

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

Stakeholder ID 4661 Name Sylvia Anne Welling

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 fail to understand how this 'vision to ensure an enhanced quality of life for the people of Epping Forest District' can be realised by increasing the load on existing infrastructure which is already full to capacity. I specifically refer to Buckhurst Hill, where roads are already congested in the main shopping area, parking is difficult and schools and tweenies are full. Quality of life will certainly not be enhanced by a further 80-90 homes (with children and cars) particularly in the proposed sites, it will be jeopardised significantly. one site would entail taking it out of the Green Belt to how does this 'protect Epping Forest Districts Green Belt'? other areas, e.g. Loughton *illegible* and I therefore strongly disagree with the overall vision.

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:

I agree with this approach so far as it considers locations within existing settlements before considering a limited release of Green Belt Land. This land should be sacrosanct and any release would set a precedent and lead to further encroachment in the future.

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

Stakeholder ID 4661

Name Sylvia Anne

Welling

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I am not familiar with Harlow so am unable to comment

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 shopping area designated in Buckhurst Hill is small but well used. My concern is firstly, what will happen to these business in the interim development *illegible* and secondly will they be allowed to return or will other shops take over? Parking needs to be considered, as it is already at a premium.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I am specifically concerned about the proposals for Buckhurst Hill, which do not include new employment development therefore I cannot comment on other areas.

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)

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:

All three areas proposed in Buckhurst Hill have problems if they are accepted for development. 1. Lower Queens Road shops and homes. What happens to businesses, owners tenants in the interim. Parking is already a problem - how will this be resolved? 2. Queens road car park. My immediate reaction was a concern about car parking - this car park is normally full to capacity, where will commuters/shoppers park? Even if a carpark is retained, some will be needed for the owners/tenants of the new flats. If it is built underground, this would be expensive and could cause problems for surrounding buildings and the railway. The flats would probably overlook existing dwellings. 3. 1 Powell road. This site is on green belt land and should therefore be sacrosanct. Admittedly it is a huge garden for one house, but it adjoins linden's field local nature reserve, which would suffer damage from any nearby development. It is positioned between two *illegible* homes, which would also suffer from increased noise and activity. Buckhurst Hill is the most densely populated area in

Epping Forest and does not have the infrastructure to support the addition of 80-90 extra homes. Traffic density is already very high, particularly at rush hours and beginning/end of the school day.

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

No Additional infrastructure detailed for Buckhurst Hill - schools surgeries and dentists are already full

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

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