

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

Stakeholder ID 2036 Name Christine Stringer

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:

There is no vision only a need to comply with government regulations. You cannot 'ensure enhanced quality of life' by providing high density housing on much needed open spaces with no regard to air quality, parking, transport and schooling.

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:

The council has given no consideration to a 'new town'. It has chosen to build on any available space with no regard for local residents or future residents.

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I have not studied this section but I believe there are areas in Harlow town centre that could be re-designated for housing rather than offices and shops. Large parts of this area at now standing empty and with current trends in shopping and industry they will not be needed in the future.

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

Stakeholder ID 2036 Name Christine Stringer

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

These are local areas which serve a local need. They are a focal point for the town a place to visit, meet up and have a coffee. However, no serious consideration has been given to adequate parking vital to local trade. Any parking provided will be needed for the extra homes being built. The council has no answer to present parking problems and certainly none for the future.

---

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Not studied this.

---

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:

Traps Hill Car park: this space should be left as it is for the use of shopper, visitors to the leisure centre, library and children's play area. To place housing on this land will result in overcrowding, creating a feeling of congestion. Underground car parks are unfriendly and often threatening environment. Old people, single

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

women and people with children will not wish to use it. Debden and Loughton Car Parks, possibly but only if low rise dwellings are built and not monstrosities such as the new eyesore on the old Winston Churchill site. All these car parks will need policing and maintenance who will pay for this? Is building underground feasible on these sites? Borders Lane Epping Forest College Sites: This is a massive over development with no regards to the ambience of the local area. Building on Luckton Playing Field will mean loss of an open space which contributes to the leafy suburb feel of the area. If housing is to be built then it should be on the 'middle site' of the college. It must be assumed that families will live in these homes and their children will need schooling. This is an ideal site to build a school but there is no provision in the plan to build one. The new road layout will not be able to cope with the increase of traffic, air pollution is already dangerously high during peak times. There are only 2 roads out and into Loughton and Borders Lane is one of them; can it cope with extra traffic? Jessel Drive: This is an outstanding feature of Loughton - it's a place of pride and one that makes Loughton a pleasant place to live. There is hard evidence that open green spaces, where people can exercise, congregate and hold community events is essential to their mental health. Taking away a sense of community leads to an increase in crime, graffiti and the dumping of litter. Obesity has now become a national epidemic to take away an open space is irresponsible and not cost effective. The argument has been made that space is provided by Epping Forest on one side of Loughton and the Nature Reserve on the other. Neither of these is within walking distance of this area of Loughton nor are there convenient bus routes to them. Children need to be able to play within easy reach of their homes so that they can go to the park by themselves thus developing a sense of independence and self reliance. To send a child to the forest is downright irresponsible. Where are young people to meet on street corners? Burney Drive and Jessel Drive are narrow roads and will not be able to cope with extra traffic. At peak time there is often complete gridlock along them. Rochford Green: This is the play area my own children used and where I walked my dogs.

Will children be expected to play on grass verges, annoying residents and risking being run over by the ever increasing number of cars on the road.

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)

**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?

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The provision of infrastructure sewage, roads, schools, hospitals and public transport is provided by other authorities ergo the council's plan really is a vision or just wishful thinking. The result will be that housing will be built before adequate infrastructure is provided

---

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

**Not able to comment as I have no training or work experience regarding this**

---

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?

**start to finish**

This plan is written in planning jargon. This may be unavoidable but the length and complexity of it is off putting to a lay person. Meetings to help with understanding the plan were few, poorly advertised and often took place during working hours. The result will be a statistic to justify implementing the plan.

---