



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

Sta	keholder ID	2542	Name	Amaya	Davies	
Method		Survey				
Da	te					
		elements of th	e full response suc	ch as formatting an	cil's database of responses to the Draft images may not appear accurately. Sho Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdo	ould you wish to review
Su	rvey Respo	nse:				
1.	Do you agre	e with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan se	s out for Epping Forest District?	
	Disagree					
	Please explain your choice in Question 1:					
	With respect to Chigwell any development is continued urbanisation of the green belt. The village has inadequate infrastructure in terms of roads and medical facilities to accommodate the proposals and will place increased strain on the existing infrastructure					
2.	Do you agre	e with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan se	s out for Epping Forest District?	
	Strongly disagree					
	Please expla	in your choic	ce in Question 2:			
	fill sites have welcome reand part lie their will be	ve been utili lief for spor s within a bi e a negative	sed and with res ts and leisure fa odiversity action effect in princip	spect to limes far cilities. Part of to plan priority hable due to its dev	belt. Chigwell Parish Council adminstrate they state what space that one Grange Farm site includes a tree bitat. At Grange Hill there is acknowled the properties of the development in the Green Belt. The prostitutes part of the development in	does exist provides e preservation order owledgement that roposed housing and
3.	No opinion	·	oposals for developed in Question 3:	lopment around l	arlow?	

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

Name Amaya

Davies

Stakeholder ID 2542

1





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

Epping?

No opinion

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

These proposals would have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities highway safety, inadequate parking. The proposals do nothing to enable successes of existing local business provide leisure opportunities, protect the local environment. They will increase pollution, noise and loss of green spaces

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

It is implicit with increased development of existing sites inevitably there will be increased traffic on already congested roads and the necessity for increased parking. At chigwell the roads are already congested because of parked commuter vehicles. This has increased considerably since parking restrictions and parking costs at Buckhurst Hill.

Davies

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

Stakeholder ID 2542 Name Amaya





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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

The village has neither the facilities nor infrastructure to accommodate the proposals. These can be categorised under: Transport- All of the proposed sites will require a means of transport whether it be from home to school, the village shops or the station that will require increased parking. The roads are already gridlocked at peak times. It is highly unlikely that anyone will walk to a station from Gravel Lane Rolls Park or Chigwell Row or wait to take a subsided bus service. This would be of no value to the elderly for shopping as the few shops are convenience stores and one has to travel to debden, loughton or barkingside. There are no health facilities, other than one dentist however there are no GPs or doctors. Education- both state schools Chigwell Primary and West Hatch are filled to capacity. At present children from Chigwell Row have to commute. Ninety percent attending Chigwell School are driven to and from school. Much of the proposed

Davies

Stakeholder ID 2542 Name Amaya





housing will be 'affordable' housing attracting younger families with potentially an increase in school children e.g. with increased housing

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:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

- 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?

Paragraph 5/ Chapter 124

There is nothing in the proposals to alleviate parking near the shops, adjacent road or station. Or to alleviate the flow of traffic through Chigwell which is currently gridlocked at school opening and closing times by the King William Pub.

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

Stakeholder ID 2542 Name Amaya Davies