

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

Stakeholder ID 2630 Name Samuel Clark

---

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I do not think the Draft Local Plan will enhance the quality of life in Epping Forest District. In Buckhurst Hill any further developments, at either SR-0176, SR-0225 and SR-0813 or any other proposed sites, would be detrimental to the local area. The Draft Plan does not provide for related growth in infrastructure required for population growth and takes away parking facilities already in short supply. Demand for services will grow even without development in Buckhurst Hill due to the 1616 homes proposed for both Loughton and Chigwell.

---

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:

Focussing any necessary expansion on Harlow which is already one of the most urban areas apart from London locally seems logical. However building on countryside or Green Belt should be avoided.

---

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I do not live in Harlow and therefore am not familiar with the area. The Draft Plan does not provide alternative potential locations for Princess Alexandra Hospital. I think that if there is the possibility of

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

Stakeholder ID 2630 Name Samuel Clark

---

relocation assurances should be given to those in Epping Forest that they will not lose access to this important service.

---

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:

Protecting retail areas within the District is important to maintain local employment. The District should emphasis the need for competitive rates for small shops to help maintain viability. It needs to encourage a balance of independent retailers and larger shops. It needs to recognise concerns raised in 4.48, page 66 in relation to maintaining local shops.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Intensification of existing sites instead of using green spaces seems a well informed idea. Green spaces should not be used for the expansion of businesses. Under point C of Draft Policy E1, there needs to be an express connection with point D, new employment sites. Local employment training and small business growth programmes will only be of use if employment locations can be found.

---

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:

I do not see how further development can take place in Buckhurst Hill without infringing on the quality of life of existing residents. Buckhurst Hill East ward of Epping Forest is already one of the most densely populated areas of the District. There are no potential sites within Buckhurst Hill where development would not have a negative effect. The proposals of SR-0176 (St Just, Powell Rd), SR-0225 (Lower Queens Road Car Park) and SR-0813 (stores at Lower Queens Road) will all affect local residents. The site at SR-0813 provides a Local Convenience Store, Launderette, Bike and Coffee shop. They all provide local services to residents. There is already a shortage of parking, particularly in Buckhurst Hill East ward and SR-0813 would make the situation significantly worse. Access to site SR-0225 is down a narrow road that is often blocked and which acts as a traffic pinch point. Any increase in traffic flow would be potentially dangerous. The Draft Plan does not envisage any of the infrastructure requirements needed for an increase of 90 homes; the reference to Draft Policy Plan SP2 offers no clarity as to how this will be provided. The Draft Plan envisages an extra 1616 homes in the immediate vicinity of Buckhurst Hill which will add pressure on services that already struggle to cope. The proposals for Buckhurst Hill do not consider the wider stress provided by a more general increase in the population of Epping Forest. Buckhurst Hill lacks open space. Infilling of existing properties will allow us to meet current headline house numbers in the Draft Local Plan. The developments in both Station Way and the nearby Luxborough Lane site, Chigwell, mean that Buckhurst Hill has already gone a long way to trying to meet the Districts' 2033 aims expressed in this Draft Plan. A recent meeting of the Parish Council was

attended by over 120 concerned local residents. They expressed deep concerns at the proposals in this Draft Local Plan and the potential for any future development of 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 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:

**The Draft Local Plan does not give specific provision for infrastructure. The Draft Local Plan for Buckhurst Hill will take away services, increase the population and offer no areas where infrastructure can be developed.**

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

**N/A**

---

## 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?

n/a

---