

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

Stakeholder ID 1454 Name Debbie Fleming

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

The vision is unobtainable. Blue sky ideas with no real substance behind them. Some areas selected have no real chance of becoming enterprise areas creating jobs. Lack of realism over positioning of large swathes of housing, which would create major problems over infrastructure

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:

Some of the locations chosen for the major settlements are are totally inappropriate. Selecting North Weald Bassett and Thornwood for over 1200 dwellings would completely turn a village into a town and triple the population over a matter of years. Using prime agricultural land at a time when the population within London and the south east is increasing and an exit from Europe will necessitate an increase in self productivity for food, is completely idiotic. There can be no development of transport systems that would alleviate the increase of traffic. The lack of effective transport links only increases the amount of cars on the road. That coupled with the majority of workers commuting out of the district, only seeks to congest roads further by a large population increase in a small village. The laughable proposals to encourage the use of bikes...especially from a country village, through forest roads, with no street lights, for people that will often have multiple journeys to schools and work, is really not helpful!

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

Stakeholder ID 1454 Name Debbie Fleming

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

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:

Some of the site selections, especially around North Weald Airfield have no substance behind them. There is an assumption that businesses will work from an area with ineffective transport hubs for staff to travel to work and will also only seek to increase the car load on local roads already at capacity.

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Many of the sites are existing Green belt and agricultural land. Farming, at a time of increased population in London and the south east and exit from Europe, will be essential for a move back to local enterprise and production to meet the food needs. Transport links are already at capacity. Travel distance to schools for students will increase further, We are over capacity for health services, lack local police presence and the draft document on infrastructure only says what may be needed, not if or how the need would be met. The impact on local residents in having over 10 years of building noise, disruption and inconvenience in a small village area, is unthinkable. The idea of completely destroying a village such as North Weald with an unsustainable increase in population is frightening. Whilst we understand that some build is necessary, even though the area has already had a number of developments in recent years, the number of dwellings needs to be at the low end. Asking a village to take the second highest amount of builds in the area is both unfair and

unreasonable. If the brownfield sites were to be utilised and the available space at the airfield used, a sufficient number of dwellings could be built to satisfy the area taking a reasonable share of 300-400.

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)

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:

There is no real substance behind the policy. The view of a higher number of builds will draw higher investment for infrastructure may be correct but does not justify huge developments in villages. What happens with a 12 year plan?? When does the infrastructure come in.....first or, as I suspect, last or never???

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

Speak to local people but also HEAR and take notice of what they are saying. This did not happen following the initial farce of a consultation.

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

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