow countryside roads;</li> <li>• Concern raised over potential flood risk from the Lea Valley area;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding additional noise pollution generated by the increase of traffic movement;</li> <li>• A view that development should protect important wildlife corridors through the site;</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
LSH-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the loss of important trees if the area is developed;</li> <li>Close proximity to Sawbrideworth station makes the area suitable and sustainable for residential use.</li> </ul>
LSH-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that existing traffic congestion at Lower Sheering would not cope with the development of a large area such as this.</li> </ul>
SHE-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A view that the impact on the landscape is negligible in this area as it is overgrown and abutting the M11.</li> </ul>
SHE-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over the presence of a significant area of Historic Woodland near the area, and openness of the Green Belt to the north of Sheering.</li> </ul>
SHE-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the impact on the woodland at Glyn's Spring, which is within the area.</li> </ul>
NWB-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that development would result in the loss of existing employment in the area;</li> <li>Some support for small scale expansion.</li> </ul>
NWB-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for the redevelopment of the site, in keeping with the village's character.</li> </ul>
NWB-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the loss of the car park serving the King's Head public house.</li> </ul>
NWB-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns raised over the impact of development on the landscape and Green Belt;</li> <li>A view that development should enhance existing recreation land and public footpaths/bridleways;</li> <li>Concerns expressed regarding the impact on traffic generation and congestion in the village.</li> </ul>
NWB-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the large size of the area, and the potential impact that development of this scale would have on services, utilities and amenities within the village;</li> <li>A view that any development should be preceded by the early delivery of all required infrastructure.</li> </ul>
NWB-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns expressed regarding the impact of noise from the A414 on new and existing residents.</li> </ul>
NWB-AF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many respondents suggested that full consideration of the future of the Airfield cannot be given until the latest study is completed and published (due July 2013)<sup>4</sup>, and the ultimate best option for the Airfield may be outside those currently identified. However, using the options presented as a starting point, there was overwhelming support within North Weald for a combination of Options 2 and 3, subject to appropriate infrastructure being provided.</li> <li>It was largely recognised that Option 1, which would effectively maintain the status quo, is not likely to be viable in the longer term. For Option 4 there was a very mixed view, with some reflecting that the history, character and current aviation and other users of the Airfield</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> This comment was made prior to the publication of the North Weald Bassett Masterplanning Study

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
	<p>should be protected, and, as a historic asset within the Green Belt, the Airfield should never be built on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternatively, others suggested the Airfield is considered to be under-used, less environmentally sensitive than other areas of the district, and a largely previously developed site in public ownership that should be sold for development to provide revenue to the Council.</li> </ul>
ROY-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially suitable location in close proximity to the train station;</li> <li>A view that this area could accommodate and potentially benefit from small pockets of sympathetic development near to existing residential settlements.</li> </ul>
ROY-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged that the area is in close proximity to the train station;</li> <li>A view that the area could accommodate and potentially benefit from small pockets of sympathetic development near to existing residential settlements.</li> </ul>
ROY-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concern raised over the impact that development would have on the character of the village;</li> <li>The area has considerable agricultural and recreational value.</li> </ul>
THB-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area would be visually conspicuous on the hill and result in some areas being overlooked;</li> <li>There is a very distinct and established boundary between the area and the village comprising a public footpath, watercourse and ancient tree/hedge line;</li> <li>A view that the area should form part of the proposed strategic Green Belt gap;</li> <li>Concern that developing this area would be in conflict with the Theydon Bois Tree Strategy;</li> <li>Access to the area is constricted by narrowness of the approach road, Forest Drive/Dukes Avenue, and throughout the village;</li> <li>A view that developing this area would further aggravate surface water flooding in the village;</li> <li>A new Conservation Area for the village has been recommended, and major infrastructure changes and increased traffic would adversely impact on this proposal;</li> <li>This area is a long established and valuable amenity value for local residents. There is a long history of all year round use for recreational activities.</li> </ul>
THB-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area is adjacent to Epping Forest, a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation;</li> <li>Previous planning applications have been refused because of inadequate highway sight lines.</li> </ul>
THB-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The railway line currently marks edge of the village and Green Belt and there is a view that this should not be broken;</li> <li>Concerns that the area is too large, relative to the size of the existing settlement.</li> </ul>
THO-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area has been used for industrial purposes and it was noted that redevelopment would enhance the character of the village;</li> <li>Substantial support for the provision of a village shop as part of any redevelopment as it would benefit the local community.</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
THO-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area has been used for industrial purposes and it was noted that redevelopment would enhance the character of the village.</li> </ul>
THO-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised regarding the possibility of providing further commercial space in the village given the perceived imbalance between commercial and residential uses that already exists;</li> <li>Concern regarding the potential impact of development on the adjacent Wildlife Site;</li> <li>Recognised by many that the site has less constraints when compared to alternative options.</li> </ul>
THO-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised that development would have a significantly negative impact on a Scheduled Monument.</li> </ul>
THO-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A view that the area is of high landscape value and should not be redeveloped.</li> </ul>
WAL-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A view that development would lead to further congestion in the Town Centre, and the lack of free public car parking compared with supermarkets would have a negative impact;</li> <li>Rather than trying to create a second town centre at the eastern side of the town, the existing centre should be increased by enhancing the area between Lidl and Tesco;</li> <li>The centre would also benefit from increased cycle routes and bus links to other parts of the town.</li> </ul>
WAL-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for sensitive re-use of buildings, but more concern if the re-use was for residential or commercial purposes;</li> <li>A view that the area is too close to the Lea Valley Regional Park and the Site of Special Scientific Interest;</li> <li>Concerns regarding flood risk, further building in the Green Belt and the impact on biodiversity, landscape, heritage and the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>
WAL-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the loss of a valuable recreational amenity in residential areas.</li> </ul>
WAL-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the loss of school playing field and the importance of urban green spaces;</li> <li>General satisfaction with the location of the existing school as it is central to the community;</li> <li>Concern raised over traffic problems, particularly on Broomstickhall Road.</li> </ul>
WAL-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern was raised regarding the impact on noise and air pollution from the motorway on new residents;</li> <li>A view that the topography of the area, and the significant number of veteran trees (with many others being protected by Tree Protection Orders) make it unsuitable for development;</li> <li>The area is considered to be an important green gateway on the eastern edge of the town, an important buffer to the motorway, and a popular place for informal recreation;</li> <li>A view that if the town is to grow then green spaces such as this will be needed.</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
WAL-B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of the area is managed by Countrycare for biodiversity, and a diverse wildflower mix is developing. The pond also supports a significant number of dragonfly species;</li> <li>• A view that the area is too far from the Town Centre and that development would undermine regeneration;</li> <li>• Concern regarding possible detrimental impacts on the setting of the Upshire Conservation Area (although acknowledgement that appropriate design of new development could overcome this);</li> <li>• Concern over the proximity to the M25 and the impact of noise and air pollution;</li> <li>• The area has been identified as being of high landscape sensitivity;</li> <li>• Concern regarding the provision of infrastructure in this part of the town;</li> <li>• A concern that development would result in an undesirable expansion towards Epping, contrary to Green Belt principles.</li> </ul>
WAL-C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong opposition to any development in this area, which many feel should form part of a strategic Green Belt gap;</li> <li>• Concern that development would further degrade the historic landscape of Green Lanes and erode green infrastructure around the Epping Forest;</li> <li>• A view that traffic will increase through the Forest, on roads of limited capacity, leading to more disturbance for wildlife and damage to the rural character of Upshire;</li> <li>• Woodgreen Road is a narrow country lane totally unsuited to heavy traffic and Woodridden Hill is an accident blackspot;</li> <li>• Concern regarding possible detrimental impacts on the setting of the Upshire Conservation Area (although acknowledgement that appropriate design of new development could overcome this);</li> <li>• Concern regarding the provision of infrastructure in this part of the town;</li> <li>• Concern that development would be in an area of high landscape sensitivity, and would result in undesirable expansion towards Epping, contrary to Green Belt principles;</li> <li>• A concern that the area is too far from the Town Centre and development would undermine regeneration.</li> </ul>
WAL-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cobbins Brook Valley is a very important wildlife and landscape corridor that should be protected as part of a Green Arc. It provides flood storage and other ecosystem services for the town;</li> <li>• The area is within the Green Belt and abuts two Conservation Areas. It is a popular walking area and contains important hedgerows, veteran trees and a small wood;</li> <li>• Pick Hill is a narrow country road which is unsuitable for large volumes of traffic. Any widening would have an adverse impact on the banks and hedgerows;</li> <li>• Concerns that the area is too far from the Town Centre and that development would undermine regeneration;</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the possible detrimental impact on the setting of the Upshire Conservation Area;</li> </ul>

Growth location reference	Summary of Community Choices feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding the provision of infrastructure in this part of the town;</li> <li>• Concerns that development would be in an area of high landscape sensitivity and would result in an undesirable urban sprawl, reducing open countryside between Epping and Waltham Abbey.</li> </ul>
WAL-E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area includes the Cobbins Brook flood alleviation scheme that has already intruded into the landscape. There are concerns that any upgrading needed as a result of development would be of detriment to the natural beauty of the area, and would be very expensive;</li> <li>• Pick Hill is a narrow country road which is unsuitable for large volumes of traffic. Any widening would have an adverse impact on the banks and hedgerows.</li> </ul>
WAL-F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land, impact on biodiversity and the high impact on the Green Belt and the view to the countryside;</li> </ul>
WAL-G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the proximity of development to properties in Beechfield Walk;</li> <li>• Concerns that development would result in the removal of an important buffer on the edge of the town.</li> </ul>