

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

Stakeholder ID 2527 Name Edward Wallace

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

The vision is good but the proposals do not seem fullfill it. The proposed areas for development are almost entirely on Greem Belt land and the intention to develop the sports centre, the cricket pitct, bowling club and tennis club are clearly detremantel to the Town. A replacement for the sports centre in Northweald or elsewhere is not acceptable. Further, there is no detail of how the infrastructure is to be enhansed to cope with the considerable extra population, in particular transport, parking, doctors and schools etc

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

the proposals do not appear to have allocated the additional housing equitably around the district. Epping in particular appears to have more than its fair share,also the identified areas are not within the existing settlement but outside its curtilage

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

Stakeholder ID 2527

Name Edward

Wallace

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

There is too much intrusion into the green belt, especially to the south where it is getting closer to Epping. Surely more areas could be identified within Harlow which has a lot of open space. Can we expect the new facilities proposed for Harlow to be provided elsewhere in the district?

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

Epping?

Yes

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There do not appear to be any new employment sites identified in Epping, the only possible one, Epping Laundry, has been allocated to housing and other similar industrial sites have been developed with housing in recent years

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Too much green belt land is being taken when there are other areas within the town curtilage which are not identified. As mentioned in Question 1, the loss of sporting facilities is unacceptable, also the presumed loss of St Margarets Hospital - relocation to within PA in Harlow would be totally unacceptable

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 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:

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

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The draft plan does not include an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Chapter 6 provides no details of what, where and who will fund these facilities. Medical facilities within the Town are at breaking point, it is impossible to get an appointment with ones own Dr within a month, also transport and parking are similarly overloaded

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?

On the identified sites which are on existing car parks it is presumably intended to build on top of the parking areas. This would make the cost of the housing uneconomic unless additional funding was available. SR-0153 This area bisects the Essex Way which is a protected footpath. Also there is no viable access to the site, the existing roads are too small to accept traffic from 300 new homes. SR-0071 Access to this site via Kendal Avenue is not possible as the identified Lane is only single track is not adopted, has no pavements and is lined with trees which have TPOs on them. Further, Kendal Avenue, although wide, has parking both sides other than for one hour mid morning which renders it almost one way and is extremely buisy in the rush hour and could not take additional traffic from over a hundred new homes
