



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

Sta	keholder ID	2571	Name	Roger	Emmens	
Method		Survey				
Dat	te					
		elements of th	e full response suc	h as formatting ar	ncil's database of responses to the Drad images may not appear accurately. So Policy team: <a href="mailto:ldfconsult@eppingfores">ldfconsult@eppingfores</a>	Should you wish to review
Su	rvey Respoi	nse:				
1.	Agree	Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?				
2.	Do you agree	e with the ov	erall vision that	the Draft Plan se	ts out for Epping Forest District?	
	Please expla	in your choic	e in Question 2:			
					be reduced with proper develop till leave this underutilised.	ment of the Council
3.	Strongly agr	ee ain your choid	oposals for devel e in Question 3: without spoiling		darlow?	

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





		pur .														
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:							
									I agree with the proposals							
								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?															

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:

1. It removes green space recreational facility within town itself (SR-0208, SR-0071) 2. IF Green Belt land is to be sacrificed, then it would be best to use extensions to SR-0132Ci to North-west, SR-0113B south to motorway, SR-0153 south-east to Stewards Green Road as being least impact on existing residents and most potential for creating new communities. 3. Residential mix and density seem misallocated. It is not clear that sufficient parking space for both existing car parks plus new housing on car park sites will be provided, notwithstanding that car park space requirement will increase with an additional 1,640 households (at 1.31 cars per household (ref.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/550726/nts9902.xls) this is another 2,148 cars in Epping vying for space) 4. Redevelopment of St Margaret's Hospital site seems to miss an opportunity for 1-2 bed and sheltered accommodation, especially as the analysis seems to undervalue the potential for moving aging households occupying family homes into more appropriate retirement accommodation. 5. Not sure I understand why Sports Centre and Cricket/Tennis club being moved to Lower Bury Lane site SR-0132Ci instead of using the new site for housing and leaving sports facilities where they

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





are. Moving Sports Centre will clearly increase the number of its members driving to the location instead of walking, thereby also increasing pollution.

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 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:

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





7.	Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?
	Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

- 1. Insufficient information provided about access roads (and bus services) into new residential areas 2. Unconvincing information about how to mitigate the already congested nature of central Epping, especially in the light of the additional car ownership expected by new residents. 3. Unconvincing information about impacts on school and GP services 4. Insufficient information about impacts on utility services to area (gas, electricity, water, sewage, telecommunications).
- 8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

Paragraph 1.10 refers to this, but nowhere is there any information on how to access and read this document. Therefore, how can I comment on it?

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

See comments in above sections

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