

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

Stakeholder ID 2502 Name Janice Mott

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 Green Belt is not being protected if you allow it to be built on. You state the desire to protect other wildlife areas and heritage resources, this is not evident in all areas. New development would significantly increase noise and pollution.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2502

Name Janice

Mott

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:

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

You can encourage the growth of local business by protecting existing employment sites and allocating new ones but you cannot guarantee these will be occupied by new businesses.

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:

There is an issue regarding access to sites SR0067i and SR0120. The only way this could be overcome would cause another hold up on the A414 which is already a road that is the scene of too many accidents. Together with all the development proposed for Ongar the infrastructure could not support the population increase. There is insufficient Health Care provision and an already congested area would become a commuters

nightmare. The density of the proposed development in Ongar is disproportionate to the location and size of the town.

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 Ongar Health Centre cannot cope since The Ongar Surgery closed therefore they would not be able to manage the significant increase in population that has been proposed. Whilst provision may be made for local employment the reality is that most new residents will work in London and will need to commute. The trains are too crowded as it is and parking at local stations is almost impossible after 7.30 in the morning. All roads into London are already extremely congested on a daily basis and it appears there are plans to alleviate the already existing problems.

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

-
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 future of the only major hospital in the area is uncertain. No development should be undertaken until there are adequate hospital facilities in place not just proposed - plans for the future will not save lives. The congestion that already exists in Ongar needs to be addressed prior to any housing development. Green Belt and open green areas need to be preserved as do areas of historic interest. Whilst the plan states as aims the rest of the plan is contradictory and does not support the aims and objectives.

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

Throughout the plan it states that one of the aims is to provide affordable housing. The word affordable is only relative to the income of the would-be buyer of a new property. Even if guidelines or restrictions are imposed in order to aim for reasonably priced homes, all property developers will aim to maximise their profits. This is a fact known by all and should be recognised. All Epping Forest District residents are aware of this. If the Government really want to create employment and affordable housing, plans need to be made to encourage industry to the Midlands and North of England.
