

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

Stakeholder ID 2873 Name Ann Pullen

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:

while there appears to be lots of details of proposed buildings, there is no information about the infrastructure and funding that would be required. The Draft Plan does not necessarily appear to benefit the people of the district.

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:

The Green Belt should remain just that. Once you start to 'release' it, there would be no stopping it, Once it has gone, it has gone forever. Harlow appears keen to expand, perhaps it would be better to allow that.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The land around Harlow is Green Belt and should not be considered for building. The aims of the Draft Plan seem at odds with this proposal.

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

Stakeholder ID 2873 Name Ann Pullen

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

New sites SR-0580 and SR-0151 are in Hoe Lane Nazeing, which is unsuitable for lorries, due to it being a narrow country lane. Nazeing consists mainly of narrow country lanes and therefore unsuitable for increased traffic, particularly large lorries. Traffic flow through the village has increased greatly over the years, with ever larger lorries being used. We cannot take any more.

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:

Proposed sites are Green Belt and should not be considered. The small local school is already oversubscribed. Heavy lorries are destroying the sewer system (especially St, Leonards Road) Parts of the village flood during wet weather accompanied by frequent power cuts. Public transport will shortly be non existent as our

provider appears to be withdrawing the service in January. The current infrastructure is collapsing under the strain and without a total overhaul will not be able to support extra building.

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:

Thorough and honest reports are needed to assess the true state of the sewer system, water provision and flooding prevention in the village. There must be sufficient funds in place to support this. Developers would need to pay for these reports and to fund infrastructure needs. Perhaps they could provide a new larger school. The ARUP assessment does not appear to have assessed correctly if , as it seems to suggest that the local school has spaces (oversubscribed) and that roads are uncongested at peak times. As write this I can hear the pounding of music from the traffic that sits, waiting in a long line towards Nazeing Crossroads.

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

Green Belt land should not be considered for development. The Draft Plan does not demonstrate clearly any need to do so. Previously developed or suitable derelict land should always be the preferred choice for development,subject to necessary infrastructure being put in place.

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

Older residents who may not have use of internet may not be aware of the Local Draft Plan and may not realise they had a chance to air their views. Perhaps such an important questionnaire should have been sent to residents. More research into the village may have given more insight into how development would impact on it.
