

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

Stakeholder ID	3029	Name	Samuel	Pickett
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: <a href="https://docs.org/licenses/lice

## 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:

There has been no consideration for the local environment, the people that currently live in the village, the infrastructure surrounding the area, the local school, the local doctors, routes in and out of the area and no consideration for the Emergency services

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:

The houses are in the wrong locations. I do not disagree that there needs to be some form of dwelling increase throughout the borough, but the areas proposed are not suitable

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

## Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Where within the plan have I seen mentioning of transport division for North Weald, let alone improvements for the local amenities!

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





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

Epping? No Buckhurst Hill? No Loughton Broadway? No Chipping Ongar? No Loughton High Road? No Waltham Abbey? No Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The existing infrastructure is not fit for purpose, the local shops run by local people are going to suffer resulting in the loss of jobs and businesses for locals!

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

## Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There has been no consideration for the local community, only for the big corporations. Yes there will be more jobs, but will they be solely for locals? I very much doubt this.

Pickett

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

Stakeholder ID 3029 Name Samuel



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 Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

North Weald does not have the infrastructure to cope with such a large influx of properties. I do understand that there is a need for more housing, but the areas and the high amount in which the draft plan has set out is beyond what the local infrastructure can cope with. We have no local Police station, Fire station or doctors that can cope. We do not have the transport requirements that would be required to provide a further 1000+ homes. The local schools will not be able to take the influx of children. The local doctors cannot cope as it is, let alone with more people. North Weald is a basset, with a truly immense heritage, yet this is going to be destroyed by destroying green and brown belt land, whilst also destroying a beautiful way of life that Is currently enjoyed by many. The locals understand the need for extra housing, but the sheer volume is unfathomable and will not work. The local sewage cannot withstand the current amount of properties, let

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

Pickett

Stakeholder ID 3029 Name Samuel





alone the high amount of properties that are being proposed to be built. This has not been carried out in a fair way whatsoever and should not be passed!

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:

This is just not going to work regardless of how it is dressed up. There currently is a shortfall of GP's working in the country, the Police are under staffed, let alone the NHS and you are proposing ove 1000+ homes are going to be able to cope with that!

- 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?

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