

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

Stakeholder ID 2041 Name Brian Johns

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:

The draft plan does not seem to consider people who live in the district now or cater for future generations. Although the draft gives a lot of information re proposed builds but none at all on infrastructure or funding to support housing or growth.

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:

Any use of Green Belt means it is lost for ever. Green Belt was to be forever and therefore for future generations. Use should be made of derelict and/or Brownfield land instead of Green Belt. Harlow seems to be willing to expand, therefore areas around Harlow should be used. Perhaps a new town or garden village should be considered in less dense parts of Epping Forest district.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The area around Harlow is GREEN BELT and therefore should not be used. Regarding this proposal, it is not compatible with the stated aims of the plan.

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

Stakeholder ID 2041

Name Brian

Johns

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

Epping?

No opinion

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:

Hoe Lane is the proposed sites, SR-0580 & SR0151, this road is very narrow and totally unsuitable for lorries. Any new or Expanded employment sites should not allow heavy goods vehicles through the village. New sites should have strict controls of heavy lorries. A lot of the people working in Nazeing and travel to Nazeing from outside the area.

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 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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Sites SR-0011, SR0300(A,B&C) and SR-0473 are all Grade 1-3 GREEN BELT and should not be used. It would appear that EFDC has ignored any Brownfield land and has chosen sites suggested by land owners but this is Green Belt land. The local area already has a problem with volume of traffic etc. Therefore to increase the housing by 220 along with 80 plus already approved would make the local infrastructure beyond it's capacity.

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

The current infrastructure is well below capacity on many fronts - flooding, road safety, oversubscribed school and therefore could not handle any form of increase.

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:

It would appear no assessments have been done to show how any of the infrastructure will be upgraded prior to any occupation. Fund from developers must be in place for existing properties to have the sewer network upgraded and to for the improvement for local schools. It should be shown that EFDC guarantees that these fund are used for this purpose and not spent elsewhere. The ARUP assessment is not realistic - it shows that areas around the proposed sites are not busy at peak time - this is not correct. Also that schools have vacancies - that the do not have!

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

This local does not show why there is a need to build on Primary Green Belt or Grade 1-3 Green Belt. Preference should be given to derelict land and previously developed land as per National Guidance in National Planning Policy Framework. the whole proposal would have a negative effect/impact on the whole character of the village, environment, nature, wild life, character of the land and the land used to producing food would be destroyed/

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

It would appear that not enough research etc. has been undertaken in producing the Local Plan for the development of Nazeing. Feel that the whole plan should be looked at again. With the view that the preservation of the Green Belt should be sacrosanct for now and future generations. And to make more effort to use Brownfield sites instead. The bus service in Nazeing is very poor and this in turn increase traffic, congestion and pollution. Any increase in traffic would make an already bad situation even worse.

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