

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

Stakeholder ID 2946 Name Gary Scanlon

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:

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

1.

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

There appears to be no detail on supporting infrastructure or any indication of funding or indeed what additional infrastructure will be provided. Experience has shown that once housing is put up the infrastructure is often lost in cost overruns etc.

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:

Why is the plan not focussed on brown belt areas rather than green belt. Harlow would seem to have the infrastructure to support additional population and therefore a better option. Once Green belt has been built on it is never recovered, there are plenty of suitable brown field sites including derelict industrial sites in and around Harlow and old green house sites in lea valley.

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

Stakeholder ID 2946 Name Gary Scanlon

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The plans lay out a series of aims, yet the actual plan itself does not align or contribute to those aims. It focuses on Green belt land rather than available brown belt land with access routes available. Why has north of Harlow been discounted (...Redacted...)

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Rejuvenation of these areas is important but this should be done in parallel to developments of houses to create a gradual growth. Rather than when all the houses are in place with no infrastructure to support the residents.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Hoe lane isn't suitable for its current usage, heavy lorries in the area have blighted the village for years exasperating this issue will harm the lives of residents and visitors and new industry will only increase what is a bottleneck of traffic within the lea valley as it satnds today.

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 stated previously the plan for Nazeing is all green belt focussed supported by owners wishing to exploit the opportunity with no regard to the community. Nazeing does not have the infrastructure to support circa 300 houses (220 new 80 already planned), traffic is already a major issue and the village crossroads is a bottle neck with long delays morning and evening from through traffic, increasing that loading would be crazy. Flood plain areas and houses further into the valley would also be impacted by large expansion of the village which will inevitably create drainage issues and additional cost

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

As previously stated the infrastructure is always the first to go when costs grow, an upfront commitment to infrastructure would form a better plan. Clearly defined and ring fenced budgets should be put in place if this infrastructure is ever to materialise.

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

The approach to building on green belt is discussed but not explained as to why this is a good idea why have brownfield sites not been considered and a business case appraisal not been included within this document laying out the financial case for building on green belt. There is little or no mention of the impact on the environment, nature and character of the village.

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

I would rather comment on the plan overall. The document seems like a scoping or overview rather than explain why decisions have been made what is the financial case? why has harlow north and north east been discarded. The focus in green belt development is flawed when there are so many brownfield sites with access and road infrastructure in place. The approach seems to be creating an increased population in an area with a declining public transport infrastructure creating a dependence on driving increasing traffic massively in areas which already have traffic problems through congestion and pollution.
