

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

Stakeholder ID 1472 Name Keith Hibberd

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Quality of life is being ignored. The emphasis is only on quantity, with no consideration on the impact of pollution and overcrowding. The infrastructure will have to be significantly enlarged to cope with extra traffic and population increase.

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:

Housing is NOT being distributed among existing communities equitably. The green belt should not be developed to the levels planned. The immediate area around Epping represents a HUGE encroachment on this supposedly protected green belt. To avoid this unnecessary loss I would suggest the following:- 1. 11,400 homes, largely in the Green Belt conflicts with Ministers statements. 2. Make a greater effort to develop in existing settlements, in particular the St Johns Road development site. 3. Look at existing poor quality and low density sites with a view to demolish and rebuild with more efficient quantity of homes. 4. Harlow has many sites within the town which could be developed. 5. Consider a brand new town or garden village in a lower density of the district.

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

Stakeholder ID 1472

Name Keith

Hibberd

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Although I agree with the idea of increasing the number of homes in Harlow, it is apparent that this could be achieved within the foot print of the existing settlement. It is unnecessary to use as much Green Belt as indicated.

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:

Shop fronts should be designed to be in sympathy with existing architecture. It is essential to retain the character of each area.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

It is essential that all sites earmarked for development should not reduce the existing sites that offer employment. If this is the case, alternative sites must be found for those business affected.

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:

I object to the following sites:-

	No. Homes	REASON
1..SR-0069/33 . homes south of Epping	55 .	Green Belt.
244 Green Belt.Too Many 3..SR-0347 Epping Sports centre.	44	Loss of facility Object if
parking is lost. 4..SR-0348 Cottis Lane Car Park	54	Parking must not be lost 5..SR-.349
Baker Lane Car Park	41	Parking must not be lost

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 opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

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

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:

Secure funding, timing, capacity and character of required infrastructure should be assured before development is allowed to proceed. The Limes Medical centre is already NOT coping and would have to be made larger or alternative centre built.

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

Traffic is already a major problem in particular at Bell Common, with significant delays, morning, evening and all day weekends. If the large number of proposed homes were to be built a By Pass around Epping would have to be considered.

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

H1

Additional population would impact on the underground capacity which, at peak times, is overstretched.

H1...Housing mix needs to be clarified.

DM7

Heritage Assets should be protected.
