

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

Stakeholder ID 4782 Name Keith Sellwood

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:

Having read your plan it appears to me that you are providing housing for people that do not at present live in the district rather than enabling more controlled and specific expansion of housing for future generations to be able to live near their roots. *illegible* does the report detail who will pay for all the additional infrastructure resulting from such a massive expansion.

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:

To me limited release of the green belt is still lose and destruction of the Green Belt. Harlow is apparently been on expansion - which is fine. Epping is already densely populated. expansion of housing should be in the less densely populated areas.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Many of the sites identified surrounding Harlow are Green Belt and as such should not be developed. Develop on other non - green belt sites only.

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

Stakeholder ID 4782

Name Keith

Sellwood

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

It is hoped that the amount of additional housing in Epping will be significantly reduced for the reasons stated. Therefore it is hoped that the existing facilities in Epping can remain as they are.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Some industrial sites have previously been cleaned/ demolished to make way for housing. So the proposal for new industrial/employment sites gives the impression of confusion on behalf of the proposals. As previously stated - it is preferred that Epping remains as existing - in which case further employment sites will not be required.

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

It is considered that the draft report contains insufficient detail to be able to comment in which case I feel the only option I have is to disagree with the proposals for the Epping area. No comment is made for other areas. More detailed information required to be able to comment.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

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:

Existing infrastructure is already "stretched" to capacity in many areas. Developments in other surrounding areas can only add to this demand. If the amount of additional housing in Epping is kept to an absolute

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

minimum, it is hoped that the existing infrastructure will "just about" cope and that no new infrastructure will be needed which is my preferred option.

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

Not received yet - awaited.

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

The report generally - It contains comments that I consider are incorrect and that these errors cast doubt about the worthiness of the report as a whole. - I.E. the local doctors practice in Epping (The Limes) is already overstretch and quality of service has reduced over recent years - the report states it can cope with an increase of 50% - WRONG- Also, the central line and local parking is over stretched already - I very Rarely get a seat on the central line - the report says it is only at 37% during peak times - WRONG
