

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

Stakeholder ID 2933 Name john Coleman

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:

There is no indication as to what the necessary infrastructure is and where it is to be provided and most importantly, funded.

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:

There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around the district as well as a great deal of space within the Harlow boundary which must be considered before the Green Belt which provides the only break in urbanisation of the whole area from London up to and including Harlow. It will completely nullify the original plan that Harlow was to be built to take people out of London and NOT to incorporate them within a wider urban sprawl.

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

Stakeholder ID 2933

Name john

Coleman

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The Green Belt, being the only "lung" between London and Harlow **MUST** be preserved at all costs and not be gradually eaten into. Once small parts of the Green Belt are built upon this will open the floodgates and the council will not be able to control it. Result - total urbanisation of West Essex and London effectively extending to the borders of Cambridgeshire.

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:

The employment sites proposed within Nazeing will not be for residents of the village. Workers will commute in (as they do now with existing work units) with the consequential traffic chaos on top of the existing chaos. In addition it appears that units are proposed for Hoe Lane. This narrow road cannot cope with the present volume of heavy lorries, any more will result in an existing dangerous road for residents becoming a potential death trap.

...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 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:

They are on the Green Belt which must be preserved at all costs. No thought has been given to the additional traffic that will result on roads that are already overcrowded. Please review Brownfield sites before stealing the Green Belt. In addition the local school is already overcrowded so where are the additional children to be educated -- bussed to other areas no doubt, adding more traffic to the currently suffocated roads, and certainly not using Public transport which is about to be reduced to virtually nothing.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

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

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:

It involves building on Green Belt which **MUST NOT HAPPEN** if future generations are to be able to lead fit and healthy lives. The assessment is based onRedacted.... - the school has no vacancies and the roads are totally congested at peak times.Redacted....

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 plan does not give any justification for building on the Green Belt - the only break in development between London and Harlow. The plan has obviously been based on the findings of an official who has driven through the village, seen an empty field and said that it is suitable for building upon without giving any thought to the consequences. He/she clearly does not live in the village and does not understand the importance of maintaining the Green Belt

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

As far as Nazeing is concerned the plan has been prepared in a hurry with no thought given to the consequences.Redacted.... proposal which is to build houses without even considering the disastrous consequences. Go back and consider the Brownfield sites and other more suitable sites before even thinking of touching the Green Belt.