

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

Stakeholder ID 1467 Name Alan lion

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

the vision is a clear view of what is required for Epping Forest District. Not sure that this necessarily enhances the quality of life. To do that takes in a much wider scope than stated. Maybe better to say a ensuring balanced living environment playing our part in providing for uk population growth and taking account of the need to provide homes etc for our children and families. Its got to be clear we don't have an option we need more houses etc.

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:

the proportions across the district seem reasonable. providing housing in places where people want to live. However costs of housing in Epping Forest District are high because of the underground and accessibility to London. Some of the sites may not be the optimum and may cause other issues. Traffic Weekly issues on the M25, M11 and A406 cause gridlock in the area

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

Stakeholder ID 1467

Name Alan

lion

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is a key employment area and housing in that area will support the expansion of employment. equally to support Stansted Airport expansion and open up employment opportunities and housing around North Weald. One issue is the high value/cost of development in Epping Forest District proximity to London and impact on starter social housing.

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:

with the exception of waltham abbey I agree. However i have doubts about WA which could be considered a town centre. this is limited by the lack of rail access

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

We need to have a limited development of employment opportunities across the District however Epping Forest District is still a main housing area for commuters to London Stansted and harlow.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

my major concern is with the proposal to add a piece-meal development of 200 plus houses to the limes farm site. Any additional development would have a detrimental impact of the green open space in an area of deprivation. by enclosing an additional area could exacerbate the opportunities for anti-social behaviour in an already high crime area. The current development has controlled entry/exit by one road preferred by the police to control potential criminal activity. Any additional development could add to traffic stress. Any additional development would need to be considered as part of a master planning exercise looking at the whole of the council and housing association properties with particular emphasis on the substandard development over garages.

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

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

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:

although para 6.12 identifies improvement to infrastructure but this seems to relate only to SP3.1- 3.4 requirements around harlow. Seems that any disruption of traffic on M25,M11,A12 or A406 causes gridlock along manor road the single east west route through chigwell. Also traffic from Chigwell High road feeds into manor road at woodford bridge a major pinch point. So significant levels of through traffic from A12 to A406 uses chigwell as a rat run. This will have a potentially limiting impact on extending housing in Chigwell and requires a traffic survey to measure and benchmark traffic . Also considering the constant increasing road congestion, raising levels of air pollution and lowering living conditions. This has a detrimental impact on the quality of life vision within the south of the district. Increasing traffic levels and the increase in local traffic requires more work within the context of the local plan to determine the impact of increasing housing by the additional 400 proposed. Assuming an average of 2 cars per household this could mount to 800 cars a large proportion entering the road network at peak times. Considering the two underground stations Chigwell and grange hill without any station parking has considerable knock on on the living and transport considerations of residents around those facilities. Recent junction protection yellow lines schemes has been introduced around grange hill and chigwell stations. The complex parking model involves commuter, resident shopkeeper and taxi parking around the stations and limiting and exacibating through traffic at peak times.

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

This is absolutely essential and impacted by my previous comments

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)