



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

Stakeholder ID	1400	Name	Christina	Paley
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:

I think the local spaces within the Debden area are a vital part of the community, my daughter played there as a child and walked the dog there as a teen. There is little for youngsters to do, to remove these places would be dreadful. I personally use them as instructed to walk by my Doctor for health reasons. I would not be comfortable walking around in less visible areas (ie, surrounding countryside). The houses here are so close together, even the gardens are one on top of the other, the feeling of claustrophobia would be awful if these spaces went. I believe it would be preferable to turn a few fields, even lose some small amount of green belt, over rather than remove spaces which are proven to have health benefits and save the NHS money.

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:

Greenbelt must be considered. The infrastructure couldn't cope. Doctors, schools, trains etc. are already struggling under the pressure. New underground and infrastructure must be put into place. Prefferably in the form of a New Town.

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

Stakeholder ID 1400 Name Christina Paley





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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

No area's can cope, a complete new town should be built. As it is, parking to attend the Hospital is awful.

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:

Leave these communities alone and build a new one.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

As before, no guarantee that business will even develop in these areas. Commute already unbearable.

Paley

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

Stakeholder ID 1400 Name Christina





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

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

No, as I said before for the following reasons: 1. Area infrastructure can't cope. 2. Damage to social cohesion. 3. Damage to health. 4. Area already so crowded, these areas are a vital relief.

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 1400 Name Christina Paley





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:

There can be no information on schools etc. until a plan is agreed and therefore there is no plan. New schools are needed 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.

The whole plan is a mistake. People will suffer for the reasons I have stated. There is no need to carry out studies, just speak to people. The underground is dangerously overcrowded. The schools have no more capacity. You can't treat children this way.

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

The Debden area is severely crowded. Please don't make it worse. The Jessel Drive area/Willingale Road has 3 schools in one road! There are near misses, parents park across residents driveways, the whole thing is a nightmare. Please consider the people here right now.

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

Stakeholder ID 1400 Name Christina Paley