



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

Sta	keholder ID	3071	Name	Richard	Irish	
Ме	thod	Survey				
Da	te					
		elements of the ful	I response suc	ch as formatting and	images may not ap	esponses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation opear accurately. Should you wish to review <a href="mailto:nsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk">nsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a>
Su	rvey Respoi	nse:				
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:  I agree with the vision, however they strategy to achieve the vision is debatable.					
2.	Do you agree		l vision that	the Draft Plan sets	out for Epping F	Forest District?
	Please expla	in your choice in	Question 2:			
	villages, suc many (inclu	ch as Loughton a ding ourselves)	nd Theydon to want to li	Bois. Epping has	a notable 'town' e proposed deve	ments versus neighbouring towns and feel about it, which is what attracts elopments for Epping will, in my view, e to live for it.
3.	No opinion Please expla	in your choice in	Question 3:			
	i do not hav	e enough local k	inowledge o	f Harlow to comm	ent.	

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





Epping?
Yes
Buckhurst Hill?
Yes
Loughton Broadway?
Yes
Chipping Ongar?
Ves

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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:

...Redacted...
Bridge Hill, which is next to two major proposed sites for development (SR-0069 and SR-0113B), and strongly disagree with the locations of these two sites. Ivy Chimneys/Bridge Hill/Brook Road are already incredibly busy local roads; a key 'Rat Run' route used to bypass the town centre, our roads are already clogged up up an unhealthy and undesirable volume of vehicles day and night. During rush hours (both work and school) the roads are already stretched to capcity, therefore I cannot fathom how the addition of a further 300 residential propoerties would ever work with the current infrastructure. Speaking of infrastructure, Ivy Chimneys School is already hugely oversubscribed with the priority catchment area already oversubscribed each year; how would children of the additional proposed 300+ properties be catered for without adversely affecting the existing local population and without turning the annual school application process into an even more stressful process? Next to Ivy Chimneys School is Ivy Chimneys Park, a nice local park supported in recent years from investment by the council. However, have you seen the volume of traffic that passes the park on an hourly basis? It's already not a great place to linger for too long, particularly with a young family, due to the emission and noise pollution - again, I cannot see how the additional traffic that will be caused by the proposed developments will aid this. Finally, the proximity to the motorways, already a source of noise pollution to our homes (and who knows how much emission pollution) surely cannot be a

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





humane place to build houses, etc? Overall, an additional 300 properties on this side of Epping will detract from the rural/local feel that many of us have invested significantly to enjoy.

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 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:

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





Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?
 Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The current infrastructure 'details' lack granularity and simply serve as a holding response whilst an infrastructure policy is developed.

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

See previous comments regarding the significant levels of vehicle emissions, particularly in the area ....Redacted.... (Ivy Chimneys/Bridge Hill/Brook Road) - I would urge the council to undertake significant appraisals of this particular issue as part of its consultation work.

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)