

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

Stakeholder ID 2489 Name Ivor Jones

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:

Very idealistic proposals for building but no thought given to infrastructure- schools full, roads congested, doctors surgeries not able to meet demand now without further pressure.

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:

Inadequate infrastructure in place - roads, transport, schools, doctors etc to support any proposed development. No practical thought given to proposed locations for development.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Green belt land around Harlow should definitely not be allowed - Historically called GREEN belt for a reason !

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

Stakeholder ID 2489 Name Ivor Jones

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

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Efforts to promote existing shopping area in past not succeeded- no room for development - poor parking facilities,, congested roads cannot be improved,these cause lack of custom

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

sites SR-0580,SR-0151,Hoe Lane very narrow, unsuitable lorries. Nazeing already has many banned lorries using unsuitable roads Existing employees are from outside the area mostly

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:

Proposed 220 houses invading green belt not sustainable, inadequate infrastructure to support demands school, doctor, extra volume of traffic on narrow roads, especially at peak times.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

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

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:

Major investment would be needed to upgrade basic facilities, sewers etc. Roads (in poor state of repair) already congested at peak times, school unable to take more pupils (places blocked by travelling population having reserved places)

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

No consideration given to fact that Nazeing is a village surrounded by Green Belt land which should not be built on. Other previously developed or derelict land should be first consideration. Destruction of Green Belt will impact on nature and wildlife and environment in general. Nazeing will not be a village but bordering on a town.

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

I

It would seem that there has been inadequate research regarding the proposals for Nazeing when producing the local plan. Use of Green Belt land should not be allowed. Nazeing has a high population of elderly residents who do not have computers and have not submitted their comments because of the lack of easy availability of questionnaires, thus not a true reflection of local opinion.
