

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

Stakeholder ID 1426 Name Beverley James

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:

1. The council seems to want to eradicate any green space from the area 2. There is no infrastructure planning 3. Much of the assumptions regarding capacity in existing roads, healthcare, etc is incorrect 4. Many of the proposed schemes are undeliverable without adverse impact eg whilst the Epping car parks are being built on the traders in Epping will probably go bankrupt

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:

Green belt land and other open spaces should be protected

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

No desire to see existing settlements joined up nor an M11 residential corridor to Stansted

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

Stakeholder ID 1426

Name Beverley

James

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Council plans are unrealistic - you certainly don't protect local shops by developing a discount retail park as has been done in Debden

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Will only attract more migrant workers - accept that the area is a commuter suburb and move on!

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:

Disgraceful to build on so many green sites - especially Bell Common. Building on car parks shows a total lack of common sense. St John's development should be included and could be all houses - no need for another supermarket

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Ridiculous to expand Limes Farm which is already notorious for drugs and violent crime. Green space adjacent to Manor Road formed part of the original planning conditions and was intended as a buffer. Are all

previous planning conditions now optional? There are also two magnificent trees which it would be a disgrace to destroy.

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:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is no proposal included in the plan merely ridiculous claims regarding current capacity which have no factual basis

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

Well that was a waste of money!

-
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)