

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

Stakeholder ID 3093 Name Glenn Sanderson

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:

The solutions are a result of poor Govt poor Council Management over many years. In addition rules needed tightening a long time back on the influence of building companies on Parish Councils and it's members - unfortunately this is all about money not environment - Tendering processes with building companies are not robust or transparent and are open to malpractice.

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:

Greenbelt will never be recovered - what happens whne that is all exhausted and the country and worls has no fresh air - Unfortunately it is time now to look at underground housing solutions to protect what little greenbelt that is left - otherwise this short sightedness will result within potential of extinction or serious social / civilisation breakdown within the next 200 years

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The problem with all of these developments is the fact that the transport links are never enough - in addition too many cars is the major contributor to any developments. You and the Govt need to look at Cars and Motor

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

Stakeholder ID 3093 Name Glenn Sanderson

vehicles and alternative transport methods - very little money has been invested in looking at cars and fuel - because it runs the world economy - start looking at the root of the problem rather than working on the end of it.

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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Just wanted to add a comment - I also have no or little opinion on this - however again the bigger picture needs to be looked at - internet shopping is gradually and will continue to erode the conventional shopping methods of the last 30 years. You need to consult with the younger generation far more as it will be they who have to deal with decisions ultimately made by an older (and I include myself in this) out of touch council / population. I doubt whether in 20 years there will be much demand for shopping on the high streets which is sad but the reality - unfortunately as well these professions like those of the past such as carpenters / miners / blacksmiths have all disappeared - businesses are all now operating with working from home so you need to wake up and get with the program, before it's too late.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Agree somewhat but again need to encourage working from home to reduce use of transport to and from working locations thus reducing requirements for larger employment sites and in turn make this housing which will reduce usage of roads and with alternate transport methods claim back road space for housing.

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

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 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 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

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

As I have said the whole outlook on this needs to change - quit thinking about making money and genuinely think about the environment - different transport is key - housing going upwards or underground essential - could be regarded as an eyesore in Nazeing but would protect the greenbelt and the environment which will keep the future generations alive. Reduce shopping malls or again build shops upwards or down due to online demand killing the high street and use what is acquired from closing retailers to add the additional housing - encourage more cycling and single transport method in the area - BUT make sure this happens once you have forced people off the road so it is safe to use single / cycle transport on the road. - A lot of this can be put in

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

place earlier than 2033 IF there is a genuine appetite to do the right thing. The Alternative is for Local Councils to disband and become Private so that things will move forward far quicker reducing the bureaucracy and redtape that exists. Additionally implement charges or restrictions on continually resubmitting planning requests from developers when plans have been turned down. It is costing the taxpayer every time an application is resubmitted after being turned down 6 months before and is not good use of local taxpayers money!

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Short term I think more schools will be required but with the modern technology by 2033 will be more remote education. Transport look at the future solutions and concentrate on removing the use of the car. So your plans need to be much more innovative and forward thinking - hence why Councils and methods of dealing with the populace are outmoded and need change.

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?