

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

Stakeholder ID 4698 Name ian Clarke

---

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

I agree that there is an urgent need for more housing especially affordable rented accommodation both in the district around Loughton. I agree that the green belt is important and should be protected but I also think that the Urban environment of towns like Loughton should also be protected, and that housing development in the towns should be low density with adequate parking and retention of Green spaces. These green spaces are not only visually attractive, like the green belt, but are also important recreational facilities. The Green Belt should not be sacrosanct if the urban environment is destroyed/

---

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 apparent from your plans that Debden and other urban areas are going to be blighted by high density housing, Increased parking problems and loss of green space. This is unfair when 90% of the district will not be affected. Other areas could easily absorb some extra housing without their environment being adversely affected. I would suggest carefully planned garden villages as other authorities are proposing and small scale housed attached to existing settlements.

---

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

Stakeholder ID 4698

Name ian

Clarke

---

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

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

---

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

Epping?

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

**Yes**

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

**Yes**

Waltham Abbey?

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:

---

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

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

**No**

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

As stated earlier I agree with the need for more housing in Loughton, but feel that other areas of the District should share the impact. I also feel strongly that some of our Green space needs to be preserved both for it's visual qualities and as recreation space for the community. I also think that any housing development should be low density (80% 2 storey maximum 30 I also think that planners need to understand the need for adequate parking for residents. In the recent developments in the area - inadequate parking is provided resulting in overspill into other roads and parking on pavements. I also think that grass verges, trees and shrubberies should be provided in new developments to soften the impact of the buildings. Specifically SR-0226, SR-0227, SR-0565 - sites that were formally carparks even if underground car parks are provided I fail to see how sufficient car parking can be provided for existing users and for residents in the proposed housing. SR-0356 Borders lane playing field. I would suggest that this should be only 50% housing and as a planning \*illegible\*

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

the other 50% recreated as improved recreation ground. If at all possible the view from the borders lane access the valley and towards London should be preserved. SR-0361 colebrook Lane/ Jessel Drive- again only 50%. SR 0358 - Sandford Ave/westhall Rd - 50% should be used for housing and 50% as a recreations ground. The views from the top of the first site should be preserved if possible. SR-0834, SR-0548 SR-035 - Tarrington Drive, post office dept and college are all sites which may be more suitable for higher density 3 storey homes as they are either away from existing homes or close to existing larger buildings.

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

---

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?

Whilst the Green Belt is important so are the Green spaces in towns, some areas of the green belt would not suffer from development as they're not particularly attractive e.g. a field of rape seed or the industrial type \*illegible\* found on some farms. Sajid Javid (sec of state for communities and local govt) recently put the case for loosening the green belt to allow suitable housing development. Parking needs to be provided for commuters, shoppers and residents to avoid problems such as pavement parking. Our local MP recently highlighted the dangers to pedestrians caused by commuter parking in Theydon Bous- similar problems can occur elsewhere/

---