

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

Stakeholder ID 3127      Name Sarah      Woodhams

---

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:

**No the draft local plan fails to protect the green belt - this will result in the loss of green belt boundaries**

---

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:

**No there is no evidence which supports sustainable development to green belt boundaries. Theydon does not have a strong existing infrastructure. New housing developments will be better placed where there is the provision of additional development such as increased school capacity and larger doctors surgeries which Theydon does not and cannot provide.**

---

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**No it is more sustainable to locate large housing developments within towns, however I do not agree with any plan put forward that encroaches on any green belt areas.**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 3127

Name Sarah

Woodhams

---

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

No primary shopping areas can help with retail development however they can also have an impact on existing local facilities within smaller villages like Theydon. The plan should focus more on housing and employment development in the towns with existing primary shopping areas.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

No the plans for employment development on green belt sites are not sustainable and will have harsh impacts on our transport infrastructure.

---

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 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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

**No as 4 of the proposed sites are green belt and will have a very harmful impact on our village. It will completely ruin our village with regards to the setting and character. 360 houses means a 23% increase size to Theydon village. This will utterly destroy Theydon in every aspect - setting, countryside, cause infrastructure**

problems with regards to the roads, transport links, school places, doctor's appointments, flooding, facilities like water and electric. This is not a sustainable development strategy.

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:

**No the plan does not explain fully what the specific infrastructure provision will be also does not clearly state if the infrastructure needed will be provided at the right time when needed and not long after.**

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

**Theydon Bois is already at full capacity with regards to all transport links - roads, underground. The existing roads, underground and bus service is already over crowded and heavily congested. There are waiting times to get a doctors appointment. there are limited places at the local schools. All local services and utilities are a full capacity. Parking in Theydon is horrendous at the best of times yet there is no mention of a plan to tackle the parking problem. This plan will mean the lost of valuable green belt sites which should be maintained. Brownfield sites should be used for housing development not valuable green belt sites!**

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

**NO valuable green belt sites should be used for any development whilst there are more than adequate brownfield sites that can be used - this is something that every district should be looking at.**

---

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