

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

Stakeholder ID 3041 Name Richard FREESTONE

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 do not believe there are any details or funding provided for upgrading the infrastructure of the area where the development is proposed. The narrow roads are already inadequate as is the busy road junction at At St Leonards Road Nazeing New Road. Flooding may also become an issue. 220 homes will add at least 300 cars to the vicinity. Local shops and car parking will be unable to cope.

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:

I believe there are several brownfield sites that would be far more suitable. Once there has been an encroachment into Green belt there is a precedent set for expanding that development at a later date. Harlow has a huge shopping centre . Consequently it would be environmentally better to build there rather than Nazeing and avoid the need to drive to Harlow to shop.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I am generally against development on Green Belt land for reasons already stated. Why not look at other areas of Epping Forest that have a better infrastructure to cope with expansion

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

Stakeholder ID 3041 Name Richard FREESTONE

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 opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The roads through and in the village are far too narrow to accommodate any expansion or development in employment. HGVs take up all of one side of the road and the current situation is already too dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled.

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:

I have already given the reasons in answers to earlier questions but in summary, the current infrastructure is already overstretched and could not cope. Current volumes of traffic and particularly HGVs are at dangerous levels already. Why has derelict and brown field land not been considered

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:

Proper investigations need to be carried out as regards the adequacy of sewerage, rainwater drainage, flooding impact on the existing environment and population. The roads in Nazeing would need to be substantially widened which in some instances might mean existing property demolition.

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

Why is Primary Green belt land being proposed for development in preference to previously developed derelict or brown field land? Isn't this contrary to National guidance in National Planning Policy framework? Such a proposed development and the need to substantially rework the infrastructure of the area would have a drastic impact on the nature and character of the village to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and food producing land.

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

The proposals reveal an inadequate investigation of more suitable sites that would protect the existing environment. There has been a marked deterioration in public transport in recent years with I think only 1 bus per hour. Car usage would certainly increase as would danger on the roads given their inability to sustain current traffic. There are frequent traffic delays at the Traffic lights particularly when turning right into St Leonards Road. This form should have been sent by POST to all Nazeing residents many of whom are elderly and do not use computers or the internet
