

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

Stakeholder ID 2929 Name Kirsty Johns

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:

Despite understanding the need for housing and a growing population the vision aims to protect the green belt whilst at the same time "changing the boundaries" to facilitate the plan.

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:

Whilst spreading the load of new development may appear sensible, some of the more rural areas have a disproportionate amount of housing compared to their current populations. Attempting to sustain this population out of the major towns with no infrastructure will be impossible and subsequent further encroachment into green belt will then subsequently be suggested to provide this infrastructure in the rural communities.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Development should be centred around existing towns with infrastructure to support them but further development on Green belt land is not welcome.

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

Stakeholder ID 2929

Name Kirsty

Johns

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

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:

Again, the rural communities are not a natural place for sustainable employment sites.

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:

It is an excessive allocation of 4 sites with up to 360 homes and employment sites. All areas are green belt and whilst 3 are already highlighted as being significantly destructive if developed, the 4th is a popular and regularly used recreationally by many Theydon and Epping residents. The local school is at capacity. One development site is on a water course and would need significant work to reduce flood risk and run off issues to the rest of the road should it be developed. The "satellite" GP is essentially non-existent to the point that new arrivals to the village register with other Epping practices. We already suffer from recurrent electrical supply problems with regular power cuts which whilst we manage them if our village increases by 360 homes

how would that impact upon the power supply. I cannot see that the infrastructure could support this amount of development to the village and if goes ahead we would no longer be Theydon Bois Village.

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is no protection of the Green Belt in the event these Draft Plan developments go ahead. The plans for subsequent infrastructure are vague, and as mentioned earlier there would likely be a need to redo the boundaries again.....

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?