

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

Stakeholder ID 2458 Name Kevin LUCAS

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

As a vision this is acceptable, the problem lies in the practical application of providing new homes. There is insufficient space outside the Green Belt which will cause considerable strain within existing settlements.

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:

Buckhurst Hill is one of the existing settlements where it is suggest 90 new homes should be built. The sites being considered will seriously adversely effect parking, making an already difficult situation intolerable. The lack of parking will mean shoppers will not use Queens Road which runs counter to the stated intention of supporting the local economy.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

There is inadequate space for these developments in the chosen sites.

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

Stakeholder ID 2458

Name Kevin

LUCAS

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Epping, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton already suffer from a lack of parking. This makes these very unattractive as a shopping centre. Further development will make the situation worse and will drive shoppers away from local businesses to the larger centres such as Bluewater, Stratford Westfield etc, which cater for parking on a sensible scale

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Employment development will require an influx of "labour" thereby creating addition demand for housing. It is highly likely the labour pool will not exist locally but will have to be satisfied from outside the areas ...Redacted...

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

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

Buckhurst Hill is already over developed, there are insufficient schools, parking is a nightmare and the Queens Road Car Park site (SR-0225) is fully utilised already, removing it during construction will stop people shopping in Queens Road. Access to the site is tight for normal traffic, the constant comings and goings of construction traffic will make the area seriously unpleasant. We have already suffered the inconvenience of construction in Queens Road due to the Council's apparent policy of allowing development in any tiny space. Further development will adversely affect our quality of life.

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 opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

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

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:

The existing infrastructure is barely adequate, especially schooling. Additional infrastructure to support the planned development will do nothing to improve the overall situation.

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?

Draft Policy P5 - Buckhurst Hill

The plan for Buckhurst Hill is essentially designed to shoehorn more residential property into an already over developed area. There is currently inadequate infrastructure and a serious lack of parking. Any additional strain on parking will drive people away from Queens Road to the detriment of the local economy. The threat of redevelopment at SR-0813 is making the sale of leasehold properties impossible whilst this process is ongoing. Overall vision for Epping Forest has some (albeit limited) merit, the implications for Buckhurst Hill are totally unacceptable.
