

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

Stakeholder ID 3020 Name David Culley

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:

1. Plan does not ensure homes or enhancement of quality of life specifically for those future generations of Nazeing. 2. Area of Nazeing is too small to support growth with no detail given of finance to support infrastructure.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

1. Any Green belt used for future housing development can never be reclaimed, our future generations face losing more than what they gain from Green belt development. 2. More effort should be placed on developing Brown field sites. 3. Harlow has more existing infrastructure and areas for development.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

1. Areas indicated are Green belt. 2. Funding will not be sufficient to support the claimed aims of the plan i.e. the required infrastructure to sufficiently support the increased population.

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

Stakeholder ID 3020

Name David

Culley

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

1. Areas identified are not suitable for heavy vehicular movements, this area is not taken into consideration for development. 2. Those HGV restrictions currently in place are not Policed or enforced. Greater movement of large lorries will cause damage to area & danger to motorists and general public. 3. Jobs created will be filled by people outside the area causing greater traffic congestion and increased risk.

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 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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

1. Loss of Green belt. 2. Increase strain on existing infrastructure, vehicle movements and congestion. 3. Nazeing has high flood risk which will be increased due to loss of natural drainage and absorption.

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:

1. More robust plans need to be in place to handle additional sewerage, flood risk and associated drainage issues. 2. Current schooling vacancies do not exist for the planned increase. 3. Nazeing is an alternative route when M25 congestion or diversions are in place. Congestion can be extensive during normal hours without these diversions or incidents occurring.

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

1. Impact on area will remove the "Village" status where generations of families have built a way of life in the area. 2. Landscape will be scarred forever with future planning applications increasing infrastructure demand while reducing amenity to residents (creeping development without control). 3. Natural wildlife will be adversely eroded.

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

Lack of research for the impact on Nazeing is concerning. Vehicle traffic is growing on an annual basis without concern for the resulting effects to the wellbeing of residents.
