

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

Stakeholder ID 3162 Name Anne Year

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:

It will not protect the green belt, as it is proposed to build on it. It will not enhance the quality of life of people in EPD as recent new developments have not; these have increased road/parking congestion, no new provision for schools/health/retail outlets/employment. I see no reason why these new and much larger developments would have a position effect of the area and the residents.

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-0158A and other local sites are existing green belt land.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The open space is there already. Transport can only be improved by re-opening Ongar & North Weald underground stations, as the road network cannot cope with additional vehicles, especially buses. No provision mentioned for medical facilities.

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

Stakeholder ID 3162

Name Anne

Year

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Current road infrastructure and public transport cannot cope with increased employment sites without having a detrimental effect on existing residents.

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 opinion

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

The proposed additional housing is not supported by adequate road infrastructure/public transport/medical and school facilities.

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No opinion

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:

The flood defenses would be unable to cope with the additional developments. Site SR-0158A is always saturated during the winter and spring months so if this area was developed existing homes in Queens Road,

North Weald would be a risk of flooding. The proposed additional housing is not supported by adequate road infrastructure/public transport/medical and school facilities.

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

The proposed additional housing is not supported by adequate road infrastructure/public transport/medical and school facilities.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

The proposed additional housing is not supported by adequate road infrastructure/public transport/medical and school facilities.

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Building new roads and adding additional bus services does not improve the area for existing residents or their air quality. No provision has been made to re-open the Ongar & North Weald underground stations. Since their closure the surrounding areas have been developed enormously which has had a detrimental effect on commuters to London. People who buy these new houses will also need to travel to London for work as the majority of people who are employed locally cannot afford to buy in this area. Additionally medical services are stretched to breaking point for many years but no new provisions have been made for existing residents.

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

It should seriously consider putting forward a proposal to Transport for London the re-opening of Ongar & North Weald underground stations; when they are made aware of current needs and the proposed enormous increase of population, they would see it was a very profitable proposal.

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