

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

Stakeholder ID 4689 Name Carolanne Griffin

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:

I cannot understand why more homes would enhance the quality of life for people already living in the district. 1. Currently, the traffic congestion and pollution is at saturation levels. 2. The Limes Doctors cannot cope with the demand of it's existing patients. I.e. average waiting for an appointment is 8 weeks- totally unacceptable. 3. New homes do not provide more employment for the area once the building work is completed. A community with feelings of "well-being" are not achieved by masses of houses but by providing facilities such as our sports centre, the hospital, bowl clubs, cricket fields, green spaces, fresh aire. Epping was always a good place to live wih great heart and these proposals will spoil all that.

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:

Release of Green belt/farm land should not be considered under any circumstances. Once built on it is gone forever - future generations will be disadvantaged. Green belt should be sacrosanct.

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

Stakeholder ID 4689 Name Carolanne Griffin

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Whilst this may be the "lesser" of many evils, it is not ideal. Before any development in this area is allowed - comprehensive infrastructure should be in place so as not to impact on the residents in Harlow and surrounding areas. Particular attention given to relief roads. Community facilities, adequate education and recreation centres. Open spaces all vital.

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:

Why are 'new' shops required in Epping? There are empty shops here already. The existing high street should be utilized *illegible* opportunity for housing on the st Johns site. The homes there would not then cause such an impact in the town as transport/ parking would not be required by those residents. Thought should be given to 'retirement' homes in this central position too ideal for older residents.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Employment is necessary but other than "retail" and "services" employment it is not essential that these business are not in the town centre/ In fact industry usually prefers to be operating from out of town business parks where there is space for car parking for their employees - attracted from a wider area. There may be a requirement for an out of town new business park i.e. Thornwood/North Weald areas - away from housing. A new station should be considered at North Weald - Extend the central line. This would benefit the North Weald residents and relieve Epping station to some extent.

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:

1. It is shocking that the 'sports' areas in Epping are identified for building houses. The sports centre is the life- blood for many people's well being. Personally, I use the sports centre 2 or 3 times a week. It keeps me fit and healthy - and I don't have to get to it by car. My husband uses the sports centre for "heart-smart" sent there by his GP the bowls clubs, cricket fields are treasured by so many people. 2. How can the hospital, St *illegible* be considered for building. As above, it is used constantly by all residents. There is call for expansion of it's services certainly not a reduction. The 'Limes' Certainly cannot cope with any more health issues. As mentioned in question 1 - it is currently on 8 week wait for an appointment this is quite unacceptable. 3. The town car parks are vital. What will happen to the 'shops' in the high street if people can not drive to the town. The town will die - the complete opposite to what the plans are striving to achieve surely? The proposal of building above the town car parks and central line car park is nonsense. How long will this take? Where will people park whilst all this is going on? The town shops will suffer and close - the high street will die - never to recover. What about all the traffic problems when you have heavy lorries and building material transported through the centre of town. Existing Facilities are: Car parks, hospital, sports

centre, bowls club, cricket fields. Should not be touched. Any suggestions of replacing them should not be considered until the new facilities are in place otherwise they will be taken away and never replaced.

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:

An infrastructure plan is not available - this is the problem. No details of when or where or how this 'mystical infrastructure' will be provided. As all our facilities, health, sports, schools are at breaking point with the existing numbers of residents, it could be made clear that all the new infrastructure is in place before any building of houses begins. Who will fund the infrastructure? we have not been given nearly enough information on this.

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

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

Comments will be forthcoming once the Appraisal has been completed. The cost of the draft plan -almost £2 million is a vast amount of public money - Our money but our views are not being given enough thought. The support of all residents with their views does not uphold the draft plan proposals. Our facilities are precious. We do not want them to be taken away from us.

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

TFL - 1. The trains leaving Epping (and returning) station are not full - but several stops down the line it is standing room only. More travellers boarding at Epping would exacerbate the situation. So saying, it should be an option to exclude the central line out of North weald. An increase in more passengers w=could be achievable by more frequent trains at peak times. 2. H1 housing mix - the housing mix of affordable housing and the private sector has not proved to be successful in other areas - this needs to be researched more before 'the mix' is planned and settled upon. Chelmsford has experienced problems with these types of housing.
