

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

Stakeholder ID 2708 Name Piers Proctor

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:

Insufficient information in the Plan about how local services and infrastructure will be uplifted to meet the demands of the housing growth in 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:

Use of greenbelt is inconsistent with Vision, and insufficient consideration of alternatives in the Plan (for example, brownfield sites).

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The Harlow development is on greenbelt land and is inconsistent with the Vision, and insufficient consideration of alternatives in the Plan (for example, brownfield sites).

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

Stakeholder ID 2708

Name Piers

Proctor

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?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Enhancements to the retail environment in Waltham Abbey could benefit the surrounding area.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Consideration must be given to any resulting increase in heavy good vehicles in Nazeing, as this is already a significant problem for the area.

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:

The development is to be on greenbelt land. No consideration in the plans of uplifting and enhancing infrastructure in line with the increase in housing.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

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

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:

Need comprehensive and credible assessments to ensure upgrading of sewerage, drainage, flood prevention and water supply are carried out. The ARUP assessment is inaccurate and flawed, for example, identifying school vacancies that do not exist.

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 sufficiently justify the need to build on primary or grade 1-3 greenbelt land. Insufficient protections in the Plan for wildlife, environment or the nature and character of the village.

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

There appears to have been insufficient consideration and investigation into the impact of these developments on both the nature and character of the village, and on the current and required level of supporting infrastructure (including the current and future levels of traffic congestion). Additionally, the consultation has been inadequate, with no hard copy questionnaires (with postage paid return envelopes) provided for those with limited internet access (e.g. elderly). Finally, the Plan does not make a convincing case for the need to develop on greenbelt land as opposed to brownfield or other existing development sites.
