

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

Stakeholder ID 2587 Name anthony Dring

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

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:

There is plenty of brownfield land available that has wrongly been designated for retail use e.g. Langston Road. There is no requirement for large scale warehouse style shopping when small retail shops are struggling to exist in competition with the internet. This will kill local high streets, create more traffic and is land that could easily be used for extensive housing close to all existing amenities and transport facilities.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2587 Name anthony Dring

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

---

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

Disagree

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:

The proposals would put added strain on current infrastructure and there are no proposals to address this. The central line service is already beyond reasonable capacity. Schools in the area are oversubscribed with pupils being transferred out of the immediate catchment areas for primary as well as secondary education, some pupils are travelling many miles to schools unconnected to their locality. Medical facilities are oversubscribed and at breaking point. Parking all round Loughton is at crisis point. On one particular proposal (building on car parks) i would object strongly to the proposal at the already congested area of Loughton station. There are always traffic problems here and adding further residents parking to the already inadequate commuter parking would only worsen this. The roads around the back of the station are already full of parked cars and any attempt to access the proposed properties from Lower Park, Algers Road would add to considerable traffic congestion down these narrow roads making them unsafe.

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)

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

### 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:

Basically this is inadequate as current problems need addressing without being added to.

---

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?

SR0226

The surrounding area of Loughton station is already overcrowded. The proposals would put added strain on current infrastructure and there are no proposals to address this. The central line service is already beyond reasonable capacity. Schools in the area are oversubscribed with pupils being transferred out of the immediate catchment areas for primary as well as secondary education, some pupils are travelling many miles to schools unconnected to their locality. Medical facilities are oversubscribed and at breaking point. Parking all round Loughton is at crisis point. On one particular proposal (building on car parks) i would object strongly to the proposal at the already congested area of Loughton station. There are always traffic problems here and adding further residents parking to the already inadequate commuter parking would only worsen this. The roads around the back of the station are already full of parked cars and any attempt to access the proposed properties from Lower Park, Algers Road would add to considerable traffic congestion down these narrow roads making them unsafe. There is plenty of brownfield land available that has wrongly been designated for retail use e.g. Langston Road. There is no requirement for large scale warehouse style shopping when small retail shops are struggling to exist in competition with the internet. This will kill local high streets, create more traffic and is land that could easily be used for extensive housing close to all existing amenities and transport facilities. A turnaround on this policy would benefit all.

---

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