

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

Stakeholder ID 3145 Name E F Linehan None

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:

By viewing the proposal for Theydon Bois it would appear that only GREEN BELT land is under consideration, this approach is totally unacceptable.

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:

This plan has not been thought through with any consideration to preserving what little countryside there is. It is a property developers dream come true - well done planners!! The destruction of Green Belt and open spaces to enable the same developers to hold onto the vast land banks they have is criminal. All proposed developers should be made to declare what spare brown field, empty property and garden snatching areas they have, and be made to develop these first - within the allocated outlined in these plans. And fined if they do not comply.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is expanding at the speed of light now, what provisions for schools, doctors, and all other facilities are in place to accommodate this vast obscene expansion.

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

Stakeholder ID 3145 Name E F Linehan

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

If not enough thought is given to developing these shopping area, it will result in local i.e corner shops being driven out of business.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

To include proposals for employment on green belt land is not acceptable. New employment opportunities should be within areas of existing offices, factories, retail sites. If they are - out of town - there will not be sufficient transport links, infrastructure therefore these areas will not flourish. Making them within towns will at least guarantee easier transport.

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 opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

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 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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Almost all proposals are on Green Belt land, regardless of it being the most precious commodity we have in England, the Lungs around London, the areas to be kept for recreation and enjoyment, and to stop the Urban Sprawl. To build on these site would completely change the uniqueness of Theydon, one of the few area to be encompassed within green belt.. 360 houses is complete over development, it will increase the size of the village by almost a quarter. At present transport provisions are overstretched, commuters park indiscriminately all over the village to use the tube, we have regular electricity power failures, the road near to the shops regularly floods when it has rained heavily, and last but not least - medical provision. At present it can take almost a month to get a Doctors appointment, hospital appointments are regularly cancelled and rescheduled due to too many patients. Where would an additional 1000+ patients be seen. And the infrastructure we have will never be able to cope with this vast influx of people.

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

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

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is no defined infrastructure plans. just general ideas. There is nothing to ensure that the required infrastructure will be in the correct places and in time to cope with any new development. Most developments start with infrastructure ...Redacted.... These infrastructure ideas appear to be an afterthought.

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

The proposal to increase Theydon Bois by almost 25% would mean that the population would have to rely on facilities in larger areas as local ones are already at capacity. The tube is overcrowded unless you wish to travel at 5.30 in the morning. Buses are also at capacity and often cancelled or held up because of congestion on the surrounding roads. This will mean additional car journeys on roads that are badly in need of repair. Worst of all is the desecration of the Green Belt, an area that historically was never to be utilised for any development whatsoever but to act as a buffer to stop urban creep. The vision in this Sustainability Appraisal gives the impression that it will keep High Value Green Belt sites and protect them from developers then it recommends building all over them. There is no continuity or even joined up writing. How many people wrote this piece of fiction and did each one read the previous comments before adding their own. Once lost green belt cannot be replaced - there are no special circumstances within this plan to allow the desecration of a unique facility that has been enjoyed by locals and visitors for years.

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

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