



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

| Stakeholder ID<br>Method |   | 4733            | Name                | Constance E            | Compton   |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------|---|
|                          |   | Survey          |                     |                        |   |
| Da                       | te  |                 |                     |                        |   |
|                          |   | elements of the | e full response suc | h as formatting and in | 's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation nages may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review blicy team: <a href="mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk">ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a> |
| Su                       | rvey Respo  | nse:            |                     |                        |   |
| 1.                       | Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District? |                 |                     |                        |   |
|                          | Strongly dis  | agree           |                     |                        |   |
|                          | Please explain your choice in Question 1:   |                 |                     |                        |   |
|                          | In so far as  | the Green Be    | elt is not protect  | ted. Attachment.       |   |
| 2.                       | Do you agre   | e with the ove  | erall vision that   | the Draft Plan sets o  | out for Epping Forest District?   |
|                          | Strongly dis  | agree           |                     |                        |   |
|                          | Please expla  | ain your choic  | e in Question 2:    |                        |   |
|                          | protected b   | y the Green     | Belt, and effort    | s of the inhabitants   | in the VILLAGE of THEYDON BOIS. This has been to protect the environment around it since the war ally not of proportion for a VILLAGE.  |
| 3.                       | Do you agre   | e with the pro  | oposals for devel   | opment around Har      | low?  |
|                          | •   | ain your choic  | e in Question 3:    |                        |   |
|                          | •   | •               |                     | h it and the Green     | Belt is not undermined.   |

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





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

Epping?

**Buckhurst Hill?** 

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

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:

I do not agree that new employment sites need to be built on Green Belt land. (e.g. Tesco and other out of town supermarkets have become failures because people want to shop nearer home, perhaps to save petrol.) There seems to be several sites already available for expansion that would welcome it, why cannot they be used first?

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





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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

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)

## No

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

These sites in Theydon Bois, in my opinion, have been chosen because the Landowners have been pressing for them to be built on for many years - against the wishes of the population on a whole. The Green Belt was created to protect the countryside and wildlife surrounding the village and ground against high pollution etc. Forest Drive is a very congested road with a lot of school children walking in it, and chaotic parking arrangements at the shops. The field at the top of Forest Drive is a boddy one! (the railway embankment has to be repaired from time to time) and helps to buffer the village from the motorways (M11 & M25). Public footpaths have existed across it for very many years. The infrastructure of the village is unfit to cater for an increase in population. The Doctors Surgery cannot cope at all with the needs of the village at the moment, with waiting times to see a Doctor - in Epping - 3 1/2 weeks. Frequent power cuts occur - this will not improve with a proposed increase in demand. The primary school is, by all accounts, full up and now the accommodation is inadequate. The underground system is becoming unacceptable with already overcrowded trains and cancellations.

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:

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Where would the money come from for all this wonderful proposed new infrastructure? And would it be on the Green Belt land?

- 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?

SR-0070

Dear Sirs, In returning herewith the attached questionnaire, I wish to emphasise and refer specifically to the current choice of Green belt field No. SR 0070 as it seems quite wrong this has been selected because the landowner has put it forward notwithstanding the many reasons evidencing the un-suitability of this field for housing development. You only have to look at the low-lying and Boggy situation of the field at the foot of a hill and adjoining a noisy and high railway enhancement (even now under extensive repair) to understand why an earlier development application was regused after a tribunal several years ago; and even earlier in the 1930's where development at this end of Forest Drive was halted. The present 'dead end' to the field was 'illegible' denied leaving access to the garage of No.2 Dukes Avenue. Among other reasons, the problem of drainage was then and still is one of the major obstacles affecting any development of the field as there is no infrastructure in plave to cope with flooding, sewage disposal etc and none of these issues have been addressed in the Council's draft plan. Yours faithfully, ....Redacted....

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