

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

Stakeholder ID 2861 Name Diane Clark

---

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:

EFDC needs to consider the views of local residents who wish to have Green Belt land protected for the future of its residents. You have included little/no guidance on any projected infrastructure developments. As a retired deputy head teacher, I find this lack of vision worrying. I have seen it all before sadly....

---

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:

Use should be made of brownfield sites and not green belt land which are the 'lungs' of the countryside. There are also derelict properties and land around which should be compulsorily purchased - people should not profit from land allowed to become derelict there are many health risks notwithstanding rats, rubbish and vandals! There are other parts of the county with lower population density and road infrastructure.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The proposed areas around Harlow are also on Green Belt land - this must be protected at all costs. Looking at the plan again, it seems that this proposal is at odds with the rest of the plan.

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

Stakeholder ID 2861

Name Diane

Clark

---

---

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?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The towns of Epping and Waltham Abbey are closest to me and I would certainly make more use of them if development of the town centres, not out of town malls were to be proposed. W Abbey is an historic town centre which is slowly dying and needs regeneration.

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I live near the top end of Hoe Lane and we are constantly horrified at the speed of vans going to businesses down there. Many times I have stopped huge lorries from turning into Betts Lane who want to drive down Hoe Lane to SR-0580 & SR-0151 Further heavy traffic should not be encouraged near this village particularly as thousands have recently been spent repairing the road surfaces damaged by huge vehicles. These are country lanes not two lane roads! Many workers travel out of the village for work. If improvement is needed, then put the buses back!

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 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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Proposed sites SR-0011, SR- 0300 (A,B,C) & SR-0473 are all Grade 1-3 Green Belt. I refer to my previous points in question 2. Brown field and derelict land is always preferential rather than the destruction of green belt. I cannot believe no thought has been given to the pressure on infrastructure. This beggars belief. I have seen the results of overcrowding in schools and community resources and it is not a desirable outcome for Nazeing. I do not believe that EFDC have sufficient resources to tackle existing problems with flood plains and resultant sewage issues in the Lower Nazeing Lea Valley area as it is. The lanes around upper Nazeing are also awash in

heavy rains and the Crooked Mile is a death trap when lorries speed along it in icy or wet conditions. These are country roads and cannot take more LGV/HGV traffic

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:

You simply cannot agree to these plans in such a state of unpreparedness! What evidence is there that upgrading of necessary services has been completed? None that I can find! Developments like these cannot and should not be used by EFDC as a means of filling the council's coffers only to blight areas like Nazeing and improve other areas' amenities. Levies raised for potential developments should be used to improve infrastructure ahead of projects, not even afterwards when chaos has been created. Clearly not enough attention and priority has been given to any credible feasibility study (ARUP). A visit to the local school is proof enough. Just try crossing the roads near the village during school run time .....Where is your evidence?

---

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

I can talk about this using my own experience. I moved to Nazeing as I was teaching in Waltham Abbey. I wanted to live in a rural environment with all that entails. I looked for a short journey to work, a conservation area where I could walk and enjoy the peace and quiet of the countryside and nature, with farmland for food production and plenty of wildlife. There is a special site in Betts Lane designed for protecting this wildlife which now suffers from drivers & LGVs throwing rubbish from van windows. There can be NO JUSTIFICATION for the destruction of this when brownfield and derelict land is available. As a Geographer I have been saying this in schools for 40 years! What about the National Planning Policy Framework or is this a work of fiction too?

---

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

I have been chatting to elderly neighbours who do not have the same level of understanding or competence with IT which is required to fill out this form. I have taken nearly an hour and consider myself competent in this field. Why have they been disenfranchised? Why no paid reply method by post? Only last month, I was reading about how the bus companies are also reducing services. How are non drivers supposed to get to the village (or anywhere else for that matter) without the bus? All of this put together does not seem to me to be 'joined up thinking'. Even the surgery in the village has had the number of doctors reduced. We have also

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

been left without a post office. Where is the evidence of thorough research which is what the residents deserve and is their right before irreparable damage is done and irreversible destruction of Green Belt occurs?

---