

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

Stakeholder ID 45 Name Catherine Evans

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 agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I agree with the overall vision, however it is how this will be achieved which is important. The overall vision is of course positive.

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:

I think careful consideration should be applied before making new settlements in locations within existing settlements i.e. Jessel Green. These areas of green space are important for the local community that already live there and use them like I do: for fresh air, exercise and dog walking. Also having green space is important for the urban realm. It is not clear in the plan which areas in Loughton are being considered. However, I have read elsewhere that these included amongst other places Jessel Green and Central Line station car parks. Using the car parks, will mean that parking is pushed elsewhere if current spaces are not maintained or increased. Loughton car park is at capacity. Although the draft options suggest that spaces will be maintained as well as housing provided. The draft should have been clearer on proposed sites. I do not believe any land should be designated for the traveller community. They do not contribute to the district in terms of finances and therefore should not benefit from the area. In the recent months they have settled on Hillyfields open space, Jessel Green and Burney Road Green. This has resulted in residents being unable to use these areas, and they have been left in an unpleasant way. The draft describes how they do not want to settle amongst the community. If they do not want to be part of the community then they should not settle here. I am happy to

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

Stakeholder ID 45

Name Catherine

Evans

read that no settlements will be provided in Loughton. I do not believe that Green Belt land should be used, I am happy to read that they will be none used in Loughton.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I have said 'Yes' to the retail areas closest to me that I utilise. Improving retail at this locations should bring a benefit to the community. However, infrastructure provisions should have been detailed. Many of the roads in Loughton exceed capacity in pek periods. The increase in population has made unsignalised junctions inappropriate during peak times. With an increase in housing and retail opportunities, I would like to see a detailed traffic infrustructure plan.

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

There is a lack of detail provided. However, at a broad and undetailed level, proposals for employment development is a positive thing.

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

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

The proposed sites aren't clear. Providing maps without road names and site names is not a transparent way of detailing the sites. SR-0361 - I do not agree. This is well utilised and an important green space for current residents for dog walking, exercise, fresh area and space for families. SR-0358. I am not happy with this proposed site. This is an important green space for families and provides important space in a high density

area of housing. SR-0356, SR-0835, SR-0526 and other small sites - Happy for this to be used for housing. SR-0227- I would like to see how this fits with the station/

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)

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Again, this section is very vague. It does not give specifics of what will be delivered. Instead it just outlines that services that hope to be delivered. It also gives little mention to where traffic infrastructure improvements will be made. There are many junctions that need specific improvements in Loughton. The junction with Langston Road/ Chigwell lane is well over capacity and needs significant improvements, often causing dangerous tailbacks on the m11. The roundabout of Chigwell Lane/the Broadway is a priority roundabout; surely this will need to be made into a signalised junction. Similarly the priority roundabouts of: Rectory Lane/Borders lane & Rectory Lane/A121. Furthermore, the priority junction of Pyrles Lane/ Rectory Lane/ Wellfields is already over capacity in peak periods and dangerous for ahead movements from the side road approaches. This junction and others are barely coping now without further housing. Has any of these improvements been subsidised by the Langston development and the housing on the Broadway?

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

I will provide comments once this has been made available.

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