

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

Stakeholder ID 1999 Name Michael Juniper

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:

The vision outlined in the Draft Local Plan(DLP) have not been applied to the content and proposals contained in the DLP and therefore the vision is not representative of the plan.

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:

whilst the council has stated it has concluded 'that the main settlements in the District are most appropriate areas for new housing' they have allocated around 24% of the housing to what they describe as a medium village. This is disproportionate.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I strongly disagree with the development of Latton Priory and Riddings area. This development is in an already congested area. Latton priory is an important historical site and there are alternative building locations on the side of Harlow. This would also fit with the proposals for improvements to the M11 at 7A and the proposed location of the new hospital. The scale of the building to the south of Harlow does not have infrastructure to support development.

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

Stakeholder ID 1999 Name Michael Juniper

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I do not agree with the second shopping site expansion in Epping St John's road as the retail outlets should be focused and concentrated in the existing High Street as splitting the High Street will not maintain the current high street prosperity.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I disagree with North Weald air field being designated as an employment site. This is contrary to maintaining the historical importance of the site. I am not against development on the air field but the entire air field should not be designated and employment site.

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:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Waltham Abbey have not taken their allocation of housing requirements and they should take their proportion.

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Ongar has better infrastructure - shops / transport links to Chelmsford (needed for the Cambridge corridor but the allocation for houses in Ongar is not proportionate to those in North Weald. The allocation for Ongar should be increased to ensure as per the vision of the District Plan that it is proportionate across the District.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

North Weald a medium sized village has been allocated 2760 houses 24.29% of the whole District housing requirement this is not proportionate and will destroy village life in North Weald. There is no infrastructure to support the development and this is against natural justice for the residents of North Weald.

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell should have a proportionate number of houses - currently they have only 5.82% and they should be supplying 15.60%.

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Theydon Bois are a comparable size to North Weald - have better transport connections and increasing the building in Theydon Bois would reduce the need for travel across the District. Theydon Bois allocation should be increased to ensure that Housing in North Weald is reduced to a proportionate level.

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

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

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

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

More proportionate housing should be made in these areas to protect the current town and village structure as stated in the DLP.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The Draft Infrastructure Local Plan does not provide the details required for each of the areas and the Infrastructure for travel across the District is not dealt with. The aspiration to use public transport and walking and cycling will not solve the transport communication problems. The infrastructure is not fit for purpose.

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

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)