

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

Stakeholder ID    1951                      Name                      Rhys                      martin

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:

It is a laughable plan. It doesn't take into account the need for infrastructure or how important Green Belt is. The Central Line is already well above capacity.....bus routes are being closed (such as 167)....and Ongar/North Weald won't reopen as the Central Line as it has been sold off to a Private Company. On top of this you want to build on every Station Car Park when parking (certainly at Buckhurst Hill) is significantly over subscribed and also build on Green Belt Land when you explicitly said you would not. May I ask what you intend to do with our over subscribed Schools/GP Surgeries and NHS? I imagine....you have no idea.

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:

All of the reasons above. The plan is laughable. No infrastructure....no plan....no transport....reduction of green belt....no parking....no healthcare.

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

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID    1951                      Name    Rhys                      martin

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Buckhurst Hill has a problem with high Council rent. If you want to support business I suggest you reduce these as we currently just have a selection of about 70 hairdressers and 50 restaurants. As a result the street has gone downhill remarkably.

---

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

No opinion

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 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:

Buckhurst Hill is already over developed. It has one train station, a limited bus service (which you are trying to cut) and over subscribed Schools. Queens Road Car Park- Where would anyone park if you removed this? Residents Parking is at breaking point as it is. Local businesses would be disrupted and construction traffic on the one way streets would be a nightmare. Lower Queens Road-You would remove four business owners who should be supported. You would also cause havoc for those living in the surrounding flats. Presumably the subway would also be closed which would cause issues as it is used for Buckhurst Hill Primary School. Powell Road- This is green belt which is what you are meant to be protecting. We have already had 2 large developments in Palmerston Road and opposite Roding Valley Station, so I feel we have already done the building work necessary here. If you wanted to look at a potential site that would actually work then how about the ....Redacted.... College? The building is coming into a state of disrepair and should never have been sold off as a State School. Surely a mix use of housing and a new state Primary School would be the obvious answer? It would enable us to help our overgrowing School population in the area and help the need for housing.

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**

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

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:

**There is no detail in the plan. Therefore it should not be accepted.**

- 
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?