

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

Stakeholder ID 3172 Name Julia Venables

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 doesnt protect the green belt despite professing to do so; it is the thin edge of the wedge which,if allowed to take place will ultimately lead to the destruction of the green belt as it sets a precedent

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:

there isnt sufficient justification for the huge number of new houses proposed for theydon bois (360). The erosion of green belt which will occur is illogical and disproportionate in in number in comparison with other sites in epping forest. Theydon bois infrastructure is already under pressure, our school is full to capacity and our GP surgeries already offer poor service due to huge patient numbers. New building needs to take place in towns with better infrastructure and facilities

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

its better to and more sustainable to develop large towns but the green belt should never be encroached on

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

Stakeholder ID 3172

Name Julia

Venables

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:

development of primary shopping areas should take place in areas which already have these so as to not undermine current infrastructure

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

no these will have an adverse effect on transport, infrastructure and local job opportunities

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

e 4 of the sites are in the green belt and therefore they will be harmed by this development and will have a negative impact on the rural nature of our village. 360 houses is far too large a number in comparison with

other areas or epping forest district; its 23% increase in the size of our village and I think it will destroy the unique character as well as threaten our infrastructure.(school/GP

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 isnt enough detail about the specific infrastructure requirments nor any reassurance that these will meet the needs of the village

-
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 doesnt support the wide dispersal of development around the district. in our village transport links are already stretched to the limit and the underground station is hugely over crowded in the rush hour and commuter and other parking is a problem. Bus services are poor. Roads are congested around the village at peak times and this would increase enormously. case law states that housing numbers alone are not sufficient justification for developemnt of green belt land

-
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)