

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

Stakeholder ID 1967 Name maria NEARY

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:

Infrastructure is insufficient for the volumes described and the resultant increase in traffic jams, and pollution, given proximity to London anyway, will further affect air quality, damage the 'existing' bit of natural environment and encourage even more people to quit central London where the government's disastrous building policies have succeeded in creating an international multi-millionaires only property market. Time to stand firm and turn the policies back on the government that caused this grand scale exodus and make THEM find the housing from the empty / unaffordable new projects all across London or displace the 'absent' multi-millionaires!

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:

Simple - as stated above and with emphasis on no extra infrastructure - plans to build another hospital? another 2/3/4 schools? libraries? Car parks for all the commuters who HAVE TO work in London to earn a living, GPs surgeries? leisure centres to help keep a static populace fit and give youngsters a chance to play sport on a real field or swim in a proper pool? NO? then don't build what local and central government can't support and simply no longer have the space for - these things are vital to a civilized society, or at least they used to be.

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

Stakeholder ID 1967

Name maria

NEARY

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Try driving around this beautifully designed new town at 5-6pm in the evening and enjoy the gridlocked traffic.

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:

Each of these towns has a unique and identifiable quality with a fair number of smaller enterprises and family run businesses which provide many goods and services not available anywhere else and a great sense of community in complete contrast to so many of the huge big business outlets who 'over' charge and 'under' stock.' It has already been distressing to see many small shops quit, for example, Loughton High Street due to the ludicrous rates and rentals and with them has gone a wealth of knowledge and product never to be replaced, as well as the loss of their jobs. To quote one, whose family business ran back 100 years, 'I'm now going to drive a mini cab' and another who said 'it's a relief that it's over, I just couldn't afford the high cost of new lease, I'm going to sign on' Excellent result! Now, within maybe a 30 or 50 mile radius there isn't one business providing the goods or the support or the know how that these people had. Local council needs to emphasize community in all senses not help destroy it.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Apart from the useless job centre there are almost no employment agencies in this area probably because there's no employment - plenty of estate agents though and a zillion beauty and hair salons. Remembering

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

that the government has now denied people aged 60- 62 their pensions there will be a huge need to provide work for this age category as well.

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:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

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

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

Insufficient services and infrastructure

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Totally inadequate and to carry out the all the proposals properly would require massive destruction of natural habitats and vital open green areas. It will increase health risk, air pollution (already very toxic) traffic flows and put us one step closer to becoming a concrete jungle without any quality of life whatsoever. People cannot be healthy without the all important green areas and nature cannot survive. Destruction will leave no future for further generations and will be irreversible. We have already lost so much in these areas over the past 30 years and children will NEVER be healthy surrounded by tar and cement and nowhere to run,play or actually experience nature and wildlife. It is YOUR duty as well as ours to stop this now.

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

All relevant comments have been made above. There is no SUSTAINABILITY of life without the right balance. It's a really simple equation - no trees, no grass, no wildlife = more global warming, less oxygen, less crops, more toxins and no more human beings. Why is that so hard to grasp? You are making decisions now for the existence or non existence of future generations.

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

ALL SAID - go back to Central Government, stand firm and local area residents will back you. JUST SAY NO.

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