

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

Stakeholder ID	3122	Name	Joyce	Eldridge
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: <a href="https://docs.org/licenses/lice

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:

The vision sounds good but planners need a reality check. You cannot improve things to any great degree when the area is already too dense. Improvements to infrastructure could improve this but it would immediately be outweighed by the increased density of housing in the area.

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:

Disproportionate amount of housing in North Weald

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

For reasons already stated

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

Stakeholder ID 3122





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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Only partially agree. There seems to be an assumption that the employment opportunities will attract local people. In reality this will probably not be the case and merely attract more people into the area causing more congestion

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

Eldridge





Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area? 6. 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) Yes Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

There seems to be no account of the housing which is at the moment under construction in Hastingwood. There are a number of sites which are under construction or about to be used. The Ratcliffe and Burridge site the old skip yard in Hastingwood Rd Brent House Farm and even the possibility of homes on the Pryor's site.

Eldridge

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

Stakeholder ID 3122





Have these homes been taken into account in your totals? There is no mention of them and surely this could allow for a reduction in numbers in adjacent areas.

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:

You have stated in your outline plan that there are excellent links into London. While the M11 corridor exists the motorway is confined by its exit routes onto the A406 east and west. It would be impossible to improve on these exits. From experience of using this motorway over the last 30 years congestion has continually increased. Even at 6.15 am in the morning the motorway does not run smoothly. Connections into London via the underground from Epping have their own restrictions. ie the possibility of parking near the station. there is a limit to the numbers of people you can cram onto a train. There seems to be no account of the increased capacity required not only by Epping and harlow's proposed plans but the entire housing regeneration taking place in the Uttlesford area and further into Cambridgeshire. There is no site earmarked for a new hospital; the present one is already running at full capacity. Furthermore with increased traffic travelling through Epping which already experiences high levels of congestion there has been no mention of increased air pollution which I suspect might already exceed safe limits. if travelling south this the only route available if not using the M11

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 plan does not look at the bigger pictue.

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)