

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

Stakeholder ID	4242	Name	Sue Mouat
----------------	------	------	-----------

Method	Email
--------	-------

Date	8/12/2016
------	-----------

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

Letter or Email Response:

I am writing with reference to the draft local plan, concerning North Weald, and to voice my objections. I have been a resident of North Weald for 13 years, and I moved here as I wanted to live in a village, not a town, a village. I have invested money in my property to improve it and so i can continue to enjoy living in this village, with all the scenery, footpaths, wildlife, and general village life. You say that the plan will maintain the village life of North Weald, but I fail to see how increasing the number of house by some 78% will achieve this. We will become a town and this is not why people moved here. In addition the number of houses you propose is nearly some 25% of your total allocation, which is an enormous amount for one SMALL village to take. There are plenty of areas where expansion or other houses could be built, and I really do not feel that other options have been reviewed & our poor village seems to be the easy option. Transport links are obviously a major concern too, the roads around here during rush hour can be terrible, especially if there is an incident on the M11 or M25, I really cannot see how the roads would cope with the extra traffic at all. At the weekends we get more traffic and a constant stream of cyclists through the village now, which creates terrible tail backs and dangerous situations ...Redacted..., putting more motorists on the road is certainly not going to help. More houses will create more cars and commuters and more pollution. The roads simply cannot cope , and this will affect businesses, local shops, emergency vehicles, and people's health. The infrastructure cannot presently cope either. I recently tried to book a GP appt and I had to wait 6 WEEKS, how on earth would it cope with an extra 1500 houses (min 3000 people) it can't cope now. Everyone of course is also aware that schools are bursting at the seams, and care for the elderly is under enormous pressure, so where is the infrastructure to cope with this expansion?? The land behind my house, ...Redacted... I purchased my house because of the view, I didn't want to back onto houses, so I bought this house, and you want to change that, with no consideration to the residents? My quality of life will be affected, as I will no longer have the view, I will be constantly disturbed and disrupted by building going on for years behind my house. The drainage is not in place to cope with these houses, the sewage works is within very close proximity. I also walk my dogs around these fields, and throughly enjoy it, the joy of living in a village, and not a town. If you build on these fields, where will people exercise their dogs, guess we will all have to get in our cars , more traffic, and drive to the forest, adding to the congestion on the roads already. In addition these fields are Grade 2, and as I understand it, are very important to the general food production, and should never be considered for development, and other land should be the option. There are hundreds of residents ...Redacted... that would be hugely affected by this huge development of over 500 houses. I understand that some development will have to take place across the district of Epping Forest, but North Weald, really seems to be taking the majority of this and this is why I totally object to this plan. Here are my bullet points 1. An unfair percentage of development per hectare for North Weald 2. A 78% increase in houses, which nearly doubles the size of the village, and so would no longer be a

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

Stakeholder ID	4242	Name	Sue Mouat
----------------	------	------	-----------

village 3. No infrastructure, schools, doctors, elderly care, social care, roads, transport, sports fields, drainage. 4. Quality of life totally disrupted 5. Grade 2 agricultural land, very important land that should not be built on. 6. Affect on local businesses that would have to cope with extra traffic 7. No transport links 8. The price of my house - I have a lovely view presently, will the price of my property be affected if it's going to look over hundreds of houses instead??? 9. The loss of village life, which we all presently enjoy 10. No additional areas for extra shops, you can rarely park at the local shops and people already park dangerously and selfishly, so this will, just make the roads and pavements more dangerous, as the village would not be able to cope with the extra residents.