

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

Stakeholder ID 3003 Name Michael Woolf

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:

It will detract from the quality of life in the affected areas and there should be an emphasis on preserving the green belt instead of eroding it

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 number of proposed dwellings far exceeds the sustainable limit for most villages especially Theydon Bois which cannot cope with the existing population - e.g. insufficient places in the primary school, current six week wait for an appointment at The Limes Medical Centre, frequent power cuts, issues with drains and sewers etc

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

It is more sensible to develop areas where there is a greater need for housing due to new transport links and which will have appropriate infrastructures which can cope with the increase in population

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

Stakeholder ID 3003

Name Michael

Woolf

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:

These will not be sustainable and should be targeted to larger sites with better travel 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:

The proposed number of 360 new houses is far too high for a village of this current size as the current infrastructure will not be able to deal with the increased population. There are four sites located on green field sites and if any of these are developed then the character and nature of the village will be undermined. Any development on the sites beyond the central line tracks must be resisted as it is a natural boundary to the village and if developed then there will be no boundaries to prevent further development in the future which would lead to an uncontrollable sprawl of development across the green belt. In relation to the current site at the end of Forest Drive I believe that when the Church previously attempted to build on this site an old sewer was discovered that meant that the field could not be used for development. If this is so, then it would be unsafe to develop this particular site. Also there are serious access issues for lorries travelling to this site as they cannot travel along Orchard/Heath Drive due to the primary school and are too big to negotiate around

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

the top of Forest Drive where the shops and Bull Public House are located (or at the other end of Dukes Avenue as it is too narrow when you turn left into Harewood Hill)

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:

No as the provision is vague and does not specific what will be done and when

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 current transport links are insufficient at current levels and the underground does not cope at peak times especially when it travels westwards

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

SR-0070

As stated above there is a sewer underneath this field which has prevented developing this site previously and it would therefore be unsafe to do so now. There are also issues about how building traffic can safely access this site due to the narrow turnings at the end of Forest Drive where the road snakes to the right and then left. Works traffic cannot travel on other possible routes as one passes the primary school and the other is inaccessible due to similar access issues at the end of Dukes Avenue junction with Harewood Hill

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