



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

Stakeholder ID	4690	Name	Bruce	Griffin
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="mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk">ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a>

# 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:

- 1) Increase in road traffic and pollution particularly in the High Street and it's function with Thornwood road and the plain make parking. Even more difficult. 2)Overload GP surgeries, in spite of your clai, the Lukes has spare capacity, as of 15th November there are no appointments available until January 2017! 3) Loss of sports centre and 2 cricket pitches. 4) insufficient school places available for increased population. 5) loss of green belt particularly agricultural land which is a strategic asset. 6) loss of St Margates Hospital
- 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:

1) Why develop st Johns site with more shops an cafes when there are empty shops and too many coffee shops in the High st. Use the site for high density housing (flats, town houses etc) 2) Harlow wants to grow - put the new development there 3) Increase density of existing settlement by infill and redevelopment 4) too much of new housing is to be in Epping, Theydon Bois and north Weald. 5) There should be no destruction of 'Green Belt' particularly agricultural land. 6) Build a new garden village outside Harlow like Great Notley Village outside Braintree.

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

Stakeholder ID 4690 Name Bruce Griffin





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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

- 1) Destruction of Green Belt should be avoided where possible 2) All developments throughout the district should have the new infrastructure currently planned only fpr Harlow.
- 4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

No

**Buckhurst Hill?** 

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

St Johns Road site should not be included but used for residential development - high density housing. Parts of the existing shopping area should be redeveloped to provide for new experiment etc.

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

### No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

1) loss of sports centre (no mention of replacement plan) 2) loss of our parking spaces 3)loss sports clubs in Lower Bury Road (cricket field etc) 4) increase pressure on local schools, GP surgery etc. 5) Loss of hospital - will now have to travel to Harlow which increase in traffic and pollution. 6) Loss of coopersale cricket

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

Stakeholder ID 4690 Name Bruce Griffin





pitch/field. 7) There are no details of types of housing to be built on the sites identified in Epping or the density of the proposed developments. Are the sites being fully utilised.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

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)

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?

### Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

No details of the funding or character of required infrastructure is given or guaranteed. To suggest that the Limes medical centre as capacity for an almost 50% increase in patients is ludicrous. Early November and there are no appointments available until January 2017 - it is already overloaded. No plan to replace the sports centre or the 2 playing fields.

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

Stakeholder ID 4690 Name Bruce Griffin





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 4690

Name Bruce

Griffin