



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

Stak	keholder ID	2796	Name	Brian	Rudgley		
Method		Survey					
Date	е						
		elements of th	ne full response suc	ch as formatting a	uncil's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Co nd images may not appear accurately. Should you wish t ng Policy team: Idfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk		
Sur	vey Respo	nse:					
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:						
	The needs of Theydon Bois are not met now in respect of infrastructure. The school is at capacity, it takes 2-3 weeks to get a doctors appointment and the transport links run to capacity. The vision of the local plan is to protect the green belt. The plan however seeks to encroach on it.						
2.	Do you agre	e with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping Forest District?		
	Disagree						
	Please expla	ain your choi	ce in Question 2:				
	area.The er cause consi	ncroachment derable con	t on the Green B	elt is unwarran irrounding area	cically comment on the plans as they affect this ted and the development of the station car park a particularly at peak times. An additional 360 new lively.		
	Do you agre	e with the pr	oposals for deve	lopment around	Harlow?		
	Please expla	ain your choid	ce in Question 3:				

Stakeholder ID 2796 Name Brian Rudgley

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





4.	Do you agree with the proposed snopping 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?					
	Please explain your choice in Question 5:					

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

Rudgley

Stakeholder ID 2796 Name Brian





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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Theydon Bois has no definitive industry which could assist the employment needs of the increase in population. There do not appear to be any plans to increase the infrastructure to support such a vast increase in population. The existing systems are at overload.

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:

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

Stakeholder ID 2796 Name Brian Rudgley





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:

There is no explanation of what the specific requirements will be and therefore no proposal to meet the increased needs.

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

The appraisal does not appear to support such a large development around both large and small villages. The railway line in at capacity particularly at peak times and surrounding roads are already congested with commuter traffic. Any increase in population would have to rely on resources outside the village (Theydon Bois). The sustainability appraisal states that Green Belt would be protected then goes on to contradict itself and state that some Green Belt would be lost.

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

As a resident of Theydon Bois I only feel able to comment on matters affecting this village. I am sure that the residents of the other areas will make their on comments on their locale. I understand that the proposed provision of 360 new homes will mean an increase in the size of the village by over 20%. In an area already stretched to capacity this must be considered as totally unacceptable.

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