

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

Stakeholder ID	1971	Name	Keith	Taylor	None
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://www.uditation.com">ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a>

# Survey Response:

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

## Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Of course, we have a duty to maintain the surrounding areas as a desirable place to live, with the correct balance of housing against jobs against infrastructure. This does not include building houses on recreational land or at the detriment of existing infrastructure.

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:

In the plans, there is proposed widespread use of car parks and recreational green spaces. I cant comment for Harlow specifically, as I am sure that residents of Harlow are much better placed to voice a valid opinion of their locale. Car Parks - The Loughton district is blighted by parking issues, mostly emanating from the huge use of Loughton Central Line Service, with people descending on the area and parking indiscriminately in surrounding roads and even on designated forest land. We simply cannot afford to lose what little parking we already have. Talk of building on recreational green land in and around the original Debden council estate is ironic really. When this huge estate was built, much emphasis was given to the quality of life that would be afforded the families that settled there, due to the openness of the plan. Now certain people want to concrete it over, madness.

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

Stakeholder ID 1971

Name Keith

Taylor





3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow? No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I do not live in Harlow and do not feel qualified to comment

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

Epping? Yes Buckhurst Hill? Yes Loughton Broadway? Yes Chipping Ongar? Yes Loughton High Road? Yes Waltham Abbey? Yes Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Retail shopping areas in the form of High Streets should be preserved. They are historically the centers of communities. Rent/Rates need to be controlled,

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

## Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Of course, but not when it involves the seizure of green spaces.

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

Stakeholder ID 1971 Name Keith Taylor





Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area? 6. 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: Seems to consist of losing car parks and what little green space we have. Where are kids going to play, people take recreational pursuits? 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: Chiqwell (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)

Stakeholder ID 1971
---------------------

Taylor





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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

We are desperate for new infrastructure. So much previous development has not been match with new infrastructure. In my opinion we should build the infrastructure before new homes, otherwise it never gets done, as has been proved in the past. Nobody is willing to pay!"

- 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)

Taylor