

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

Stakeholder ID 1660 Name Stephen Hand

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:

This plan promotes a ridiculous over development of housing which would completely ruin the whole Epping Forest DC area. Where will commuters park? How will schools and doctors cope? The roads are already heavily over congested. These insane proposals would cause total gridlock of traffic in areas like Loughton. There is already a lack of sports facilities and amenity space. Your proposals build over even more of these essential facilities! It appears that you want to concrete over every square inch of our beautiful green areas. What next? Skyscrapers in Epping Forest?!

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:

See answer above. No Green Belt land should be released for housing development as this will set a very dangerous precedent putting further development on Green Belt land even more likely in the future.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

See previous answers

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

Stakeholder ID 1660 Name Stephen Hand

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

It would be good to see more jobs created locally but not in poorly payed retail. Also business rates need to be substantially reduced to encourage businesses to set up and / or remain.

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:

To remove commuter car parking is insane. Most people who live in the area work in central London. How are people expected to get to work? To remove Epping Sports Club in Lower Bury Road is insane. It removes a valuable and rare amenity and sets a very bad precedent for the future.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

To remove the car parking from Loughton and Debden Stations is insane! See answer above. People will move out of this area if they cannot get to work. Only in the dream world of the town planners do people live in a car free environment. In the real world where the rest of us live this idea is total madness! How will people be able to use Loughton library or go shopping in the High Road if they can't park? Building over the amenity spaces and sports fields in Deben and Loughton College removes rare and valuable amenity space and puts huge extra pressure on local infrastructure, schools, doctors, etc. To allow 30 homes on the former post office site in Loughton High Road is again insanity! How will it be accessed? Where will occupiers and visitors park? The High Road is already grid locked most of the time because of the ridiculous road & traffic light junction with Brook Road plus the ridiculous car parking along the High Road (instead of the former slip road). To allow a development of that mass & scale in that location would cause the local infrastructure to fail.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

Building on the Lower Queens Road car parks brings the same issues as I stated in my answers above. The proposed size of the St Just development on Powell Road is too dense.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

The loss of green belt or fringe green belt at Chigwell Nursery should never be allowed. It is also rare employment generating land which should not be lost. To promote 66 homes is far too large in any event. The roads and infrastructure cannot cope. The former Beiss Shammai school should be retained for educational use and purchase for Chigwell Primary School to use. To allow the beautiful Grange Court to be developed into 9

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

homes is criminal. Again it should be retained for educational use especially with all the extra pressure on school places.

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

The loss of the station car park will cause commuters great difficulty and add to pressure on the local streets for car parking. Madness. The loss of green belt land at the end of Forest Rive and on the former Old Foresters site sets a very bad precedent for future development on the green belt.

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:

Totally inadequate. The Council allows Buckhurst Hill Boys School to be sold off for a pittance and then only a few years later has to build Debden Park at vast expense to the rate payers! Great planning for the future! These proposals are totally inadequate if the new housing is allowed.

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

Badly conceived and totally inadequate. Clearly drawn up by people not living in the real world.

-
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)