**Appendix 1**

**Epping Town Council**

**ExtraOrdinary meeting comments on Epping Forest District Council’s draft Local Plan**

**27-10-16**

**General comments**

Number of units for Epping is too high.

Accept some growth

If community facilities are to be removed, they must be reproduced and enhanced to accommodate the additional numbers

Infrastructure must be provided to accompany development. How is it possible to accept or make decisions on these key areas, when the accompanying service and infrastructure plans are not in place? How do we know they will be delivered as promised?

Aspirational plan with little detail

Certain key documents not produced yet, eg transport and services

Look at density of development to preserve green belt

Don’t develop all car parks at the same time – keep same number and enhance as more development will need more parking not less

Congestion during construction

Loss of parking during construction

Too many houses, too much development, some site selection poor

Evidence is not complete

Traffic and congestion already a major issue in Epping – 6 of the district ‘hotspots’ in Epping – how is it sustainable to add to this with no mention of road improvements?

Parking – already at major capacity. Want to boost the town? How can we do this without parking and just more residences

**Site specific comments**

**Area as a whole**

**0069 (land at Ivy Chimneys Road) – 79 homes approx.**

**Less environmental damaged - field**

**0069/33 (land south of Epping) – 255 homes approx**

**0333Bi (Epping sw area) – 24 homes approx**

**0445 – 23 homes approx**

**0113B (land to south of Brook Road) – 244 homes approx**.

Size of site reduced.

Green Belt. Vistas out to open countryside

Ivy Chimneys potentially Ok – drs and relief road for the area?

Roads and access bad. Would need to relieve congestion.

Improved facilities. School for this area.

This is not sustainable as existing. Roads are a nightmare already. Improve infrastructure, otherwise this is not sustainable development.

**0071 (land at Stonards Hill) -115 homes**

No

0071 upwards is a real no no. This parcel up through Old Pastures (not on this plan) = no.

This is proper countryside

Green space

Access is by 1 private lane

Environmental issues – corridor used by wildlife into forest. Big badger sett, etc.

Huge diversity of wildlife.

Vistas over Canary Wharf

**0132Ci (Epping Sports Club, Lower Bury Lane) – 49 homes approx**

**Section 1: Sports Clubs**

Loss of cricket/tennis & bowls = when further amenity loss when residents have told us sports facilities are very important

Access down Lower Bury Lane – narrow and busy with school

Not sustainable development

Loss of amenity

If the town is growing, we need more sports facilities **in the town**

**Section 2: Fields**

Creeds Farm to Cemetery = natural boundary of Epping

Vistas into Epping

Dangerous precedent

Swaines Green acted as a buffer zone, this just moving development to the other side

A development too far

**0153 (land north of Stewards Green Road) – 305 homes**

Vista over countryside. Avoid losing that. Essex Way runs through it.

Ruined for the neighbours. Will take away the side line of greenery for the Orchards. Been trying to preserve the bungalow area.

Perhaps move the site up towards the railway line where less damaging

Size? Density?

Area with fewest community facilities. Steep hill.

Would need a local shop or services.

**0208 (Theydon Place) – 66 homes approx.**

No

Part of Bell Common

Loss of vistas. Wildlife. Bats. Green playground and local wildlife site/corridor for wildlife. Many dog walkers.

Huge diversity of wildlife.

**0229 (Epping London Underground car park and land adjacent to Epping Station) – 89 home approx**

Car park underground. Parking must be maintained. Development here would need more parking, as dwellings would also need parking. What about during construction?

Could parking be tiered to increase numbers and preserve green belt?

How high will development be? 3 storeys? Underground and two above? Visual impact on Epping and for the neighbours?

Extend Oyster to Harlow to deter outside commuters

More parking in centre rather than at station, all at the station just for commuters and not using the town

**0348 (Cottis Lane car park) – 54 homes approx & 0349 (Bakers Lane car park) – 41 homes approx**

Parking must be maintained. Development here would need more parking, as dwelling swould also need parking. What about during construction?

Height and density ruin look of town?

Town centre parking to encourage town use. All parking at station = commuters, not using shops, market and town. Market important; evidenced.

**0347 (Epping Sports Centre, Nicholl Road) – 44 homes approx**

Outdated and old-fashioned

Brownfield site which could be developed but a better one must be provided within Epping. Where will the replaced sports faciliites go?

**0555 (St Margaret’s Hospital Site) – 181 homes approx**

Keep core facilities in town. Many older residents can’t take multiple buses for basic health services such as blood tests.

Some offices maybe? Some development? Some parking?

Look at as part of overall health strategy but when will this be available?

Congestion here is already dreadful. A problem now that will become a bigger problem with more development and traffic. This is not sustainable.

Environment quality and air quality poor? How is this sustainable?

**0556 (Civic Offices, High Street) – 42 homes approx.**

Could this be mixed use? Offices and residential? Employment in town.

Where will the staff park? (Stonards Hill is already used for this and shouldn’t be).

Development should respect the setting, conservation area and green, should not be high rise. The skyline from Epping Green and bungalows in Homefield Close should be protected.

**0587 (Epping Sanitary Steam and Laundry Co Ltd, Bower Vale) – 22 homes approx.**

Brownfield site. Vacant. Ok as long as access details sorted out through the planning application process

**0404 (Instititute Road allotments) – 27 homes approx**

EFDCs own report says allotments are popular

Have they been marketed fairly?

Part already developed

**0405 (Coopersale Cricket Club & CTG School Playing Fields) – 19 homes approx**

Cricket pitch in the Green Belt – double hit

Coopersale already taken a lot of development and its only a village

Not enough properties to trigger infrastructure and school, etc already at capacity. Drs? Area can’t take much more

Why take away all the leisure facilities when residents want and need

Need leisure and recreation within walking distance of Coopersale

Buffer to forest

**Other land - thoughts**

Committee discussed alternative areas but no other sites were proposed as suggested alternatives at this meeting.

Areas mentioned were:

Piece of land in front of Birch View (near St Margaret’s)

Mill House – though Green Belt

Private car parks if any not used. Intensification of use/better used? (Back of library and onwards). Though consider deliveries.

Land down near Bower Hill Industrial estate

Area NW of Epping

St John’s Development – windfall? Should it be windfall?