

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

Stakeholder ID 2006 Name john Gardner

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 'needs' of the District are government imposed quotas not needs. Additionally the population growth may have been grossly overestimated in the light of Brexit. The UK population would actually fall if net migration was zero. 'The average woman in Britain, on reaching 45, has had 1.9 children' - Telegraph 16-08-15.

2. 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 2:

Notwithstanding the answer to Q1, there should be a New Town approach as this is the only way to ensure that the correct infrastructure exists to support the proposed level of expansion. 'Bolting on' to existing settlements only works at very small numbers as the infrastructure can not cope already. The 'Bolt on' approach is inconsistent with the council EFDC's vision 'enhanced quality of life', it will in fact worsen existing residents quality of life.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

This approach shows some balance in the planning mix and is already a large town. The problem is that the road infrastructure in and out of Harlow (including M11) is already overloaded.

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

Stakeholder ID 2006 Name john Gardner

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

Epping?

No opinion

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:

The essential character of Ongar requires a focal point. This is provided by the shops. It is debatable as to the future of independent retail and what variety can exist in a high street as the vast majority seen to be eateries, beauty or betting shops.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Agreement is subject to proven need. Please see answer to Q1.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

"Ongar" means "grass land" and "Chipping" means "market town". Ongar has in recent times seen a huge expansion in the number of dwellings (The Gables, Ongar station, Zinc arts, Four Wantz roundabout, numerous development behind western side of town centre etc etc) and is in danger of completely losing its character.

The proposed expansion is disproportionate and misaligned with the infrastructure and services which are only barely adequate for the current residents.

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The plan does not provide sufficient detail or commitment as to what specific infrastructure improvements will be made and by when. There seems to be no consideration given to the aggregate impact of developments throughout the District / County Region. Not all of the people living in the extra houses will be able to walk or cycle to work so significant road and public infrastructure improvements are required if grid lock is to be avoided. Just based on my own commute I produce 33% more emissions in the morning traffic than in the evening and lose an additional 30mins of productive time. This country needs to be more productive in order

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

to produce better incomes and jobs. cramming everyone into already congested areas will make us less productive and will produce more pollution.

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 plan to build so much extra property in an already congested place will cause additional pollution and reduce productivity as explain in Q7. This is not a sustainable plan.

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

No comment
