

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

Stakeholder ID 2607 Name Camilla Ioder

---

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 local plan is flawed as it doesn't take in to consideration the lack of infrastructure and facilities for the area now, let alone with the extra housing planned.**

---

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:

**Again, flawed, North Weald is a small village and the plans literally double the amount of dwellings. If the district really needs to find room for the extra housing, it would be surely better to consider areas within the district with greater facilities or alternatively consider building a new town that is developed with its own facilities i.e. Doctors, school, shops, parking etc**

---

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**I think that Harlow desperately needs regeneration and that hopefully this could be the start of that.**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2607 Name Camilla Ioder

---

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

Epping?

**No opinion**

Buckhurst Hill?

**No opinion**

Loughton Broadway?

**No opinion**

Chipping Ongar?

**No opinion**

Loughton High Road?

**No opinion**

Waltham Abbey?

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

---

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

**I think it's a great idea to have a new employment development but I think this has to be well thought out to ensure that the kind of employment suits the demographic of the local people.**

---

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

**No**

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Epping is highly populated already with ageing facilities. Building on the station car park to make a multi story car park is an error, the car park should remain the same size and become multi-storey. Commuters have nowhere to park as it is so use shoppers car parks in a town with little parking and a poor public transport service when it comes to buses. Epping has a terrible traffic issue at peak times, more housing without major work to roads BEFORE building is foolish.

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 opinion**

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

**No**

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

North Weald prides itself on being a small village. The draft plan doubles the size of the village again with no plans for infrastructure. I have been advised that infrastructure will happen alongside or after development, this is an error. The village struggled this summer when two small houses were built along the high road, coping with large building works and quite possibly several developments at the same time would bring the village to a standstill. The high road is the main route in and out of the village, there would need to be new roads built which I fear would turn us in to a town and not the village we all love. My children attend the village school which has just been extended, again I understand that all the building doesn't not guarantee a new school is built, where will they go to school? We have a part time doctors surgery in the village and the limes in Epping. Appointments are almost always at least four weeks away as it is, how will new people get healthcare? Police, we have no PCSO any more and Epping police station has closed, how will the increased population be policed? With over 20% of the planned housing across the district being allocated to North Weald, how will we still be a village??

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**

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

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

**Thornwood is already a village with no facilities, how will adding new housing with no facilities help traffic and a burden of providing service to other areas?**

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:

**At the meeting in north weald we were consistently told that infrastructure would be organised retrospectively. As I have mentioned, this is unsatisfactory, infrastructure needs to be in place before to accommodate the building the work and increase in population. Otherwise the strain on local resources already stretched will be unsustainable either that or the deal will be reneged on and it won't happen at all.**

---

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)