

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

Stakeholder ID 2921 Name adam Tahsin

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:

Far too little focus on protecting green belt land -- the basic premise that the plan is aimed at doing so is clearly belied by the proposals to build houses on green belt land. The green belt and the environment obviously aren't being protected by the plan, as it aims specifically to remove the protections inherent in the green belt. This cannot have any benefit for current residents.

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:

The proposed "limited" release of land is a misconception: once the land has been released, it is gone and the character of those areas will be changed for good.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The proposed sites are on green belt land - development should be considered on brownfield land only.

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

Stakeholder ID 2921 Name adam Tahsin

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:

Expansion of business and employment in rural areas must take into account the need to preserve the character of those areas. The planned sites in Nazeing do not do this. There already are considerable issues with HGV traffic in Nazeing - my house even physically shakes at times from the HGVs travelling downRedacted....

....Redacted.... We do not need even more such traffic in the village.

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 proposed sites are on green belt land, while no effort appears to have been made to place sites on brownfield land or to re-develop already dense areas of the village. Again, these sites will only increase infrastructure problems for Nazeing, particularly on HGV traffic and the need to support the local community with facilities, which already are sorely lacking. Specifically, the site proposed on Middle Street is in a well-conserved quiet part of the village. There are several listed houses directly next to or opposite this proposed site (such as Smalldrinks and others), as well as the church. There are also several WW2 shelters at Perry Hill that are of historic value and considerable local interest. It is completely unacceptable for the council to be

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

suggesting that this part of the village should face such a drastic change in character. This proposed site also seems to be on the slope up Perry Hill -- there is a real concern that concreting over this area could lead to further flooding issues on Middle Street. If there is no longer sufficient bare land to soak up rainwater, it may instead just wash down onto the road and houses below. In short, residents do not want houses to be built on green belt land in Nazeing. It is of no benefit to residents and simply will create more problems for longstanding villagers. I would be heartbroken to see the village I grew up in, and lived in for over 20 years, change in this way.

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

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:

Nazeing already suffers from infrastructure problems and so adding even further pressure will only be harmful. Flooding and sewer problems are a major concern, particularly on Middle Street.

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

There is no justification for building on green belt land. The plan will only serve to alter irreparably the character and environment of the area and the specific sites where development is being proposed. We do not want this and such changes in our villages should not be imposed by the council against our wishes. As one of the nearest rural areas to London, we should be wary and reluctant to accept any erosion of the green belt. While the council see these proposals as only a limited concession to development, one must ask when and where the next concessions will be once the floodgates have been opened. I say again: residents do not want this. We care for our natural environment and want to maintain it for future generations.

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

Too little emphasis has been placed on protecting the nature and environment of the villages concerned.

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