

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

Stakeholder ID 3017 Name Nora Nanayakkara

---

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:

The assumptions on which the plan are based are flawed. There is a lack of evidence of defined user need for the proposed development. The plan is aggressive and the proposed sites are poorly situated - if they go ahead, the negative effect on traffic (already bad!), health and schooling infrastructure (woeful) and access to

---

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 proposal assumes that everyone will wish to travel into London to work, or that the idea of a business and innovation hub around the M11 will work - there is no evidence to suggest that it will. Further, the proposed sites are all located near motorways, but have otherwise minimal infrastructural links and are poorly provided for in terms of traffic management, school places and access to NHS services. When there is an incident on the M11, the traffic along Epping New Road/through Epping and back towards Thornwood is so bad that it often takes more than half an hour to get from Kings Wood Park to the traffic lights at the bottom of the Plain.

---

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

...Redacted...

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

Stakeholder ID 3017

Name Nora

Nanayakkara

---

---

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

None of these proposal take into account the current traffic levels and the likely impact of adding retail amenities to areas where parking is already at a premium.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

---

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:

Traffic does not allow for development (please see response above which mentions traffic congestion, delays, pollution and road rage incidents around Kings Wood Park/The Plain/High Road when there is an incident on the M11, which happens with increasing regularity ) b) Development would cause unsustainable environmental impact c) Access to the site is sufficiently difficult to make the site unviable d) Wildlife issues - hedgehogs for example were frequently seen in Kings Wood park when we moved here in 2010 but are now very rare e) Details of the site are insufficient e.g. no details have been provided on parking and f) The infrastructure plan is insufficient to determine the viability of the plan (e.g. the district has not obtained commitments from the county council to determine if the plans would be carried out)

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**

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

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

**This draft infrastructure delivery plan is vague, with no clear commitments, the assumptions are untested and the projected outcomes are woolly.**

---

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?