

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

Stakeholder ID 2726 Name graham SMITH

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 whole project is a smoke-screen. There is no "vision". Who spends four years to send out maps with no roads clearly defined? These proposed Green belt developments were often regurgitated for planned builds. Nothing new or inspired.

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:

Communities need space for health filled livelihoods. Expand Loughton, Harlow or use "Brownfield areas" within our "village curtailage".

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

As far as I am aware no one is making any new land (with the exception of Singapore and Dutch). Nazeing has a large area but where the majority live there is no "village hall". Our public meeting halls are derelict and grubby, but that's O K, where is any community spirit. People dwell in a place and move on with no connection. This whole exercise is "Strictly Commercial", or put another way....a sham. Tikki-Takki dwellings are planned & proposed but homes are needed where people live and inter- connect with. Live in not dwell in.

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

Stakeholder ID 2726

Name graham

SMITH

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

....Redacted....

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Years ago houses were proposed for a site called Hillgrove, it was rejected by residents and the preferred option was employment. A complex of many units with industrial use exists.Redacted....

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:

At the beginning of the 20th century Nazeing had 175 houses. At the end of the century the house tally was 1800 houses and rising. Up to a hundred houses are currently being applied for proposed builds. In the past 20 years an average of less than five houses have been annually completed. 220 new homes is a guesstimate too far. Thirty years ago a proposal for 120 houses was made for Fernbank, Nazeing, a part brown-field site it did not happen, but history keeps repeating if the same ideas are repeated.....

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

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

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:

Too little too late. Why has this shamefully lengthy "Plan" taken four years. It looks like it is dying and it has hardly been born. 106 agreements place money in a paper chain but don't get to benefit our community. ...Redacted.... We spent years to get a Drs surgery and it is a shadow of what it could be. We know that school provision is not a planning consideration it is down to the Essex Education Authority to provide places. I propose that action speak louder than your belated policy words.

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

In November this year EFDC considered a proposal to build four council houses on Garages and land that was clearly over-development (Adjacent 14A Pound Close Nazeing). People need space to breath. Plant some trees. Many of our main tree species are under attack from disease, or mans neglect. Encourage and support what we already have by improving the environment, not encroaching on it.

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

Environment protection relies on citizens culture. Many people will be unable to use this format to respond to this consultation exercise,
