

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

Stakeholder ID	3355	Name	Andrew Smith 2
----------------	------	------	----------------

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 disagree with the vision which is in reality to provide homes for people with no existing connection to the district. The plan does not protect the Green Belt - instead it damages it by building on land now set aside as open space. The environment will be damaged by increased population, traffic and general stress on the local area and its infrastructure. The vision of on M1!! Corridor for coordinated and common business growth from London to Cambridge is fanciful but also harmful. Epping Forest District has no particular comparative advantage in the sectors mentioned and to chase them is a waste of effort.

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:

The distribution of additional housing is not proportionate to the existing population and the disparity of damage is unacceptable. Epping has expanded relatively fast in recent years yet it has been allocated a very high ration, which is wrong and unfair. Housing proposed for Loughton is the area most know as "Debden" or loughton North" and the rest of Loughton has not had to bear any additional homes. Similarly Chigwell proposals are largely Limes Farm. It is not explained why any increase in housing in or around Harlow should need additional land as the density there is currently quite low, especially for a main town. Increased density within Harlow could save the Green Belt while providing homes nearer to existing infrastructure, including the hospital and train and bus stations. Few of the proposed development areas are in existing settlements and the bulk are in the Green Belt which is wrong. If Green Belt were to be used (to which I am totally opposed) it should be in the form of a new village community, perhaps off the A414. The plan has not considered increased densification in our district nor in Harlow. In my view that would enable poorly designed and low

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

Stakeholder ID	3355	Name	Andrew Smith 2
----------------	------	------	----------------

quality housing to be replaced by better and more intense areas accommodating many more families, with infrastructure already in place .

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

No -see my response to Q2. If the additional infrastructure mentioned is to be provided why was its capacity, location, financing and timing not stated in the plan. I do not approve a draft plan which leaves such vital issues unstated. I suspect that no plans exist and when developed they will entail additional destruction of the Green Belt (for which certain infrastructure is a permitted activity). In this way the plan is not an holistic one and accordingly should not be adopted. Information shown in the draft local plan for the sites around Harlow is skeletal and accordingly it is impossible to form a view. I am opposed to using Green Belt land wherever in the district it may be.

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

Epping?

(blank)

Buckhurst Hill?

(blank)

Loughton Broadway?

(blank)

Chipping Ongar?

(blank)

Loughton High Road?

(blank)

Waltham Abbey?

(blank)

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The St Johns Road site is a large one in the town where it has been proposed to build shops and a supermarket (the latter contrary to the results of a public consultation). It is wholly unacceptable to decide on the parameters of Epping High Street while the plans for St Johns Road are unknown as a misjudgment for St Johns might seriously damage the High Street. Too little attention has been paid in the past to encourage or require market town appearance to shop fronts and buildings facing the main retail street generally y . I recommend more and better policies to achieve that outcome.

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

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

(blank)

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

It is unacceptable to be asked to comment while the plan is still under development. Over recent years several employment sites have been given planning consent to become residential which shows poor foresight. These developments have not been used as an opportunity to revise access, for example, to the Epping Station or to improve roads generally. The draft plan includes the derelict laundry as a residential site built it could and should be retained as a business site.

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

I do not agree with development on the Green Belt. The selection of sites has been reactive to sites put forward, which was wrong. The sequence should have been to identify if changes to the Green Belt were objectively needed. Then the best possible sites should have been identified and considered for development, but that was not done. The concept of "need" is not satisfactory and it certainly has nothing to do with local people. The bulk of the anticipated additional housing would be used by incomers whose preferences are inherently difficult to foresee. I do not agree with the disproportionate allocation of

additional homes to Epping. A new village / community should have been considered for development in a less busy area in the district and preferably y near a rail line.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

(blank)

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

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

-
7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Clearly Chapter 6 does not specify quantity, location, nature, funding or timetable for any of the additional infrastructure required. The chapter does not amount to a delivery plan. Such infrastructure is not just important but critical and the lack of specifics on quantity, location, funding and timetable makes the plan vacuous.

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

It is not possible to consider the current draft plan properly when so much that is needed has not yet been completed.

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