

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

Stakeholder ID 2844 Name Susan Sharp

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:

The Draft plan does not seem to take into consideration the people who actually live in the area at present and in such does not provide for their offspring who may wish to stay in the area that at present they are priced out of. I can NOT find sufficient information on how existing infrastructure can cope or will be updated and for that matter how such infrastructure will be funded. There is also a lack of information of how the proposed housing growth will be funded

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:

I am very concerned with the consideration of a limited release of Green Belt land which immediately implies the council has no care or concern for what the Green Belt was instigated for. The destruction of Green Belt countryside for housing is an appalling thought, surely within the district there are plenty of either derelict or Brownfield land areas that could be built on. This would also then enhance these areas rather than destroying our beautiful countryside.

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

Stakeholder ID 2844

Name Susan

Sharp

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Once again the plan seems to consider the use of Green Belt land around Harlow which would appear to contradict the stated aims of the plan.

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:

The sites within the Hoe Lane area, SR-0580 & SR-0151, are not accessible by suitable wide roads. As its name implies this is a narrow winding country lane, with numerous blind corners and little passing room. Any such expansion of sites within or nearby villages should not increase heavy goods traffic through small villages such as Nazeing. Controls would need to be brought in to deal with heavy goods vehicle movements and the, no doubt, outside employment workforce.

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:

Grade 1-3 Green Belt land is proposed for use for sites SR-0011, SR-0300 (A,B&C) & SR-0473, however derelict & Brownfield land has been overlooked. The sites being considered are owned by those with no care for the destruction of their Green Belt land. The plan appears to take no consideration of the pressure this will add to the already overstretched existing infrastructure. The roads struggle at present with the number of car journeys undertaken on a daily basis, this will shortly increase due to the ending of any public transport in the area in the new year. The roads, after heavy rain, are already prone to flooding and the prospect of covering

areas of Green Belt with concrete and tarmac will do nothing to alleviate this, more likely the problem will increase as there will be less open land for natural drainage.

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 are some interesting anomalies in the ARUP assessment including showing the local full Primary school as having vacancies and uncongested roads around the proposed development sites at the most definitely already existing congested peak times! Upgrading of existing sewers, drainage, water supply etc. would need to be ensured and in place prior to any new developments. There must be clear procedures & responsibilities in place for assessments and delivery of the plan before it is adopted and therefore only then can any individual development be approved.

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 Local Plan does not adequately explain the need to use Primary Green Belt land to build on. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates preference towards derelict or previously developed land over use of Grade 1-3 Green Belt land. The plan does not take into account the overall impact on village life that these developments will have. The sustainability of the existing character of our village is under threat on all sides, without the threat to our varied wild life and beautiful vistas.

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

The council is at present resurfacing the entire length of St Leonards Road which has an inadequate and damaged sewage system running alongside and under it and has one of the proposed development sites adjacent to it. This would seem to highlight the councils inability to foresee the future!
