

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

Stakeholder ID 4651 Name Anthony Scott

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:

Green belt must NOT be used for development. Nor existing car parks. Further development in the district will not improve the quality of life for existing residents. New infrastructure will require even more land to be developed. Too many sites have been earmarked for development, and too many new homes to be built.

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:

No Green Belt to be used. The local plan maps are vague and confusing. Before any further steps are taken the areas designated for potential development should be clearly marked on detailed maps with roads identified if they form boundaries. The Key to the maps are confusing meaningless and require further explanation.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Provided no Green Belt is used for development. Brown sites must be the priority.

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

Stakeholder ID 4651 Name Anthony Scott

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

(blank)

Loughton Broadway?

(blank)

Chipping Ongar?

(blank)

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

(blank)

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Existing retail areas should be protected and not expanded. Many retail premises remain unused and these should be occupied before any further development. Business rates are too high for start up businesses. The council should take more steps to reduce this burden.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Only existing employment sites should be developed. More employment sites will attract more demand for housing, more traffic, more congestion and more parking.

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:

Totally opposed to the development of Green Belt sites. Farmers must not be allowed to sell off land for development. we will need all available farming land for food in the future.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Debden Estate is a high density housing area in the district. Green spaces are important for recreation and well being of the residents. Only a very small number of houses should be built. Loughton is already too

crowded, too congested and has insufficient parking. Further expansion of population will lead to existing resources being stretched further e.g. NHS, transport, schools, recreational facilities and car parks.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

As above

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:

As above

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

As above

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:

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

-
7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

More infrastructure requires more land resulting in further development.

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?