

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

Stakeholder ID 2974 Name Michele Davies

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I cannot support the proposals for some of the extra homes in Buckhurst Hill as these are ill thought out. The Green belt needs to be protected at all costs.

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 support the development of Harlow as it is already a large settlement; there is a missed opportunity for another new town type development in North Weald which would meet some of the requirements of housing.

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2974

Name Michele

Davies

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

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:

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

1. Site Lower Queens Road: this is absolutely nonsensical and does not make sense economically and socially. Closing down businesses, having to buy out leaseholders, moving councils tenants, breaking up a settled community, blighting the leaseholders who are now no longer able to sell their properties, the community losing its launderette and local shops and the poor shopkeepers losing their investments and hard work for the sake of an EXTRA 11 PROPERTIES This is madness. 2. Car Park by station in Queens Road: There are 103 parking places there - an additional 44 flats will mean a minimum requirements of 147 underground parking places - I am not a builder but I bet that this will make this site economically unviable with the huge costs of underground parking. Additionally where are the extra minimum 44 extra school places to come from? This car park is full all day so only if there is a 100% guarantee that there will be no losses of car parking, and that the extra school places and doctors registrations are available would I support this scheme. 1 Powell Rd: This has gone to planning already and been rejected on the basis of Green Belt so why is it back on the agenda. If the house can be converted into a few (3/4) flats without touching the garden then I would have no objection but only then

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

The proposed developemnt of the disused airfield for air activities is a shot in the dark and is likely not to come off - this site is likely to carry on costing the ratepayers huge sums of monies as it currently does. This is a missed opportunity to use all of that site and do something really imaginative by creating a new small town/large villageRedacted.... War heroes died for a better future, not for derelict concrete in their memories and a bright new small town, with a memorial , street named after them etc would be a better use of that site.

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

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:

I cannot see any details of this so cannot support this - at the moment this is just a wish list that does not mean anything. Proposals for developers to pay a levy for planning permission for health or education for example are nonsensical. For example when they were applying for planning permission for a scheme at 1 Powell Road which would have catered for 57 elderly people the developers' contribution to health was I remember below £10,000. So any proposals to base the infrastructure required for this local plan on their contribution is obviously fictional. In addition Essex County Council is in the process of destroying our infrastructure by terminating grants to our excellent TFL bus service that takes us into London (20,167) and also our recycling facilities. So on the basis that the infrastructure current requirements are not even being met one is 100% sceptical that they would be met in the future with increased population. We need to see details before agreeing to this.

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

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

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