

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

Stakeholder ID 4688 Name Simon Boutlwood

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 can only really speak for Ongar in detail but I think the plan to decimate the development away from larger urban towns/ cities and place it in more rural areas shows a very naïve approach to planning. These areas don't have the infrastructure in place to cope with the number of new homes being built. Nor does it (Ongar) have the current people of Ongar at the heart of plan. The historical/ nature and character of Ongar and other rural towns & villages, will be changed beyond recognition. The development marked SR-3090 is near Greensted churches *illegible*. This is for 175 homes on an area half the size of the estate next to it. Which only has about 80 homes. The vehicles will enter a small country road with blind bends opposite a school, which doesn't have enough off road area to allow vehicles delivery *illegible* children not to park on the main road. This is an accident waiting to happen.

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:

SR-3090 will be green belt land. I think placing the increase along the Mill corridor will allow safer and clearer development for Epping Forest District. I will allow industry to site their business premises there too and the new population will have access to the employment opportunities this presents. So *illegible* the increase across the district is not a good plan. Infrastructure is easier to build off a motorway than rural roads. The impact on small communities will be horrendous.

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

Stakeholder ID 4688

Name Simon

Boutlwood

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

There is plenty of brownfield sites around Harlow which would take the number of homes required for the district. Natural railway airport and motorways are already in place, so no more cost or reduced cost to implement.

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I don't know the other towns well enough to answer this question. This questionnaire is flawed or should I say written in a way to diffuse the facts against your proposals. The point about primary shopping area is mute, because the lack of adequate roads and parking will mean no one will try to use or could use Ongar high st as a great place to shop. There is no incentive for new and *illegible* business to bury their shops here, if there are no customers.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

You are not utilizing the M11 corridor area at all. Nothing in your draft plan provides extra employment opportunities in Ongar.

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)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

The areas you have set out in the plan for Ongar are near traffic *illegible* points. The A414 will come to a grounding halt at the four *illegible* The bottom end of town, will ground to a halt as cars will not be able to enter from the Borough' onto the high street due to the volume of traffic caused by the new developments if built. Both areas have schools nearby which means during 'rush hour'times, this will get even worse. The Country roads around SR-0390 will be used more as a kind of 'rat run' there will be a lot of accidents due to the state and type of roads they are. The new people in the SR -0390 development will have severe problems entering the road and this will create major safety issues for them. The road users using the Greensted Rd and especially the parents of children using Ongar Primary school. North Weald district will be obliterated!

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

You have identified the sites in Ongar. Most, if not all are unsuitable due to lack of infrastructure. (Lack of adequate roads, schools, medical facilities, shops, other forms of transport, drainage to historical sites (pollution affecting the wooden structure of Greensted Church) Leisure facilities, GP practices, parking, damage to green belt, decrease in the quality of life living in Ongar. Increased crime with no police presence. You have said these sites are available. I was told at the draft plan exhibition that all land owners had been contacted by EFDC about availability to this land and had been chosen for development. Being one of these

land owners I have not been contacted at all! The Council representative said they used the information on the land registry to contact these people. I can assure you my land is registered with the land registry.

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is no clear setting out of proposed infrastructure development in the plan. Again I was told by an EPDC representative no infrastructure would be built until development of the sites. So you want the developer to pay for it under s.106 of the planning rules. This will not be adequate as their profit margins won't be big enough, with the amount it will cost to make the necessary development required for the plan to meet its policies. I asked about the Ongar- Epping train line. I was told the cost is too high for TFL to re-open this line again. This service cannot be undertaken by the heritage line as they don't have the infrastructure or money to do it. They can't even use Epping station. Asked about a by-pass for Ongar. Was told Essex Country Council couldn't afford it.

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

What is that? Another layer of *illegible* to deflect the flaws in your plan being made so apparent.

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

You will never build on my land. I was told by a council (EFDC) at your Ongar exhibition, if the land owner said 'no' there will be no development - so I say no.

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