

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

Stakeholder ID 4672 Name Philip Elyie

---

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](mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

### Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

One cannot disagree with the aims expressed in 'the vision' The detail however, needs to be carefully examined.

---

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

Affordable housing should be a priority and needs to be addressed in every part of the District. Very Careful consideration needs to take place where land is currently identified as 'Green Belt'

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

---

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

Stakeholder ID 4672

Name Philip

Elyie

---

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Yes there is not a great deal of evidence to date. To point to the encouragement of shopping/ retail in Ongar town centre. Business seem to struggle.

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I disagree with regard to the development referred to as SR-0394' This appears to be a major individual development which would include the redesignation of land currently identified as 'Green Belt' it is important with regard to this proposal to refer to the very negative experience residents in my local community have had in the way in which the town planning \*illegible\* have dealt with objections to the building of a huge \*illegible\* stone (EPF 2918) by the same land owner who has now submitted their new proposal. The notification to residents most directly affected was inadequate. The sting of the building failed to take into consideration an alternative option which would have lessened the impact on the chosen residential properties. Requests to 'soften' the impact have it seems. Been completely disregarded. We are therefore understandably alarmed by this new proposal which would undoubtedly have a major detrimental impact on our lives. It would undoubtedly have a major detrimental impact on our lives. It would fail to protect the natural environment which provides an exceptional view from the street (much less so since EPF/2013/14) There would be an erosion of land identified as 'Green Belt' and a substantial increase in pollution (noise, traffic, dirt especially) The village benefits from regular groups of walkers, making use of the many public footpaths, which surround High Ongar (including the area under discussion) The area of possible development submitted by the landowner is vast. The increase in heavy lorry traffic would be \*illegible\* Travelling through narrow residential roads with a primary school situated on a potentially dangerous bend (double yellow lines ignored daily by parents during the morning and afternoon pick . Even now Lorry traffic to North Hall results in vibration transmitted to my 19th century wooden - structured cottage as it rumbles past. The district plan points out the importance of taking into consideration 'quality of life' and 'Enhancement of the district' and this must be seen as part of my redevelopment proposal.

---

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

I have no objection whatever to the building of much needed extra housing, especially if it serves to reinvestigate and revitalise a flagging High street economy. However, I must object to the proposal to build housing in place of the Ongar sports and leisure centre. I have used the centre for swimming and exercise classes over a number of years. It is always busy and provides a valuable resource for local schools as well as the public. At a time when a rise in obesity and type 2 diabetes is so high on the national agenda, to even think of chasing down the only gym/pool in Ongar is inconceivable - almost criminal! I know that an alternative site \*Illegible\* been suggested but, for those who rely on public transport, it is not a viable alternative. There is also a contradiction in on the one hand increasing the population of a town while on the other, removing from it one of the few and most valued, best used amenity. If there is a genuine desire, as expressed in the

aims of this consultation, so provide facilities for the one community, then this proposal is surely, a non-starter think again!

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

As previously stated, I do not agree with the proposal to replace the Ongar sports and leisure centre with extra housing (even if there is a suggestion that in \*illegible\* a sports facility will be made available in the far from accessible village of North Weald. My objections to the proposed to create and industrial estate (SR-0394) are also expressed.

---

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The plan needs to be far more detailed. Bus services? Links to the London Transport system? Road access to proposed industrial sites? Etc. As I face up to the prospect of living in old age in this community. Transport links are a concern. When I first moved here bus services existed to Broadwood and Epping (serving High Ongar) There was also, \*illegible the central line link to Epping- the only regular service is the 32 Ongar - Chelmsford link. Without the ability to drive there is very little opportunity to meet up with others. There are very many elderly persons living on their own in this locality so this is an important issue.

---

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

---

## 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?