

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

Stakeholder ID 2764 Name Charles hillman

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:

The council has routinely ignored infrastructure requirements (schooling / roads & parking & other transport methods / drains / refuse dumps). Amid all the self congratulatory waffle your plan is screamingly silent on your plans to bring the existing infrastructure into the present century or to adapt it for the further developments which you now propose. Historical planning policies - national and local - have forced this to become a region for commuters. But councillors do not have to commute and hold in utter contempt those who do.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

You have not yet created the infrastructure to support - even at a minimum level - the existing settlements

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Linking the A414 to a northern Harlow junction on the M11 and improving road access and parking facilities / availability at Harlow station would reduce time wasting hold ups in and around Harlow (and reduce the current acute pressure on station parking in Epping)

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

Stakeholder ID 2764 Name Charles hillman

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

High local taxes and rents have driven bakers and butchers out of Ongar and Epping and we have instead a lot of charity shops, antique shops and posh dress shops, while day to day shoppers are driven out of town by parking problems and shop locations. More day to day shops in Ongar would be a good thing. As presently configured, however, Epping cannot cope with the extra traffic that more shops would generate (and need).

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The decline in working age population as a proportion of the overall total is a tribute to council failures either to make commuting tolerable or to provide employment sites in the area. There is a limit to what the council can do to encourage employment locally, but they can and have done a whole lot to discourage it over many years. A (rather fuzzy) hint that they have spotted the issue is to be welcomed

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

insufficient parking for commuters. insufficient parking for residents.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

insufficient parking for service users and residents. reopening the railway line for a light tram type connection would be a relatively inexpensive way to take a little of the pressure off the Epping terminus, but

you would need to create appropriate parking for the new station which your previous decision to sell off the surrounding land for residential development self evidently makes more of a challenge than it needed to be.

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Hopelessly inadequately detailed. Hopelessly inadequate in terms of access and parking

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

I have not looked at it (partly because I have no idea what an "Interim Sustainability Appraisal" means / is / does).

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