

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

Stakeholder ID	2019	Name	Kevin	Watts
----------------	------	------	-------	-------

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 town cannot cope with the increased traffic that will inevitably happen.Redacted...., if I have to go out for supplies I am constantly sitting in traffic that can sometimes be gridlocked, this time is not chargeable to my customers. If I head towards London, it can sometimes take up to 40 minutes to reach Buckhurst Hill, this has been proved recently when the council planning put temporary lights on every exit and entry going in and out of Loughton. If the town cannot cope now how will it in the future. At the recent meeting at Murray Hall, it seemed that all the answers to the questions were about 'hope' there was no specific plan to tackle the influx of traffic in Loughton or the surrounding areas that are also having to cope with new properties being built. How can you justify council tax prices, I pay over £2,500.00 per year to live in an environment that has green spaces, not for a built up concrete jungle that it will become. There is no parking being allocated to the new build, the response to the question at Murray Hall was laughable, apparently none of the residents will need cars as they live close to a tube station, it is short sighted and not an answer to our future problems.

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

Stakeholder ID	2019	Name	Kevin	Watts
----------------	------	------	-------	-------

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

I am not opposed to change or for new properties to be built, but it has to be feasible and not compromise the town that is historic and that does not have the amenities to cater for a large influx of people. There is no infrastructure in place, the GP's are booked for weeks ahead, our hospitals have waiting times that are unacceptable and our schools are at full capacity. What is the plan to tackle these issues? The new services won't be put into place as quickly as the properties will be built and once they are built, I expect that we will all just have to get on with it, regardless of the chaos it will bring.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

There are lots of green spaces in Harlow and room for amenities to be built, but of course this should also not compromise Harlow or its residents as some areas of Harlow are quite deprived.

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Debden has a site for a shopping area and so does Waltham Abbey, but the other sites are historic and should not be jeopardised.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Again this will compromise our area with regards to traffic, pollution and overcrowding.

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:

As explained previously there is no coping mechanisms to deal with a large influx of people. Our roads cannot accommodate more traffic, our green spaces that allow people to live a healthy life, that combats isolation and tackles child obesity will be taken away, how do we promote a healthy lifestyle and reduce illnesses and GP waiting lists if there are no green spaces.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

Again a historic area will be compromised if the building goes ahead and there will be overcrowding on the roads, causing a gridlock.

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)

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

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

It will not be enough to ensure that the future residents are catered for, the infrastructure should be put into place now as our services are over subscribed with waiting times that are ridiculous, it will not give enough schools or amenities to the people that will be residing locally.

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

All the local residents feel the same as I, the proposal is already signed and sealed, its just the delivery that we are waiting for. In the past we have been ignored and have been asked for our views, but the proposals go ahead anyway. At Murray Hall, only three questions were allowed for each point, to restrict residents in this way means that their answers are not really relevant, making the process of appealing almost a waste of time.

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