

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

Stakeholder ID 2403      Name Sarah      Nay

---

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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

If the purpose of the "vision" is to ensure "enhanced" quality of life for existing residents, it is not fit for purpose for the reasons outlined below. Overall, it is inevitable that this very large amount of new housing must reduce the quality of life of existing residents. If the purpose is also to provide "infrastructure", the plan is also not fit for purpose. Infrastructure in Epping is already stretched - adding this amount of new housing will inevitably worsen that situation. As I understand matters, the sole purpose can only be to meet a perceived need for a high amount of new housing capacity. A preliminary concern is that it is unlikely that the Council has sufficient evidence to be able to maintain its predictions of housing need as rational predictions in light of the referendum of membership of the European Union. I am very concerned that 'shoe-horning' this very large amount of additional housing into Epping will destroy its special character as a rural, historic, market-town that also acts as an important gate-way to the nationally important ancient woodland of Epping Forest. This would not be a concern with alternative local towns such as Harlow. Even assuming that this amount of new housing is needed (and as above, I have grave concerns about the Council's evidence base), the Draft Local Plan seems to envisage such a dense and large development in parallel to Ivy Chimneys Road as is likely to result in 'rival' infrastructure being needed in that area, which will drain business away from the historic Epping High Street. There has been entirely inadequate appreciation of the pressure that this amount of new housing will put in Epping's infrastructure - the roads (particularly Ivy Chimneys Road) are already busy and dangerously congested with large numbers of parked cars (both commuters and residents) at any given time, and the doctors and dentists lacking available capacity. The character of this area which borders Epping Forest (and is a route for tourists who walk up from Epping tube) will be massively impaired by such dense development. A relief road parallel to the M25 will not ease the problem of congestion on Ivy Chimneys Road and Centre Drive - the new residents will insist on driving the existing roads as the most direct roads to Epping tube, the High Street, and Harlow/M11 beyond

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2403

Name Sarah

Nay

---

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:

As above, I am very concerned that a small rural historic market-town has been selected for such dense new development, completely at odds with its special character. The same concern would not apply if further dense development were to be added to Harlow, which is already densely developed with no special character to be preserved. Even assuming that it is rational to target Epping for a large amount of new development, the best hope for preserving Epping's character is (along with keeping the numbers down as much as possible) is to scatter the development more widely over more sites. The amount of development concentrated parallel to Ivy Chimneys Road will be unsustainable in terms of infrastructure and the already inadequate road system in that locality.

---

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Assuming that appropriate infrastructure, as above I consider Harlow a suitable target for further dense development.

---

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:

It does not appear that employment development has kept pace with existing residential capacity. It would seem preferable to make sure employment development does not lose out to the drive to increase residential capacity.

---

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 strongly disagree with sites SR-0069, SR-0069/33 and SR-0333B. This high level of dense development in this location poses a number of very difficult problems: - character- the character of this border area with the Epping Forest will be entirely destroyed by this amount of dense development. It would also be entirely inappropriate to, as is proposed, place blocks of flats on the site, when there are absolutely no blocks of flats in this locality which are predominantly characterised by small detached or semi-detached two storey houses. - quality of life for the new residents - I do not understand how the new residents of this new proposed development could be asked to live on top of the M25 and to put up with that level of noise and pollution. I cannot recall any similar development along the borders of the M25, which may be because it is in fact completely inappropriate. - road infrastructure - each household of the new residents will have at least 1 car which they will drive daily to local schools and in all likelihood to either Epping Tube, the M11 or M25. Importantly, the tube and the High Street are too far away for the majority of people to consider reasonable walking distance. This end of Epping will become unsustainably congested with vehicles. There is already queuing along Ivy Chimneys Road at peak commuting times, made worse by the inadequate parking provision along Ivy Chimneys Road for existing residents. This will of course be made worse by putting several 100 additional households behind Ivy Chimneys Road. There is no route for a relief road that will ease this problem ; people will always choose the shortest route. - harm to the High Street - the High Street is already frequently congested, which will be made worse by several 100 new households using it as the shortest route to Harlow and the M11. Given that the high street is more than what most people would consider 'walking distance' away from the High Street, new infrastructure is also likely to be needed on the site behind Ivy Chimneys Road, which will drain business from the historic high street, and entirely change the character around Ivy Chimneys Road. As would the 'shoe-horning' of additional dentists and doctors in this area. - wildlife - I am not a wildlife expert and I have not been able to capture any photographs during this consultation period but I have sighted what appear to me to be red kites flying over this site on a number of occasions. It would seem a pity to disturb an area which this protected species may be treating as a habitat.

Indeed, I understand red kites to be a protected species pursuant to Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

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 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:

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

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

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

I do not consider that sufficient information has been provided about the plans for local infrastructure. Though I am very concerned about the threat to the local sports field and the Epping Sports centre, which I would strongly disagree with removing unless they are replaced in all respects.

---

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

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