

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

Stakeholder ID 2799 Name Pauline Mitchell

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:

Changes proposed allowing the destruction of Green Belt land is unnecessary. It will not benefit the people of Epping by increasing the population and placing strains on infrastructure and services. additional pollution caused by the expansion proposed will cause further damage to the environment.

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:

Epping residents generally want to retain the character of the town and community without expanding the town, whereas Harlow wants and needs to expand to support development of businesses and services. Therefore the main areas of expansion should be where it is desired and needed i.e. around Harlow, Newhall and Church Langley.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow wants this expansion and appears to be happy to support more development.

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

Stakeholder ID 2799 Name Pauline Mitchell

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Some areas should be expanded such as St Johns Road Epping for business use while others may be suitable for conversion to housing or mixed use development.

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:

The use of Green Belt land for housing is unnecessary and undesirable. These are the plans I object against the most. The open spaces behind Kendal Avenue and Hartland Road site SR-0071 must be protected. This area is home to forest, protected trees (including the very rare Whitebeam) and fields which are an important habitat for bats, badgers, deer, stoats, rabbits, hare, owls, woodpeckers, bees, to name a few. It would be devastating to offer up this area for development and is one of the most favoured places for the residents of Epping and their children to enjoy the open space. Additionally, the fields are very uneven and unsuitable for construction. This was previously a river tributary and is prone to flooding and bogs, which again is an ideal attribute for the local wildlife. The proposed access road is a tiny private lane that can barely accommodate the path of one small car, let alone construction vehicles. The houses are very close together. Please, I urge you to leave this site alone. The adjacent road is already congested with cars parked for tube station access. This would only aggravate the problem. All of the other proposed areas in Epping are very much invading

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

much valued green belt land and I believe it is wholly inappropriate to alter these borders. Once they are altered, what would prevent the proposal of further alterations. The residents of Epping live this far out of London to enjoy the beautiful countryside and ancient forest, away from the crowded city. For those of us who work in the city, we have chosen this area at the expense of a short commute. There are only two primary schools and one secondary school in the town. The rapid increase in population will not be sustainable for the schools, local amenities or transport links. The Central Line is already over-stretched and carriages are generally crowded by the time they reach Loughton (from Epping). The areas to the East of Bower Hill are again open fields with an abundance of wildlife that must be protected. Likewise the areas by Ivy Chimneys Road. The roads are barely wide enough for two cars and I fail to believe that they would be suitable to accommodate a large new housing estate.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Again, the plan is proposing to develop another huge area of natural beauty and wildlife. This leg of the Central Line is very much stretched. I cannot see how the local transport networks would accommodate such

rapid development. It would take away from the character of the area and the town does not have the amenities to provide for such an increase in population.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

An additional site is available adjoining and to the north of site SR-0149. This is the site of Happy Grow Garden Centre and car park and the fields towards the High Road. The owner wants to retire and sell the land for housing development. This would take pressure from the need to use Green Belt land for development.

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

This lacks detail and is extremely superficial. No real proposals appear to have been made. there is no detail on how the infrastructure will be funded or where projects will be located and whether there will be further destruction of Green Belt land.

-
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 appraisal should also consider the impact on population growth and requirements following the decision to leave the European Union and potentially reduce immigration. further comment is not possible at this time.

-
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)