

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

Stakeholder ID 2146 Name ian hovell

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 vision includes "protecting Epping Forest District's Green Belt and environment...." Having read it, it clearly fails to do this and will involve sacrificing a considerable area of local greenbelt land, at the expense of the character of many small towns and villages

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:

360 additional houses in Theydon Bois would add approximately 25% to the population. This is ludicrous and clearly fails to represent a fair distribution of new housing. The facilities and infrastructure barely support the existing population (many children have to be driven to schools in other towns and villages.... the tube is very busy already.... there is very limited parking in the village.... we already have regular electricity blackouts.... there are very limited leisure facilities.... many residents have to travel to neighbouring towns and villages to see a doctor / dentist.... the roads already get very busy during peak times such as school runs....)

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

Stakeholder ID 2146

Name ian

hovell

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is a significantly larger town with much better facilities and infrastructure but again, developing greenbelt land should be avoided where possible to protect the character of the towns and villages

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Employment development should be directed towards the larger sites close to / within the towns of the district that are looking to expand. The EFDC plans for employment development on green belt sites are not sustainable and will impact the local infrastructure and transport links

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 opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Firstly they involve significant development on green belt land. Theydon Bois is a charming, rural village, the character of which would be significantly, adversely affected by such development. The present infrastructure and facilities simply cannot support a c. 25% population increase (lack of schools, lack of doctors and dentists, lack of road facilities, insufficient parking, insufficient underground train capacity, few shops, frequent energy black outs even at current provision levels....)

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is very limited detail on this in 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.

this does not support the wide dispersal of development in / near the small villages in the district. People will have to travel further for schools / doctors / shops / dentists adding further road / rail congestion

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

the character of the local villages must be enhanced or at worst maintained. I'm not confident that these plans will successfully do this
