

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

Stakeholder ID 2681 Name Howard Day

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 agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I agree with the strategy of the proposed Local Plan and understand the amount of work it has taken, if the proposal can be achieved all people and residents will benefit.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

I agree that the settlements around Harlow should contribute to the development needs. I disagree with some of the area locations proposed within the settlements and in particular NAZEING

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I strongly disagree with some of the site chosen for the proposed development, and feel that insufficient investigating has taken place before producing the location areas

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

Stakeholder ID 2681 Name Howard Day

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

These main areas have always been good shopping and should be enhanced to provide competition for online shopping.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Care has to be taken to avoid traffic overload and noise contamination in all given areas.

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 areas proposed are bad planning, and will be detrimental to the village, not enough thought has been given and I suspect it has been developer driven, It would be difficult to implement your police on infrastructure in Nazeing, which is now old and overloaded. Traffic will be a major problem, Nazeing never planned for the amount of through traffic it now suffers, More thought needs to be given to this problem, I except that Nazeing needs to make a further contribution to housing needs and 220 additional homes are not unreasonable, providing they are built in the best place, which your proposed plan is wrong in respect of:- SR 0473,SR-0300a, SR-0300b and SR-o 0150 SR-0473 would have a high visual impact from the surrounding green

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

belt areas including the LVRP SR0300a and b are just non starters they would be a totally unacceptable intrusion into the green belt in an area that should remain protected countryside and not developed its bad planning. SR0150 I think should stay as an a trading area which has been used for many years as fencing supplier and is an amenity to the village I would like to comment on the other areas covered Nazeing proposel however the map used in your draft local plan make it impossible to clearly identify the location the same goes for the residential areas My request for a better plan have been ignored, I can only make a general comment that heavy traffic and noise should be paramount to any further increase in commercial use....**Redacted....**, I would like to see good planning as there are better alternatives available to achieve the development targets. I will be writing separately to you on this matter

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:

I have to be negative as I have no Knowledge of your infrastructure plans for Nazeing or your proposed location for them. If you are to achieve an expectable plan it needs a rethink, on school relocation village fertilities and improve the village centre, it is not good planning to build the needs of the village miles away from its centre, making at another traffic problem and deprive non motorists access.

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 would welcome the opportunity when available.

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

I have a genial comment, which is that the proposed plan needs to be refined, and any further comments you receive in any given area, are listened to and would they be an improvement The overall plan and policies are good, now it needs attention to detail and the release of green belt must be of benefit and not a loss.
