

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

Stakeholder ID 2801 Name Alan Roberts

---

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 overall vision is satisfactory but the plan does put priority on protecting the Green Belt and there is inadequate definition of infrastructure plans and piecemeal approach to job creation. Instead of protecting the green belt as expressed in the vision the plan is for building on many parcels of Green Belt in the villages and towns in Epping in preference to brownfield sites or previously developed green belt sites which are often eyesores or derelict. This plan will lead to the urbanisation of Epping's towns and villages and greatly affect the rural nature of Epping. The building in towns and villages will mean putting more pressure on the infrastructure which is often already inadequate. The draft infrastructure plan is very weak on actual detailed plans which should be implemented in advance of the building of houses or employment sites. Many of the new houses proposed as part of the plan will be occupied by commuters to other areas particularly London or Stansted Corridor because of the good transport links in Epping which will hardly help Epping develop local economy.

---

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:

Harlow has the infrastructure to support increased housing and employment sites. However the plan is half hearted about this approach. It should not release Green Belt land in the towns and villages for housing but instead Epping should plan for all the target house numbers to be allocated to the areas around Harlow. In allocating a number of the house target to other towns and villages in EFDC area which do not have the same facilities as Harlow to cope it is creating an unsustainable problem. Harlow has numerous sustainable advantages to employers and residents. Very good facilities such as road, rail, buses, hospitals, schools,

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

Stakeholder ID 2801 Name Alan Roberts

---

shopping, sports facilities, etc all which would be easily upscaled to cope with more houses and employment locations over the plan period.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

See answer to previous question.

---

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

Epping?

No opinion

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:

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

As a Nazeing resident the proposed employment sites in Hoe Lane are inexplicable. Hoe lane is a very narrow country lane and is unsuitable for more traffic. Sites of employment in Epping should be concentrated in locations outside of towns and villages which will help reduce lorry and van movements in the narrow roads of towns and villages. The plan is an opportunity to solve problems of the spread randomly of sites of industry and employment but the plan has not been bold enough. This is a missed opportunity.

---

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:

The sites selected for housing in Nazeing are all but one are all on Green Belt land and all are prime grade 1-3 agricultural farm land currently in use for food production. However in Nazeing there are numerous sites used previously for glass house industry which are either derelict or uneconomical. See Lea Valley Growers Association report. See <http://www.lvga.co.uk/lea-valley-growers-win-national-awards/the-future-of-the-lea-valley-glasshouse-industry/> This lists several sites which could be used for housing but have been ignored by the planners. This is contrary to NPPF which states: "Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value" and "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been

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

previously developed or brownfield land. In fact Nazeing should be seen as a special case because of the number of these sites which could be developed for housing often they abutt housing so if developed would enhance the rural character of Nazeing. The plan has not demonstrated the exceptional circumstances or the support of local people for the utilisation of Green Belt land which the NPPF makes clear when it states: development may be allowed only where very special circumstances exist, and that Green Belt boundaries should only be adjusted in exceptional circumstances, through the Local Plan process and with the support of local people". There is no evidence that local people have been consulted on the changes to Green Belt. The Nazeing Parish Council have not provided facilities to acquaint the residents of the local plan or its content. Nor have EFDC apart from distributing a small introductory leaflet to all residents. This leaflet identifies the top priorities from feedback of residents as : NO 1 - PROTECTING THE GREEN BELT It is therefore surprising that in Nazeing and other towns and villages the Green Belt has been changed to accommodate the plan when good alternatives are available.

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:

In respect of Nazeing, the infrastructure is already inadequate. •There is too many too much traffic due to its location as a rat run for commuters from London or the M25 heading for Harlow, Broxbourne, Hoddesdon or other towns north along A10. •Too many HGV due to very large commercial horticultural businesses supplying products to all major supermarkets. Also there is growth in distribution warehouses in Nazeing and routes to other industrial activities in Hoddesdon. •The primary roads are very narrow and HGVs cannot pass each other without mounting the verges. •The primary school is overcrowded. •Broadband is inadequate •Parts suffer with flooding regularly. •No bus services (last will be withdrawn in early 2017). •Lack of pavements causing residents to have to use their cars. The draft Infrastructure section is big on data although lacks credibility as it shows for example the primary school having vacancies but in fact the school is overcrowded. Hence my view is that the plan provides no viable solutions to the current infrastructure issues let alone the increased pressure that would be arise from increased housing.

---

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

The Draft Sustainability report lists the key sustainability objectives such as Air Quality, traffic congestion, flood risk, sewerage, car dependency, transport and PROTECT GREEN BELT. This report does not mention Nazeing where all these objectives are key to our lives In the village. The report is therefore inadequate when it comes to local circumstances in Nazeing. It will be damaged in respect of all the key sustainability objectives of the plan.

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

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

P10

The local plan is inadequate in its depth of research into special needs of Nazeing. Nazeing has unique attributes that need addressing for reasons listed in answers above. The Nazeing Parish Council and the EFDC Councillors for Nazeing have been delinquent in their duties to the residents. They should have developed a NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN which would have fed into EFDC Local Plan. They chose not to do this for reasons best known to them. I would highlight two special needs ignored by the local plan in respect of Nazeing. •The existence of several derelict or uneconomical green house sites have been ignored when deciding on location of housing instead the easy option of selecting green belt land has been taken. WHY? •The poor state of the infrastructure in Nazeing has been ignored. See list in list in Q7. The draft infrastructure plans has only platitudes about solutions. In respect of Nazeing some can be solved with right investment like school places but width of roads, the size of Horticultural businesses and traffic congestion caused by commuting cannot be changed. EFDC has been delinquent in communicating the details of the plan. Certainly every one had a small leaflet delivered to their homes. The leaflet makes the point that THIS IS YOUR PLAN. However it is not an easy task to understand the impact of the plan say on a village like Nazeing in a document which is several hundred pages long. Many of the residents are ageing and do not have facilities to access the plan on line or have the option of travelling to one of the exhibitions. The leaflet asks for FEEDBACK. That has not been made easy. Few paper copies of the feedback form were available in Nazeing. Completing the questionnaire on line is also a complex task which will deter people for answering. The timing of the deadline which clashes with Christmas preparations will also reduce the responses. There should be a bye line on the statement in the small leaflet - GIVE US YOUR RESPONSES. It should say IF YOU CAN READ THE HUGE REPORT AND FATHOM THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON LINE I attended an exhibition at Waltham Abbey I tried to understand how the decisions about Nazeing were made but those present just kept directing me to huge documents as they had no detailed knowledge of Nazeing. I came away with my questions unanswered. EFDC or Nazeing Parish Council should have had public presentations of the decisions made about Nazeing. The one public meeting organised by residents was heavily attended which shows the interest but councillors although invited did not attend. It should not have been the residents on their own trying to make sense of the plan. When Nazeing Parish Council were urged to explain the plan to the villagers they included an item on the monthly meeting and published agenda on the village notice board. Consequently few people attended and Richard Basset, local EFDC councillor with knowledge of the plan, arrived late. This was attempt was totally inadequate in communicating the plan to the village