



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

| Stakeholder ID | 2612   | Name | Paula | Jones |
|----------------|--------|------|-------|-------|
| 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: <a href="mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk">ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a>

## 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 plan does not sufficiently protect the Green Belt and environment. Infrastructure needed to support the plan is not sufficiently developed and would lead to further concreting over green spaces. Once green spaces are taken they will not be put back and must be protected at all costs.

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:

Building on Lucton's Field, Rochford Green and Jessel Green would impact to the detriment of health and wellbeing of people living in the area. Roads and underground are already groaning under the weight of existing use. Traffic already stretches up Boarders Lane way past Murray Hall. Every car parking space across all roads around the Broadway e.g. Ladyfields, Colson Road, Lushes Road, Westhall Road, Oakwood Hill etc are already taken throughout the week. No explanation has been provided of where owners of further buildings would park. Neither should existing green spaces be built over for parking spaces rather they should be better protected.

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





| 3. | Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?  |  |
|----|---|--|
|    | Strongly disagree   |  |
|    | Please explain your choice in Question 3:                       |  |
|    |   |  |
| 4. | Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in                 |  |
|    | Epping?   |  |
|    | No opinion  |  |
|    | Buckhurst Hill?   |  |
|    | No opinion  |  |
|    | Loughton Broadway?  |  |
|    | No  |  |
|    | Chipping Ongar?   |  |
|    | No opinion  |  |
|    | Loughton High Road?   |  |
|    | No  |  |
|    | Waltham Abbey?  |  |
|    | No opinion  |  |
|    | Please explain your choice in Question 4:                       |  |
| Е  | Do you agree with the proposals for now employment development? |  |
| 5. | Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development? |  |
|    | Please explain your choice in Question 5:                       |  |
| 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

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

1.Disagree strongly as the plan does not protect the green areas of green belt and the environment enough. Expanses of green spaces particularly Luctons field, Jessel Green and Rochford Green and the smaller green spaces directly outside of homes i.e. where people live are VITAL for many reasons including: a.Physical and mental health: many people, particularly those who are older, have limited physical means to travel to the

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





outskirts of town. When depressed we lack energy and the world can become a smaller more introverted place. Often getting out of bed is an achievement so having to travel to larger areas of green open spaces is beyond what is achievable at those times. Having a horizon where we are able to see the sunlight without clutter of buildings and having green spaces where we can walk, walk a dog, play with children or just be in green space improves overall health. Many millions of pounds are spent on drugs such as Prozac when simply getting out into the open air can improve wellbeing. b. With climate change it is predicted that we will continue to have milder and wetter winters which we are already seeing evidence of. I have experienced my own road Redacted and Loughton High Road, flooded so that the water has flowed like a river. If Luctons field and other fields and green spaces are built on and continual concreting of front and back gardens is allowed there will be insufficient ground available to soak up rain water and homes will be flooded. c.Traffic: This has increased exponentially over the years. Already, traffic in the morning backs up along Borders Lane past Murray Hall. With extra housing in Lucton's field and the Middle Building there would be even more traffic. If I move my only car, I already often have to park half way into Redacted as I won't park on the green as others do. d.Green spaces are an integral part of what makes Debden/Loughton a good place to live and where I have lived for over 40 years and want to stay living, e.Infrastructure: The capacity on travelling by tube from Debden has already increased exponentially over a few years, particularly in the last 5 or 6 years. Building further homes in this area would put further undue pressure on the tube, parking, GPs, hospitals etc.

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:

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





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:

Insufficient information provided.

- 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?

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