

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

Stakeholder ID 2616 Name David Johnson

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:

Overall the plan does not address the environmental, transport and infrastructure implications of proposed developments and if pursued, this plan will lead to significant degradation to the quality of life of residents

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 housing proposals I specifically object to are as follows: 1) Jessel Green. This would utterly destroy a valuable and scenic green space to the detriment of the local population and would lead to the very "town cramming" you say you seek to avoid. It would also be a flagrant breach of the garden village development philosophy underlying the former Debden estate. 2) Borders Lane sites. The Borders Lane site was of course not intended for housing, but if it is to be so used sporting and medical resources must be allocated and the housing must be of good quality, regardless of classification. 3) The Station sites. I question the practicality of these proposals both in terms of the quality of life of future residents (The first trains run from just after 5 am and through the night to Loughton at weekends) and the resulting car parking issues. This smacks of profiteering by TFL. 4) Loughton Library and car park. This is a terrible proposal, given the consequent destruction of a modern library and the blow the loss of parking would represent to local traders. General. This plan takes no account of the shocking state of local infrastructure (has any elected member other than those representing Loughton driven around the Debden Estate recently?) nor does it recognise that the Central line is already at capacity and parking around the stations is an increasing problem. Traffic gridlock is already a daily event in areas such as Rectory Lane. Education provision is fully committed and any further

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

Stakeholder ID 2616 Name David Johnson

development would require significant additional education facilities. Any successful plan will require huge financial resources and a degree of coordination not previously evidenced in the record of EFDC.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The balance of housing numbers between Loughton and Harlow is wrong. I understand that Harlow are interested in further development, but the plan seeks to cram more housing into Loughton, to the great detriment of that area.

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Loughton Broadway is a classic example of the neglect of a key asset. There is a need to preserve and enhance the attractiveness of this centre in the face of increased competition from Langston Road. There is little evidence of any real commitment by EFDC to the improvement of the Broadway.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Please see my comments above.

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 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)

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

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Resources need to be allocated on a significant scale and a timely manner. There is little evidence of this being done in the past and even if successfully achieved, the overall result will be a degraded environment both in terms of living and commuting if the housing proposals were to be enacted on the scale and in the locations envisaged.

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)