

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

Stakeholder ID 2866 Name Clare Denton

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:

The Draft plan does not take into account that Epping Forest District in particular Buckhurst Hill is already densely populated with the infrastructure not being able to cope. There are not enough school places and many children have to go to the next town to be taught. The doctors surgeries are struggling to cope with 11,000 people in Buckhurst Hill with only 3 doctors surgeries within the area. We do not need any more homes (in fact we cannot take anymore homes as the town of Buckhurst Hill is the most densely populated out of the whole of Epping Forest.

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:

It is unsustainable to consider taking green belt land as once you start doing this then other developers will think they have the green light to apply to take more. Soon there will be no green belt left.

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2866 Name Clare Denton

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I can see that Loughton Broadway should be encouraged as a shopping facility as many people see Debden as not a prime shopping area. As for Buckhurst Hill, it already has a high street. Unfortunately many people including myself use Loughton High street to shop as there is a greater choice of shops that are also more affordable to everyone. Buckhurst Hill needs to create not just designer shops etc but have shops that everyone can enjoy. Epping already has a good high street.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Epping Forest has limited choices for employment this is why commuters travel to London for work. Unless there are greater opportunities available in the area I don't see how there can be employment development.

---

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:

As a resident living in Buckhurst Hill I would like to disagree to any planning in Buckhurst Hill. Buckhurst Hill does not have the infrastructure to cope with any more developments. It is the most densely populated and densely built area within the whole of Epping Forest. Indeed there are only 3 doctors surgeries for 11,000 people! Children cannot attend their local primary schools as they are over subscribed. We cannot take more developments. LOWER QUEENS ROAD CAR PARK This car park is used everyday by commuters and shoppers. My flat is opposite the car park and if a development were built it would greatly effect the light to my kitchen window. There are serious problems with parking within Buckhurst Hill and so this car park is desperately needed. At present there is congestion at Princes Road leading into Victoria Road and the infrastructure is not there to support further congestion. The location is not a good one to put a development on as it is down a cul de sac with one way in and out. Whilst works are being carried out many homes and businesses will be affected and shoppers/commuters will have nowhere to park. I therefore object to this site being used as it is not a practical solution to use this site based on the issues I have raised. LOWER QUEENS ROAD STORES If these stores are demolished, many residents will lose the amenities that these shops provide. As a resident who lives near to these stores, I often use the off licence and the launderette. I also use the subway cutting to access the central line which I would be unable to do due to the fact that whilst these flats were being developed the subway would be cut off this would cause a massive inconvenience not just for me but for everyone living the other side of the railway line. The subway gives access to Buckhurst Hill High Street as

well as to the underground. Furthermore, I would have difficulty getting to and from my flat during these works. I therefore strongly oppose this development.

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 infrastructure is not there are present. Unless more schools and GP surgeries are built then the area will not be able to cope with further development.

- 
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?