

---

**From:** Rosemary Langlands [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2023 19:38  
**To:** localplanconsultations  
**Subject:** Local Plan

I am aware that the Local Plan has been amended, I have read the amendments and I am aware that there is a new closing date for representations.

I have been waiting for an update to the 'Vision for Chingford \Mount' which I assumed would arise as a result of the amended Local Plan. There has been no sight, sound or even a hint of the current 'Vision'. Looking at the amendments there seems to be a few changes but none that reflect the opinions of the residents. More new homes is the change that stays in my mind for the area. I intended to make my representations after reviewing the revised 'Vision' but as that seems to NOT be forthcoming but the time limit of 21.9.23 is fast approaching I must make my comments based on assumptions that the 'Vision' is unchanged except for the increased new homes.

So.....

I have read and digested the 'vision' red book dated November 2022 and read the revised Local Plan. My comments, suggestions and objections which I would like to bring to your attention are as follows –

1. The area is NOT urban as you state, it is at worst suburban at best semi-rural and should be kept semi-rural.
2. The 'vision' or suggestion that it is or should be a 15 minute town centre is impossible
  - a. Chingford Mount IS NOT a 'town' it is an area in the town called Chingford, it is a shopping area valued by local and not so local people
  - b. Not every can walk, ride a cycle or use public transport. There are many categories of people for whom all 3 would be impossible for example the old, the disabled, folk with several children to look after when travelling etc
3. What gives the council, or any level of government the right to restrict the freedom of movement of any one unless they have been put in prison for a wrong doing? The UK is a free country – or is meant to be – so people have the right to travel in the manner they choose to where ever they choose to go. In nature the human being is a mammal that lives in family groups within tribes but needs room to be free NOT restricted unless society has decided there has been a major offence when offenders may be imprisoned. Yet I have been told at a public meeting that private vehicles are to be discouraged and phased out.
4. For those who can manage to use public transport but cannot walk or cycle (and there are many in this category) what do they do when the public transport goes on strike, or the routes do not reach them, or get changed? The new local plan seems to ignore public transport more than the original 'Vision'
5. Are taxis and 'mini cabs' deemed to be public transport in this context? If an elderly or disabled person could afford to hire a 'cab' of some kind would their access be restricted like private cars would be? Would there be waiting areas for these vehicles? Would the local council fund them for folk who usually use their own vehicle to get to shops, appointments leisure outings etc? If not then private cars are essential for most people who use them!
6. What about delivery vehicles, removal vans, plumbers, builders, decorators etc. So many need a vehicle for work and that doubles as a family car – would they be banned too? No parking spaces means no deliveries no removals, no workman being able to visit homes – we need the car parking and any new homes MUST have at least one parking space each.
7. Will public transport used via an Oyster card have access to ALL roads? I suspect not. So some will not be able to leave their homes – freedom of movement should be for all not those selected by the any level of government. More people but they are not allowed a private car = more on the buses – more buses? I suspect not!
8. There is no need for further pedestrian prioritisation at the crossroads. I am a pedestrian – I do not drive a vehicle – the green man system at the traffic lights is perfectly adequate. Possibly increasing the 15 seconds to 20 would be nice for those who cannot walk fast enough for 15 seconds to be sufficient.

9. There MUST BE an accompanying noise for the green man system – not everyone can see the green man. Not all the crossings in the borough with a green man system is audible.
10. Please explain how a cemetery and a park can ‘feel disconnected’. I assume you do not mean to suggest that these spaces have feelings but are trying to suggest that people feel they are not in the ‘town centre’. They are within a few yards of the crossroads and should not be any nearer. The exits being very slightly away from the crossroads means they are safer for the users of the amenities.
11. The ‘vision’ states the ‘town centre’ is a “poor quality public realm” that there is “low perception and public image”. Please explain these statements. The area needs to be kept clean and our lovely cleaner Tommy cannot be expected to do the whole area on his own! Pavements and roads need to be repaired and/or replaced and then need to be maintained to a good standard. Do not permit yet more private businesses to dig them up and if an amenity supplier like the gas company needs to dig make sure they repair and replace to the same good standard. There is need for more cleaners in the area, there is a need for tree maintenance to be carried out, including pollarding, pruning, leaf collection etc. There is a need to deter folk from fly tipping, littering, letting their dogs fowl the footpaths. Try actually fining someone, educating the incoming folk. The fly tipping on the green areas has increased so much in recent times. Make sure ALL residents know the council will collect if asked, fine folk seem fly tipping. More cleaning staff will have more chance to see littering etc happen. To erect more homes and to bring in more people is NOT a way of reducing fly tipping etc. Discouraging private vehicles will mean folk can’t get the tip in N Chingford or Walthamstow.
12. Albert Cres should be retained as it is except please remove some of the horrid wooden painted boxes and install a public toilet. At every public meeting I have attended concerning the area (I have been to them all) strong comments are voiced about the lack of toilets in the area. For anyone who suffers from IBD, IBS, side effects of chemo therapy etc this is so very bad. There is no choice but to go into a shop and ‘beg’ a member of staff to use the shop’s private/staff toilet, and by the time you have displayed your ‘toilet card’ and ‘begged’ enough it is too late. Carrying spare clothes and rinsing out the soiled ones in a shop toilet or their hand wash basin, then getting home with them is just horrid and WRONG. The whole business is inhumane and this council should remember it could be them that is put in such a position one day. WE NEED PUBLIC TOILETS AT CHINGFORD MOUNT.
13. The bus stands in Albert Cres are a very safe and good place to wait for a bus! I simply do NOT agree with the suggestion that the area is anything but a good place to wait for a bus at any time of the day or evening. I have never felt unsafe there. To move the 158 and the W16 buses to another bus stop would increase the number of people at those stops and make them TOO BUSY. Too many people waiting on the public highway at the same place
14. The ‘vision’ mentions a safe place for “8 – 25 year olds”. Does anyone on the council really think that an 8 year olds needs are the same as a 25 year olds? At a public meeting some of the audience stated there is a need for a ‘safe place’ for the youth to go to get help and advice with all that concerns them including employment, bullying, living in a dangerous home environment etc. It was stated that there was such a venue in Walthamstow but not in Chingford. The council folk there said that this would be part of Albert Cres. There is not enough room on that piece of land for such a venue. The ‘pods’ shown on the vision would not be fit for purpose. Suggestions came from the audience to use the old library building if Age Concern did not want it any more. If they did want it to let them keep it but use the old classrooms at the back of the library. Another suggestion to use the top floor of the car park. No comments were forthcoming – as was the case for all suggestions or requests. Make good use of the buildings that are there NOT pull them down.
15. Increasing the number of homes within the immediate area (ignoring the other nearby projects under consideration) by 205 would destroy the ‘village’ ethos there at present, it will destroy the semi-rural nature of the area. The residents (who actually pay council tax) do not want to live in an urban environment. If they did they would move! The increase of people in the area would destroy the already over stretched GPs, dentists (it is not possible to get a NHS dental appointment now!) schools, vets (the local vets are refusing to take on new clients already) etc. Each new home will have at least one vehicle despite your desire to curtail such ownership (as was explained to me at one of the public meetings). You are not going to ensure that each site developer will include car parking. There will be road rage, there will be chaos trying to park in local side turnings. The lack of medical facilities will mean that folk will go to A&E with their medical problems when they are in pain as there will be no GP or dentist to help. Whips Cross Hospital IS NOT within 15 minutes of Chingford Mount – good luck in doing that journey in less than an hour from the Mount, even once you have removed all the private vehicles and increased the buses it will not be 15 mins away. The North Mid is around 20 minutes away – but it isn’t in our AHA. Are you ready for that back lash? For the funding leaving our AHA and going to the N Mid?

16. What about emergency vehicle access to Cherrydown Ave and the area in general? The additional time to get to the properties will mean loss of life in some cases. Are you prepared for this and those that decide to take financial action because of the council's lack of foresight?

17. Your 'vision' dated Nov 2021 and Nov 2022 both show 90 homes on the Sainsbury's Hall and W F Car park site.

a. I know that you are aware that Sainsbury's have no intention of giving up their lease of their store there but you haven't altered the 'vision' in the light of this knowledge. Do you intend to build on top of Sainsbury's?

b. The Nov 2022 'vision' suggests there will be some retail parking. Where exactly? I cannot see any on your diagrams. Do you intend to build on top of the car park?

c. Some of the homes in Albert Ave are already blocked in at the front by giant Canadian Mountain Ash trees. There is no light or heat at the front of the properties. So now you want to block out any light or summer heat at the back of the same houses?! Your plan seems to install even more giant trees to ensure 'privacy' for those houses, so a total black out all round with respect to heat and light. Surely we are meant to be using less power not more because the council is removing out access to natural light and heat? There should be NO buildings in that area over 3 stories high and there must be NO balconies at the back. At the local meetings 7 storey buildings were mentioned – this should not be allowed as that is not in accordance with the ethos of the area and it would completely remove any privacy, trees or no trees! We do not need any more trees!

d. At the public meetings I have been too I kept being told that the Car Park adjacent to Hall Lane Sainsbury's upper story is unsafe. I find this very difficult to accept as if it was would the lower story still be in use? Would Sainsbury's still be able to have their deliveries in the giant lorries and would the skip retrieval lorries still be allowed to go there? I would guess if it was unsafe – NO. In addition around 20 years ago there was a consultation meeting between the local residents, the police and the council after so many complaints were made by the residents concerning the anti social behaviour happening in/on the upper story. The council solved the problem by closing the upper storey, there was no mention of any other reason to close it. Who or what is it supposed to be unsafe for?

e. The car park is currently used by Sainsbury's staff, they rent out a number of spaces on an annual basis, it is used by shoppers wanting to use the retail facilities and it is used by visitors who simply can't park anywhere else – the car park is essential to retain the retail element of the area and no retail means the death of an area. I am aware we are being forced to buy on line but this not everyone will buy everything this way for a long time yet, if ever. It may be increasing but again I say this is a free country and most folk like to select their own purchases after seeing them, touching them and using whichever are the appropriate senses for their purchase.

18. The 'vision' for the site referred to as Albert Corner would result in the loss of 2 major shopping chains – Superdrugs and Iceland. Both very popular and well used stores. We need to keep these stores as they bring folk in to the area who then also use the other smaller shops. Why should the little jewellers be forced to close? It is inhumane to take away the means by which folk are simply trying to pay their bills. Yet another car park will be gone! We need the variety of the stores, it is good for the shoppers and for competition between the shops. A monopoly is not good. All the shops are used and are needed. The removal of shops, removal of choice, removal of freedom of movement, increasing the population – all sounds like totalitarianism. This is a free country with freedom of choice, speech and movement. The humans are not 'stock' to be controlled by various levels of government.

19. The old library building is at present Age Concern. Do they not want to keep the building? If not then it is perfect for a youth facility and it should be used as such. This then retains the lovely building and it is still being used by the public. Maybe even a few books could be in there for young people to use! If the current use of the building is to continue then use the rooms at the back of the old library for the young. You want to do something for the 8-25 year old folk, well different rooms for different ages maybe? What the area doesn't need is a block of flats 7 stories high with no car parking! 25 new homes means there must be 25 parking spaces!

20. To leave it to developers' discretion to provide facilities on the various site is sheer lunacy! Developers are only interested in profit NOT the quality of life for the residents. This would be disastrous for all that live in the area. It must never be allowed to happen.

21. There are 2 sites nearby that have been started on and then left, presumably because each developer has gone bust. They have been left in the state they are in now for a number of years. These 2 sites, one on the corner of Templeton Ave and the other opposite Morrisons (it used to be a petrol

station, I think) should be brought to a conclusion. I am flabbergasted that any thought of further building plans is in anyone's dreams let alone minds while these 2 plots are left in the state they are in.

22. LBWF have altered the Blackhorse Road tube station area from an urban homeland of normal London (Essex when built) homes with places of work etc into an urban jungle of high rise blocks. It looks like a 'mini Manhattan. It doesn't look like Walthamstow anymore. It looks awful, it looks non British and may well end up like other estates that consisted of nothing but blocks of flats – like the Chingford Hall Estate. ALL of those blocks were pulled down – has this council learned nothing from their past errors! The estate was a no go area, especially after dark. Human beings are not rabbits, we do not thrive in 'hutches'. In fact rabbits don't flourish in them either.

Rosemary Langlands

