

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

Stakeholder ID 3130 Name Scott Crawford Mr.

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:

Far too much development is proposed in Loughton - we already have massive problems of congestion and the large number of new residential units proposed on many sites will destroy the established character of the town.

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:

You are right to protect green belt land but very wrong to attempt so much "infill" development which will eliminate the remaining green and open spaces within densely populated centres such as Loughton.

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is a good choice for development as it has lots of surrounding space and the proposed densities are more in keeping with the character of the town.

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

Stakeholder ID 3130

Name Scott

Crawford

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Loughton and Epping commercial policy should recognize these as *suburban* town centres. Retail/commercial use approval should be contingent on restrictions requiring that these business serve the local bedroom communities rather than out of town development. For example, they should only permit business to operate if they are mandated to close by 9 pm. We have easy access to London for anyone who wants night-time activities.

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

No opinion

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:

Developing Traps Hill car park (SR-0565) is a terrible idea. The area has a strong residential, low-rise character which will be destroyed by building this dense, tall structure. The area is already under far too much pressure from parking and traffic congestion and the resultant pollution due to its proximity to the town centre. The current car park provides both parking and a key open space in a dense area. SR-0565 is a

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

disastrous example of violating established character and imposing development which is neither balanced or sustainable - in direct contradiction of the remit of the plan.

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 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.

SR-0565 and SR-0226 are both very bad proposals. We need to keep the current open space and car parking facilities in order to have healthy, balanced development in this already very dense town.

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