

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

Stakeholder ID 1509 Name john Wotton

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:

Chapter 6 of the draft plan has no commitment no substance and really say's nothing to help understand what will accompany the house growth in each area of the district, so I do not consider this as an infrastructure plan. The comment "Further work on detailed proposals to make this provision will be undertaken between now and the next stage of plan" is a ridiculous statement infrastructure has to be known and move hand in hand with proposed house development.

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:

Development is virtually very low in some areas while places like Epping, North Weald and Loughton carry a very heavy burden. The comment that the areas chosen are to "maximises opportunities for development around Harlow" does not make senses as travel to Harlow is required from all EFDC sites so Harlow development should have no impact on EFDC plan.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

As previous response

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

Stakeholder ID 1509

Name john

Wotton

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

Epping?

Yes

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:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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:

Development is low in some areas while places like Epping and North Weald carry a very heavy burden. Harlow development means nothing as travel to Harlow is required from all EFDC sites. If there was a clear picture on the infrastructure projects that will accompany the house building then we access the plan better. For Epping and North Weald the current proposal is for around 3200 homes and using a conservative estimate of 2.5 people per home that is 8000 new patients for local doctors. It takes 3 weeks to get an appointment now and without a number of new practises it will become impossible to be seen by a doctor. If there is only 1 child per home there will be 3200 children looking for a school place. Roads are virtually at a standstill already without a further 4,800 cars based locally using a conservative estimate of 1.5 cars per home. Policing and fire service for this and other areas will also need to be increased to match the rising population. The plan is not fit for purpose. We understand this is a "draft proposal" and until the plan is approved home numbers are unknown but there needs to be an infrastructure plan running side by side with the housing development plan. There should be a declining scale showing the number of houses to be built and a clear plan of the infrastructure

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

development that accompanies that number houses. Then there will be accountability for those projects. Currently there is no accountability for Epping Forest District Council for the infrastructure to go with house development and therefore there is no credibility to the plan.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Development is low in some areas while places like Epping and North Weald carry a very heavy burden. Harlow development means nothing as travel to Harlow is required from all EFDC sites. If there was a clear picture on the infrastructure projects that will accompany the house building then we access the plan better. For Epping and North Weald the current proposal is for around 3200 homes and using a conservative estimate of 2.5 people per home that is 8000 new patients for local doctors. It takes 3 weeks to get an appointment now and without a number of new practises it will become impossible to be seen by a doctor. If there is only 1 child per home there will be 3200 children looking for a school place. Roads are virtually at a standstill already without a further 4,800 cars based locally using a conservative estimate of 1.5 cars per home. Policing and fire service for this and other areas will also need to be increased to match the rising population. The plan is not fit for purpose. We understand this is a "draft proposal" and until the plan is approved home numbers are unknown but there needs to be an infrastructure plan running side by side with the housing development plan. There should be a declining scale showing the number of houses to be built and a clear plan of the infrastructure development that accompanies that number houses. Then there will be accountability for those projects. Currently there is no accountability for Epping Forest District Council for the infrastructure to go with house development and therefore there is no credibility to the plan.

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

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

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:

Chapter 6 of the draft plan has no commitment no substance and really say's nothing to help understand what will accompany the house growth in each area of the district, so I do not consider this as an infrastructure plan. The comment "Further work on detailed proposals to make this provision will be undertaken between now and the next stage of plan" is a ridiculous statement infrastructure has to be known and move hand in hand with proposed house development. There should be a declining scale showing the number of houses to be built and a clear plan of the infrastructure development that accompanies that number houses. Then there will be accountability for those projects. Currently there is no accountability for Epping Forest District Council for the infrastructure to go with house development and therefore there is no credibility to the plan.

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

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

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