

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

Stakeholder ID 29 Name PETER SHEN

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:

The plan for housing in Loughton, and particularly Debden, is intrusive and seems based purely on economics.

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:

Housing is needed but not at any cost. The decision to build houses in existing amenity spaces is a disaster for residents.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The plan sounds OK, but not enough detail about extra infrastructure -can we trust the authorities to deliver on promises? I don't.

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

Stakeholder ID 29

Name PETER

SHEN

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The plan makes sense - but the retail area in Langston Road could take trade away from the Broadway. It was promised that the selection of shops would not compete, but the published list of proposed shops is contentious. Also, the traffic management in Langston Road junction is already a nightmare- the retail area could make this much worse. The road improvement plans look inadequate(again).

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The arguments given so far seemed sensible and logical

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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

All proposals (except Vere Road and Station Road) are taking amenity sites - open spaces, like Jessel Drive and Sandford Avenue were deliberately created in the original planning of Debden to make the estate a pleasant environment for residents. Why must they be filled with crowded housing? Car parks in both Loughton and Debden are already in short supply , and yet the proposals are set to obliterate 4 of them-where are all the cars going to park? What impact will there be on traders and residents who live nearby? Building on Epping Forest College land has already been done - with significant traffic increase. Another 400 plus homes will

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

overload Borders Lane/Rectory Lane. The college will not be able to expand in the future when all the land has been taken. And what happened to the College Sports Hall that was promised for that land? Is that part of the plan?

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 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:

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

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Chapter 6 ticks all the boxes, but the record of the Local Authorities in providing appropriate infrastructure for new developments has not been good. This seems to be true for school places, surgeries, and traffic management. We already have problems with all these issues, and to state that the ECC will require contributions from developers is fine, as long as that money be exclusively spent on providing the infrastructure solutions required. But I am not confident that this will happen.

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

I will wait for the report

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?