

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

Stakeholder ID 4711 Name Arnold Verrall

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:

I feel passionately that the Green Belt is sacrosanct and that not 1 square metre of it should be built on whilst 1 square metre of brownfield site remains undeveloped. We all know that building on green fields is far more profitable for developers, an issue the local plan fails to mention. It's good for them, not food for the rest of us. You will no doubt be aware of a recent report which revealed the extent of brown field site underestimation in this country. This should result in the suspension of all local plans and serious assessments of our planning options nationally.

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:

See above.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 4711 Name Arnold Verrall

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:

Epping could do with less shops and more residential units in their place. Large swathes of Epping High Street equate to what is, essentially, a brown field site.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Bower Hill's industrial estate has several empty units which gives it, essentially, brown field status. Is the demand for local employment really that strident?

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:

The massive development proposed to the south of Brook Road and Ivy Chimneys is plainly unfeasible. Apart from obviously being on the Green Belt, the fields flood every year. If building does eventually have to take place here, why are tower blocks not an option? They take up far less space and can be attractive and functional, if designed properly. In fact, if tower blocks were built on all brown field sites in the area, would

there need to be any loss of our Green Belt at all? I am not a nimby on this one, as I'd be able to see tower blocks from both sides of my house, should they be built on the sites proposed for housing.

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

I have no opinion at this stage as Chapter 6 is so nebulous. Why didn't Ch. 6 at least estimate how many new school places, hospital beds and GPs surgeries will be required? You have included the no. of houses, so you must have some idea of the likely total no. of new residents and from that let us know how many of the above will be required. Will these essential new facilities mean a decrease in the no. of homes proposed or are your figures for new homes taking this into account i.e. are your proposed no. of new homes essentially "gross" or "net" re. required facilities for essential services. There is no mention of funding via private finance initiatives (PFIs). Please confirm this financially crippling system will not be adopted.

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

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?