

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

Stakeholder ID 2733 Name Iain Lawrence

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:

It is short-sighted and destructive. It is of no benefit to anyone already living in the areas, and would be given as a green light for further disregard for Green Belt boundaries.

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:

How it could be considered as viable for over 300 new houses to be built in a small village with little infrastructure is beyond baffling. The village simply will not be able to cope with this deluge of new homes. How will the schools cope? They are already over-subscribed. Doctor's surgeries? Parking? Roads? The fact that EFDC is ignoring the rules around sustainable development around our Green Belt is despicable.

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

It makes much more sense to build sympathetically around already established towns, but the fact remains that you are still developing in Green Belt land.

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

Stakeholder ID 2733

Name Iain

Lawrence

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

There is no need to disrupt already thriving and sustainable centres.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Green Belt, again. The local infrastructure is unsuitable for any development. Transport, the already busy roads would not suit any development. Employment should be aimed towards towns in the district that already have, or are keen to expand their opportunities.

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:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

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

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

This utterly disproportionate allocation within the village is tantamount to increasing it in size by one quarter. Not only would it destroy the character of the area, it is unthinkable that the local facilities, services and infrastructure could cope with such an incredible rise in population. The transport links would buckle under the pressure, as a vast number would travel into London for work. The schooling system would be under immense pressure to allocate places to a new influx of children. The medical services would of course struggle to cope with more patients, as we are not talking about 350 more people moving into the village, we are talking about 350 more families. By building on the Green Belt we run the risk of it becoming acceptable to have more and more proposals to develop. Our countryside will be harmed and the rural and beautiful character will be destroyed. If we had all wanted to live in a built up area, we would have chosen to settle in

London. This is not London, it is Epping Forest, an area famed for it's stunning landscape, and that is something that should be protected.

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

It is stunningly inappropriate.

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

This does not consider the current state of the area. Theydon Bois station is already at full capacity, the Central Line is notoriously over-crowded. The local roads could not function as they currently do, and I fear what car journeys would be like should this proposal go ahead. The proposal is unsustainable, the Green Belt should be protected, as the EFDC has told us they would on many occasions.

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

Any development proposals should only ever be for the benefit of the local community. These plans are nothing short of destructive, when the character of our area should be something to be proud of, to nurture and protect at every instance.

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