

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

Stakeholder ID 4752 Name Christine Magol

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Not sure that the draft plan fulfils the vision of enhanced quality of life for people in Epping. Plans for infrastructure e.g. schools, doctors are not detailed and limiting the car parking will lead to the decline of the shopping centre.

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:

Do not want green belt built on

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 4752

Name Christine

Magol

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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:

Epping Draft Policy P1 - Epping Schools are already oversubscribed- where is a new primary school going to be built? - GP services will need to be expanded - the current sites are struggling - where is a new medical centre going to be placed? General vision of 'enhanced quality of life and infrastructure' does not answer these questions. Car parking in Epping is essential for the shopping area, dentists, hairdressers etc to survive. It is already impossible to park in Epping at certain times of the day so any reduction in car parking will be

detrimental to the well being and growth of the town. Building 4-storey buildings in order to include car parking is out of character with Epping. It may work at the station site but not elsewhere.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

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:

Coopersale Draft Policy p12 - The proposed sites in Coopersale include building on a cricket pitch, school playing fields and children's play area (on allotment site). Given the rise in childhood obesity, where are our children going to exercise? Building in Coopersale involves moving the green belt so that green belt land can be built on - I am opposed to that.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Difficult to agree/disagree with a proposal that is not specific enough

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

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?

policy number: S10404 - Giving adjacent to a proposed development increases uncertainty and worry. The proposed '17 years' does nothing to relieve that anxiety.
