

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

Stakeholder ID	3152	Name	Karen	Simper
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: <a href="https://docs.org/licenses/lice

Survey Response:

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I accept that Councils are under pressure from Government to build new homes, and improve infrastructure, and I accept some of the proposals in the draft plan, but not all

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

I understand there is a proposal to build 134 homes adjacent to High Ongar Road along the A414, and to knock down the Leisure Centre at Ongar for further homes. The A414 is a fast dangerous road, so this seems a dangerous option, unless speed control can be enforced. Removing the Ongar Leisure Centre is not improving the facilities in the area, it is obviously a disadvantage to local residents, who use the facilities there.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 3152

Simper





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

Epping? No opinion Buckhurst Hill? No opinion Loughton Broadway? No opinion Chipping Ongar? No opinion Loughton High Road? No opinion Waltham Abbey? No opinion Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I refer to chapter 5.24, site area SR 0394, land identified for possible B Class employment use. High Ongar is classed as a "conservation area" where restrictions apply to certain aspects of home improvements, and this is in fact one of the many charms of the village environment, together with the surrounding greenery, that most of us have moved here from busier towns to enjoy. There is a triangle of land as you enter The Street from the A414, in between the A414 and The Street at the Nash Hall end of The Street, if this were developed it would change the entire look and feel of the Village. It is not in keeping aesthetically or indeed with "conservation" to release the green land surrounding this area for industrial/commercial use but this is not the only concern. Mill Lane and The Street are already used as "rat runs" particularly during Rush Hours and we are already subject to ever increasing traffic, and ever larger vehicles that should really be deemed inappropriate for these narrow, residential roads. There is a vehicle weight restriction sign in Mill Lane which is often ignored. The speed limits are also regularly ignored. Any addition to commercial property in this area would increase traffic, dust, noise, pollution and danger. Speed is already an issue which is particularly worrying with the Primary School that sits on The Street and with many of the residents being families with young children. Many of the cottages are old with little foundations, and they vibrate when heavy vehicles pass. Whilst we understand that everywhere must take some of the pain of development, High Ongar is a small(ish) village environment, surrounded by farmland which is in danger of being lost unnecessarily. There is a small housing development being proposed in Mill Lane, and in percentage terms this is a fairly large addition for the village, so is this not enough for our Village to be doing its bit for the Plan? We so desperately want to remain a village, and not become subsumed into Chipping Ongar Town. We believe that this is what "conservation" should imply, and I hope that you will hear our concerns.

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

Stakeholder ID 3152

Simper





Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area? 6. 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: See earlier general comments 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 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)

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





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? No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

- 8. 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?

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

Simper