



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

Stakeholder ID	2969	Name	Janet	Lawrence		
Method	Survey					
Date						
	elements of th	ne full response suc	ch as formatting a	uncil's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultand images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to reving Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk		
Survey Respo	onse:					
1. Do you agre	ee with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping Forest District?		
Strongly di	Strongly disagree					
Please expl	Please explain your choice in Question 1:					
There is no	information	regarding infras	structure and fu	unding for this to support the new builds.		
2. Do you agre	Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?					
Strongly di	sagree					
Please expl	lain your choid	ce in Question 2:				
	If this plan goes ahead we will become part of Harlow which has its own infrastructure deficiencies. An alternative is to use derelict or brownfield sites.					
2 Do you agr	oo with the pr	conocals for dovo	lonmont around	Harlow?		
3	-	oposals for deve	iopinent around	nai iow:		
Strongly di	· ·	so in Ouestian 2.				
·	-	ce in Question 3:	n aroon holt le-	ad. The infrastructure of Harlaw is matched to some		
				nd. The infrastructure of Harlow is not able to cope we se with other Councils' additional housing.		

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

Stakeholder ID 2969 Name Janet Lawrence





 Do you agree with the proposed shopping area i 	n
--	---

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:

The new sites are located in Hoe Lane is reached by an unsuitable road for commercial vehicles. The amount of traffic during the rush hour already causes gridlock in the centre of Nazeing.

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

Stakeholder ID 2969 Name Janet Lawrence





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:

The sites will increase the major problems already present in the current infrastructure- traffic volume, flooding, lack of public transport.

Lawrence

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

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

Stakeholder ID 2969 Name Janet





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:

Assessments and provision of required infrastructure is needed before developments are approved and the occupation of new builds. The ARUP assessment needs to be reviewed as it is not accurate and therefore the Development Plan is based on misleading information e.g the roads in question are not crowded in peak times.

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 Draft Local Plan is base on inaccurate information (see Q7). It does not demonstrate the need to build on Green Belt land in preference to previously developed or derelict brownfield sites. It does not take into account the severe impact on the quality of life for the existing residents.

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

The whole issue needs to be re-examined in an unbiased way using accurate information. Plans and funding for the required infrastructure needs to be in place before making a decision on the development. Hard copy questionnaires should have been posted to all residents to give them the option of completing the questionnaire on paper.

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

Stakeholder ID 2969 Name Janet Lawrence