

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

Stakeholder ID 4745 Name Michael McKinley

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

protection of the green belt and the districts open spaces is paramount

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

While regrettable, I accept the inevitability of some green belt release to comply with the expectation of central govt. Hopefully, the released areas will be very carefully considered and will make use of logical boundaries such as major roads and railways and resist a jagged edge at the green belt which might encourage further development

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I am not qualified to comment on this aspect of the development in detail, however my concern is that the development results in increased traffic resulting in increased pollution (noise, light & air) particularly along Harlow to London corridor affecting both epping forest & the remaining green belt countryside

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

Stakeholder ID 4745

Name Michael

McKinley

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I am very concerned about the current decline of the centre of Waltham Abbey, the plan emphasises tourism but the town centre also needs to be use to those of us who live here. We do not all live in Tesco's! We need a better balance of retail businesses beyond gift shops and estate agents. Shop frontages should be regulated to be in keeping with the historic nature of the town. It is not fit for the tourist industry at present

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

every effort should be made to contain industrial development within existing brownfield sites and in considering any development, new or intensified, emphasis must be placed on the effect of traffic generated. Since when has (something) hill been considered an industrial estate? The type of heavy traffic using ... hill is quite unsuited to its location

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Yes

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No

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:

No

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No

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:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

No

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

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

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

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

Comments for multiple areas: As a resident within the parish of Waltham abbey, but not within the area bounded by the maps 5-9, all issues relating to green spaces, the green belt and Epping Forest are of prime importance. One appreciates the attention given to these issues in the draft plan, particularly with regard to the international importance of Epping Forest. I read with interest draft policy DH7 Heritage Assets B concerning conservation areas. I live in Upshire conservation area and have not been impressed with the safeguarding of the conservation area in recent years. Those of us who take great pains to maintain our properties in keeping with the listing and landscape of the conservation area have often felt let down by the planning authority in respect of other developments. I would like to see better guidance or enforcement over issues concerning e.g. frontages, all night lighting and maintaining of natural .. resulting in loss of flora.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

the infrastructure must be in place before the development begins

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

In "vision for the London Stanstead Cambridge corridor core area , Epping Forest is described as a recreation/green asset. 1 year for the future of the forest if emphasis is placed on its recreational role in this area of escalating population. Its sustainability depends on putting the forest first and peoples exploitation of it second.

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)