

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

Stakeholder ID	4173	Name	Paul	Bradick
----------------	------	------	------	---------

Method	Email
--------	-------

Date	5/12/2016
------	-----------

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:

I have been a resident of Buckhurst Hill for the past 30 years and wish to make the following comments and objections regarding sites identified in the Draft Local Plan. (1) St Just 1 Powell road This application replaces a previous planning application for care homes which was rejected by EFDC. Part of the development proposes building on GREEN BELT land which was one of the many reasons that the application was originally refused. All the original objections remain valid and can be summarised as follows:- Building on Green Belt land which the council and our local MP have promised to uphold to preserve the unique countryside that the area has. The proposed development is adjacent to a nature reserve which will suffer and will have a detrimental effect due to the building and the additional people living there some of whom may not respect the area that residents have enjoyed. Local services will be severely stretched including Central line trains that already are full and inadequately sized and present health hazards to travellers and restrict the access to elderly and handicapped people. The other development areas proposed around North Weald have no public transport available for residents who work in London and will impact the Central line. Schools are becoming full mainly due to the questionable and short sighted decision of EFDC/ECC some years ago to sell Buckhurst High School for £250000. What a mistake or am I being naive in thinking that financial gain was not part of the deal. I had meetings with the EFDC at that time and was told the reason to sell was due to the projected numbers of children declining in the area which was a lie and is not the case and sooner or later additional school accommodation will be required. Doctors surgeries are becoming full and the local hospital Whipps Cross has become inadequate and overcrowded with potentially dangerous consequences. Parking is already a problem in these areas and the additional parking that is proposed will make matters worse with the additional consequences of increased pollution levels. (2) Lower Queens Road and bottom of Queens Road. Much of the above arguments will apply to these proposed developments but additionally it would seem that the minimal additional housing and retail that would be achieved would not warrant the proposed development's impact on local people and local businesses. Many businesses in Loughton High Street are being forced out of the area due to high Council taxes. Would it not be a good idea to attract local businesses in these areas with a reduction of taxes to local people? It was stated in the Local Plan that local businesses are to be encouraged but no proposal was identified to achieve this goal. (3) In short Buckhurst Hill is a unique area around London and as other similarly located areas should be preserved and form a buffer to prevent the urban sprawl from destroying what can never again be replaced. Once the Green Belt is only partially destroyed it would set a precedence for future developers to seek other vulnerable areas for financial gain driven by the questionable need to provide housing in Epping Forest and other similar areas. What is clearly needed is a national plan to identify areas that do not impact on vulnerable areas such as Buckhurst Hill and Loughton which are already densely populated.

....Redacted....

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

Stakeholder ID	4173
----------------	------

Name	Paul
------	------

Bradick
---------

