

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

Stakeholder ID	3761	Name	frederick	Ball
----------------	------	------	-----------	------

Method	Letter
--------	--------

Date	29/11/2016
------	------------

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)

### Letter or Email Response:

RE: Draft local plan for Epping Forest I am writing to oppose the Draft Local Plan for the Epping Forest area. My objections are with particular regard for the planned building of 195 dwellings on Jessel Green in Debden. I am opposing your plans for this area for the following reasons:

- o Jessel Green is used year-round by almost every section of the community, from the very young with their parents in the playground, to people exercising and playing ball games, to older people walking their dogs. In addition, the Green is used in the summer months for community and church events
- o People in the local area use this green because it is the only thing like a town park that we have. It is the only accessible green space in the area, especially for the young and elderly. It is unreasonable and unsafe for these groups to have to use the forest for games, recreation or dog walking . People feel safe on Jessel Green because it is wide open and lit at night, totally unlike the forest
- o Apart from using the green for recreation, there is very little for young people to do in the area. As mentioned before, there are no town parks in Loughton or Debden, as there are in surrounding areas. If the plans were approved, and this recreational space were taken away, youngsters would have even less to do. The area already has a rising anti- social problem among young people, and would get worse with even more inadequate green space
- o Many small estates in Debden, such as Oak Tree Close and Hereward Green, have signs saying 'No ball games'. If Jessel Green is given over to housing, where would children and families go to play such games and exercise? The answer is that they would be driven indoors - the council should be concerned with negatively affecting the health of young people, given the country's obesity epidemic
- o Schools in Debden are already over-subscribed, and would not cope with the additional demand on places
- o Thousands of extra people in the Jessel Green area would put an additional huge strain on already overstretched healthcare, social and emergency services in Essex
- o The Jessel Green area is already 40 minutes from the nearest A&E and hospital services. More people in the area would add to the waiting times and add to the delays in getting treatment. The Princess Alexandra Hospital has just been deemed inadequate, so it is irresponsible to add more people onto to that particular hospital's lists
- o Roads are already overcrowded and often gridlocked in the Debden area, the Central line is at capacity and the 167 bus looks to have been restricted to a Loughton-only service. Hundreds of extra people and cars and journeys in the area will put ,a further strain on an already poor infrastructure
- o Open spaces are good for the mental health of residents. I consider that putting houses on the only viable open space in the area would create mental health problems for the residents of Debden, not to mention physical and respiratory issues caused by pollution from more cars. The air quality in the area would suffer enormously with added housing
- o The roads and pavements in the surrounding are already in a poor state of repair, with numerous potholes and badly tarmac-ed areas . These would become even worse with the added strain of hundreds of extra cars and other vehicles
- o Many people in the Jessel Green area have purchased houses there because of the wide open space and lovely, green views from their windows. Such people may be quick to move out of

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

Stakeholder ID	3761
----------------	------

Name	frederick
------	-----------

Ball	
------	--

the area if the housing sites were approved, giving rise to a more transient, lower socio-economic population, which would change the suburban and peaceful nature of the area. I do not understand why Jessel Green and similar greens in the area are not considered to be as important as other greens in highly urban areas - no one would ever dream of building on Hampstead Heath or Primrose Hill. Our greens need to be viewed as equally important areas within high density housing. Given so many reasons NOT to build on the Jessel Green site, it is essential that the Council look to house people on other sites in the district. For example, the poorly-maintained industrial brown-field sites around Langston Road and the Metropolitan Police site in Chigwell. These sites need to be properly explored and exhausted first. Building on these sites would have nowhere near the negative effect on local residents that your plans would have on the people of the Jessel Green area. As a resident of the Jessel Green area, I strongly oppose the Draft Plan and hope that you will take my concerns seriously and will now consider other sites such as the above for housing and future development.