

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

Stakeholder ID 2480      Name Simon      Heap

---

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 think it lacks a cohesive vision. It is primarily putting new homes where there are existing transport hubs. There is a lot of talk about infrastructure but no substantive detail on how this is to be achieved.**

---

2. 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 2:

**Given that I don't think that the plan truly addresses the districts needs this is the least worst option.**

---

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**I still would like to see comprehensive planning without just handing over an area to a developer.**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2480

Name Simon

Heap

---

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

There is nothing radical planned so it will be pretty much as it is,

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

How could one not agree with trying to encourage employment. Again the detail will follow.

---

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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

I think it will change the character of the town and it will become more like Loughton. It seems that 14% of the required homes are scheduled for Epping and that means a loss of 40% of their Green Belt Land

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

The planning that went into Debden is quite extraordinary. The whole concept works as is and the green spaces, deemed important 60 years ago are still important. The green spaces are viewed in this plan as bits that the original builders didn't get round to building. They are vital for the people that live there. There is a lot of data about the benefits of people coming into contact with nature ranging from emotional well being to improvements in cognitive ability. The effects of being in contact with green spaces are long lasting. This does not mean up the road and round the corner contact with nature. The approach to build on these spaces is the product of very lazy thinking and a

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

carelessness about the well being of the residents. There are chosen because they are near to stations but the trains that go through those stations are filled to capacity, even though TFI say otherwise. Please see [https:// ...Redacted...](https://...Redacted...)

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

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:

The area of green belt so designated for use is too far away from shops and transport to be of use to anyone needing affordable housing. Why should green belt land be lost to provide expensive houses. It is still quite a walk from the station so more cars will be used. A mistake in my view. The redevelopment of Lower Queens Road could be a good idea but the existing residents should be, after temporary re-housing, returned on the same basis as they left. i.e no increase in rent. The car park location is too tempting to realistically be avoided but if so redeveloped the existing car park should be retained under the new structure and increased in size to accommodate the new housing.

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

**No**

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

I think this whole site should become a Garden City and thereby remove the need elsewhere. It has transport links and is very under used

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

**No opinion**

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

**No**

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

This proposal is utterly ridiculous. I can see that the pain should be shared across the district, if no garden city developed, but to propose doubling the size of this village would be to destroy its charm. The clamour to build would spread to Abridge.

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:

[http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity\\_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/bs\\_great\\_outdoors2.pdf](http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/bs_great_outdoors2.pdf)

---

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

### No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There really isn't much detail. There are a few stated aims and ambitions but absolutely no detail. If sites are to be developed then the infrastructure should be in place before hand. Bus routes should be strengthened and widened or any planned developments will rely on cars. Buses are the proper way forward and need to be supported by subsidies until they are, by and large, so reliable that they become the preferred method of commuting to and from local stations and towns and thereby profitable. 5.88: Existing education and health care facilities are at capacity or oversubscribed. Even 90 more homes will require new surgeries, dentists and school places. All of these are missing from the plan in Buckhurst Hill.

---

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

It all sounds lovely, However it and the plan do have contradictory element in them. The plan emphasises SP4 (vi & vii) and DM5 (A iv) the need to retain and design into developments urban open space yet the plan also lists green open space in the more urban parts of the district as appropriate for development. How can this be reconciled in terms of sustainability?

---

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

SP4 (vi & vii) DM5 (A iv)

These policies are at odds with the plan.

T1 (ii & iii)

The aim is good but there is no detail or proposals on how this is to be achieved. We need to start subsidising buses to get people out of cars. The services need to be reliable and frequent. Certainly more than one an hour.

E4

All very good.

H2 C

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

Where the land is held by the council there should be a rigid application of affordable home provision.

H1 (Aii)

This is a charter to squeeze yet more houses into already densely populated areas.

SP6 (C i & ii)

How are these policies compatible with the allocation of Urban green spaces in the more densely populated areas?

The draft vision for the district

---

"Epping Forest will be conserved and enhanced" How will this be done? The council has no say in what happens in the forest as it is managed by the Corporation of London. Just recently the CoL decided to sell the deer culling policy to a gun club. This was predominately on the buffer lands. The gun club has had its contract revoked, effective 6 th Jan 2017. ....Redacted.... The point being the council has no say in this matter. What if the CoL wishes to charge for parking in the forest? They would be almost like a local authority within a local authority.

DM20

Again very good but it should go further and insist on micro renewables be incorporated into any scheme, except where the look would be at odds with its surroundings. If it was understood that this was going to be rigidly applied then any developer would be able to plan it into a scheme and thus negate the arguments over viability.

P 5 Buckhurst Hill

i) St Just, this site, if pursued will be at odds with Policy H1 ii) This should be ok if and only if the car park provision is kept beneath any development and that if more spaces by the development the car park may need two level below ground to accommodate such. iii) In principle the notion of knocking down and rebuilding is acceptable. However the occupants must be offered the new builds on the same terms as present. Shops will probably not retain customers during the build and that would be a severe loss in terms of the launderette, which is widely used. It could continue operating throughout the build but this would require vision and effort. The main question is viability, is it worth the upheaval to get 11 flats. What is the return after re housing, relocating of businesses, demolition and rebuild? I am surprised that St Elizabeth's on Hornbeam Rd/ Chestnut avenue is not included. It stands empty and unused and could provide say 9 flats if converted in a sensitive manner. It would meet objections but at the moment it is decaying.

P 5 Buckhurst Hill

B: How are these infrastructure improvements to be provided? We could start right now with a shuttle bus from the station to the high road. Funded by the council, it would allow more people to walk/ arrive at the station without recourse to cars.

P 5 C; I think it would be good to encourage retail , other than hairdressing and tanning, to return to Queens Road, possibly by being flexible on business rates.

---