

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

Stakeholder ID 2101 Name Ruth Taffs

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

It is of paramount importance that the green belt is fully protected.

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 disagree entirely with the volume of housing. Doctor surgeries can't cope, schools can't cope and in addition the roads are ridiculously busy currently. I don't feel that the area as it currently stands can cope with the extra volumes of people without the full infrastructure being implemented before the house building commences. For example, the M11 junction 7, the A414 has undergone a lot of changes recently but that STILL struggles to cope with the traffic across Harlow. The roads through Thornwood and into Epping are traffic 'hotspots'. More people are using the 'villages' as cut throughs to avoid traffic congestion, they make these roads extremely dangerous to drive at certain times of the day. In addition as far as Epping station goes, there is CURRENTLY an overwhelming requirement for GREATER parking capacity for both commuters and day visitors to London. With potentially more housing within the community this need will become even greater, this doesn't appear to have been addressed at all in the plan but should be of paramount importance. I am assuming that the assumption is to create local jobs for these new homes, however, the reality is that the cost of buying a home in our area commands a greater salary than one would generally achieve locally, therefore more people will be travelling to London for work. It is short sighted to consider otherwise.

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

Stakeholder ID 2101

Name Ruth

Taffs

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

These are the areas that I mainly use.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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 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)

No opinion

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

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

I don't believe that any infrastructure changes will be made either to coincide with or prior to any building work taking place. It states in the plan 'where healthcare needs are identified' whilst at the same time reflecting that if an area being built encourages 'healthy living' the suggestion is that there won't need to be an increase in Doctors or Hospital services! A foolhardy statement in my opinion, our current hospital, Princess Alexandra is under far greater pressure than ever nowadays, the current requirement is for a new hospital within our area and that's before any new homes are built. To me the wording regarding infrastructure just provides 'get out' clauses for a developer. If they tick the boxes regarding green spaces, bike lanes etc will people be healthier? Will they really not require Doctors, will they not have accidents and emergencies that require a fully functioning A&E department? Life dictates that they will. This MUST be addressed before anything commences in my opinion.

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?