

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

Stakeholder ID 2417 Name Cllr Syllvia Watson

---

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

The draft vision for the district is acceptable although consideration of the Roding Valley is absent.

---

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

The location of proposed housing is less of an issue than its extent. The proposed housing numbers are high given the constraints imposed by the green belt, including Epping Forest, and particularly when Harlow's development is being facilitated.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The development around Harlow is acceptable as regards supporting the regeneration of Harlow. However the high cost of loss of green belt must be offset by guarantees that Harlow's proposals are consistent with EFDC's design requirements and the timely provision of sufficient infrastructure. The potential relocation of the Princess Alexandra Hospital is a matter of great concern as it is the principal such hospital for residents of Buckhurst Hill and indeed most residents of the district. The proposed sites for development in Epping include St Margaret's Hospital but it is not clear whether the hospital would continue to function.

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

Stakeholder ID 2417

Name Cllr Syllvia

Watson

---

---

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:

The primary shopping areas in the two town centres and four district centres are left broadly left in their current locations and any extensions appear logical. The mix of retail etc is a concern and there is no clear strategy to assist local businesses competing in the internet age eg shared out of hours collection points.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The proposals for new employment whilst admirable may not be deliverable. Local businesses face increasing competition and high rents with, in turn, high business rates. The relatively high level of business start-ups in the period 2009-2014 may owe much to the City of London job losses following the 2008 crash and may not be sustainable. The lack of consultation with the London authorities is disappointing give the large percentage of residents employed there. Although research and development is mentioned it is not pursued other than as a by-product of Harlow's regeneration. Nor is the impact on employment of the location of hospitals and schools considered.

---

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:

The proposed development sites in Buckhurst Hill have caused great concern to many residents. Buckhurst Hill is already the most densely populated of the 12 main settlements in the district and yet the proposal is to develop more than the 53 homes suggested in the Issues and Options consultation. The approved developments of affordable housing by EFDC have been omitted from the numbers. Taking each of the three sites allocated for development in turn:- SR-0176 (St Just, Powell rd) - the site consists of green belt that wraps around the house, St Just, that is a heritage asset. The proposal does not respect the setting or historical context of St Just and in particular may physically separate St Just **....Redacted....** from Linder's Field **....Redacted....**. Also development of this green belt land will detract from the openness and viability of Linder's Field and curtail an important green corridor. SR0225 (Lower Queens Road car park) - this site does not appear to offer any real prospect of viable development without a loss of car parking. Low-rise housing in close proximity to the site makes high-rise development unacceptable and underground car parking therefore financially unviable. AT the very least a developer would probably argue that homes close to the underground station do not require car parking and ask for exemption from providing affordable housing. There is no alternative car parking site and the current parking stress would be exacerbated with further displacement to Stradbroke Grove and adjoining roads. SR-0813 (stores at Lower Queens Road) - this site currently provides essential services and resources for vulnerable residents in a cluster of retirement and sheltered housing facilities. The development would disrupt, possibly permanently, these valued services.

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The approach to infrastructure sets out general aspirations but no detail. Two areas of infrastructure, being transport and education, are of particular concern. Buckhurst Hill is one of four settlements along the Central line, already at capacity, and their expansion is at odds with Transport for London's confirmation that services will not increase. The draft Local Plan gives no information about the location of schools to be expanded or to be newly built. This makes it impossible to form a definitive view about proposed development sites especially when Buckhurst Hill has seen Year 1 pupils allocated school places as far afield as Waltham Abbey. The position regarding secondary education is even less certain given the lack of consultation with neighbouring London authorities.

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

Given the considerable uncertainty in key aspects of the draft Local Plan the consideration of an interim document would necessarily have too many caveats to be of any effect.

---

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

The retention of non-designated heritage assets, listed or not, needs to be prioritised over development if the character of each settlement and visitor attraction are to be retained. The policies protecting green spaces and wildlife corridors need to be stronger. The data on aging population should not be extrapolated to make a case for increasing sheltered accommodation and care homes by a similar percentage. There is robust evidence available that although the numbers of older people are increasing the numbers requiring care are not.

---