

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

Stakeholder ID 3170 Name Nicholas Vincent

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

The plan seems to take away green spaces within existing housing areas within the community.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 3170 Name Nicholas Vincent

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

The proposed site SR-0176 in Buckhurst Hill will cause an unprecedented intensification of the housing in that immediate area. The large care home to the south of this site is already earmarked for demolition and replacement with a high density housing project. To then take the proposed plot and place a high number of new homes on it will overload local roads, GP surgeries, schools and hugely increase traffic volumes for local

residents. The proposed site also removes an area of woodland used extensively by local people to visit and walk their dogs. The size of the development site is completely disproportionate to the surrounding area.

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

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

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?

4.2

"that it may be more appropriate to allow the market to determine the most appropriate houses to build" The market is always going to demand higher density residences which seems to directly contradict the previous points that "the majority of responders supported the inclusion of a density policy with the mix being dependent on the character of the area." It should be clear that preserving the character of the area should take precedence over market forces that will clearly favour huge blocks of small, cheaply constructed flats. Many people have chosen to live and stay living in this area precisely because of the character of the area, and to allow market forces to dictate planning policy serves to completely undermine both the stated goals and the wishes of the residents.
