

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

Stakeholder ID	2888	Name	Jarek Trykozko
----------------	------	------	----------------

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:

The analysis on population growth within Epping Forest District was made few years ago, prior to Brexit decision, which is going to rapidly slow down and perhaps even reduce a population growth over the next decade(s). Therefore population growth assumed in the Local Plan is a great overestimate. The EFDC report on 'Open Spaces etc' estimates this to be 16,500 by 2031. Yet the new Local Plan proposes 11,500 new dwellings, with an average of 2.5 beds per dwelling, anticipating therefore 30,000 new beds. That is more than double what was anticipated even before Brexit. At the same time the Local Plan is underestimating or simply ignoring the current actual overcrowding of : (a) London Underground Central Line Epping branch, (b) local roads and the one through Epping in particular. It is claimed that Central Line Epping Branch has spare capacity and is under used. The simple truth is while one can get on the train at Epping, few stops down the line and the real congestion is beyond its limit. Ask passengers trying to get on at Woodford and beyond. The main road via Epping is a gridlock at rush hours already. You need to observe the two junctions at the entrance and exit from Epping to see that. Recent Essex Transport Strategy report stated: "Epping also suffers from significant congestion during peak times of travel. Part of the town centre has been declared as an Air Quality Management Area, as a result of high levels of pollutants from traffic." Also, everything should be done to protect the Green Belt around London. Once lost it will never come back. Given the evidence above I cannot understand why so much new housing is proposed for Epping and surrounding areas. An analysis done few years ago concluded no more than 6,000 dwellings. The new Local Plan proposes double that at almost 12,000. Not only that. The figure of almost 12,000 does not include the certain housing development in the centre of Epping by St John's.

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

Stakeholder ID	2888	Name	Jarek Trykozko
----------------	------	------	----------------

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

**Any new housing should focus on the area inside M25 and save Green Belt from being damaged.**

---

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

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**The Plan seems to add more pressure on already congested links to London via M11 and Central Line.**

---

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

Epping?

**Yes**

Buckhurst Hill?

**No opinion**

Loughton Broadway?

**No opinion**

Chipping Ongar?

**No opinion**

Loughton High Road?

**No opinion**

Waltham Abbey?

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

**But the new Epping Town Centre should include a Sports Centre. I do not think that there is a need for a cinema.**

---

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

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

---

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

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:

The plan proposes that Epping Sports Centre is sold for housing. No equal or better replacement is offered for Epping. Contrary to government's and local policy promises and recommendations submitted by local people in the recent 'St Johns Road' study. According to 'Essex Sports Facilities Strategy', "in urban areas, all persons should be within 20min walking time of a larger leisure centre and swimming pool open to community". Epping and Loughton are recognised as the two main Town Centres in the District and yet Epping is to be denied a Sport Centre? Instead citizens of Epping are offered 7-8 miles drive to Loughton or Waltham Abbey or Ongar. That would generate additional road traffic for those that can be bothered with driving to such distant locations, others would simply give up, while our young people of Epping would have nowhere to spend their extra energy. Welcome to obesity and antisocial behaviour that would result from such decision. The Plan

also proposes to damage Green Belt by re-locating Epping Sports Clubs from one side of Bury Lane to the other. It is only a question of time and the new site is converted to or partially taken by housing.

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:

Transport = The proposed Plan does not make sufficient improvements to the existing infrastructure. Leisure = The Plan proposes that Epping does not need a Sports Centre. Because there would be provisions in Loughton, Waltham Abbey, Ongar. Given how big Epping is and the fact that it is recognised as a Town Centre in the Plan, and the other places are approx 8 miles away, it is difficult to understand this proposal.

---

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?