

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

Stakeholder ID 4756 Name Alan Federick Burns

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I do not believe the *illegible* will ensure an enhanced quality of life for the people of Epping Forest District. Our present environment will suffer with the total loss of our open spaces.

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:

We have not got the available space in Loughton for more housing, building upwards will further destroy our quality of life.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 4756

Name Alan Federick Burns

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

If it protects and encourages retail use I am in total agreement, but I fear the plan will not live up to proposals - we will still be overwhelmed by estate agents, charity shops and national fast food "eateries".

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):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

The past year or so gave the District the ideal opportunity to solve a certain number of problems concerning housing needs. The Langston road site that is now being developed as a retail park (why? Do we need such a thing with westfield at Stratford only a small ride away in on the central line!) would have given probably at least 150 homes and would not have needed the *illegible* of Chigwell Lane from Oakwood hill up to Borders Lane with the complete loss of trees and grass borders. Plus the disruption is causing traffic issues. Debden area estate was built as a pleasing place to live on with trees and grass lined roads (also man never used for/by commuter car parking) interspaced with various green spaces allowing for a certain peace within our lives and with facilities for recreation and community get together. This so called draft local "plan" for our area makes for another life of Tottenham style existence with high rise with density blocks of flats towering above our present home with the added to which flats we would have the underground car parks. Car parks that most people would be too frightened to put their ears in for fear of the sort of persons and conditions they may find there. Or would these car parks be for commuters??? From Rolls park corner view the monstrosity that has arisen from the cold Winston Churchill site at the corner of Debden Broadway - it is *illegible* in this to be our area skyline of the future Loughton? apparent needs or demands for housing in the future within our area; but there must be an awareness that we actually have no such spaces to build on locally. We cannot just build on top of what we have at present. So we must turn our attention to other ways. Our county has sufficient land space around our present living boundaries and if we now have to review our thinking on much sacrosanct area of unsized or neglected agricultural land with certain other patches of so called Green belt, then perhaps we will have to do just that.

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)

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)

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?

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)

Stakeholder ID 4756

Name Alan Federick Burns