

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

Stakeholder ID 2744 Name Anne Grigg

---

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

---

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:

The results of the Issues and Options consultation preferred the preferred option of Proportionate distribution has not been followed in the draft Local Plan. By ignoring the proportionate distribution outcome from the Issues and Options consultation, the North Weald percentage has changed from approx. 5.6% to over 23%

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Junction 7 M11 is currently overcapacity and there is a requirement for an additional new Junction 7a. Long tailbacks are frequently experienced with traffic queuing back for miles. Further development would have a detrimental impact on this Junction. Development would impact on Latton Priory and its setting as it a Listed Building Grade2\* Development should not breach the ridge. This land is Green Belt Grade 2 Agricultural land and Authorities should seek to use poorer quality land in preference to higher quality, which should be protected from development in order to ensure Food Security. NFU provide statistics in relation to the UK's self sufficiency in food and it has fallen from 75% in 1991 to 62% in 2012. NPPF identifies sustainable as

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

Stakeholder ID 2744

Name Anne

Grigg

---

meaning ensuring that better lives for ourselves does not mean worse lives for future generations. Therefore any development needed now to meet OAHN that is build on the best and most versatile agricultural land is not supported by the NPPF as it will mean the ability of future generations to meet their own needs is compromised.

---

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:

Whilst agreeing that North Weald Airfield should be an employment site, it should not be solely designated as employment. A more appropriate designation would be designated as Employment/Aviation/Leisure to ensure that the sole designation of Employment should not apply and exclude the other uses. North Weald residents have been assured over the years that aviation would continue as well as leisure facilities being available and therefore employment should not exclude these uses. Draft Policy D4 Community Leisure and Cultural Facilities references the communities response What you told us - regarding North Weald Airfield - "the potential role of North Weald Airfield for sports and recreational uses was recognised and promoted as a development 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**

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

5.110 suggests that the higher allocation is proposed taking into account the Master planning study and the land availability elsewhere in the District etc. but the draft total allocation of housing shows a significant oversupply and therefore a smaller growth would be adequate. There are key highway capacity constraints such as M11 J7; A414 between J7 and Rayley Lane; Junction of Epping Road and Thornwood Road The Plain J8. ECC has identified a lack of funding for road infrastructure. Without these improvements, sustainable transport will not have the desired effect of limiting the additional number of vehicle movements associated with the amount of proposed development. Much of the land identified for proposed development is classified as Grade2 Agricultural land. The NPPF references that L.A.s should when preparing local plans safeguard the long term potential of the best and most versatile agricultural land. I refer again to NFU and o the UK's self sufficiency in all food was 62% in 2012 down by a fifth since 1980 at a time when global food production needs to increase significantly. NFU fears that inadequate productivity have placed the country behind mainland Europe and as a result it fears that in 25years time self sufficiency will drop by a further 10%. I suggest that it is essential that there is retention of the best and most versatile land and areas of poorer quality should be used. It is estimated that 60,000 new farmers and farm workers will be required 2009 - 2017. Sites Latton Priory - Scheduled Ancient Monument - site of Augustinian priory of St John the Baptist. It includes crossing of the church which is the only monastic structure to survive as a standing building above ground . The Green Belt land acts as a barrier to prevent the sprawl from Harlow. SR-003 The Masterplan identifies a key constraint of development as the need to protect sensitive uses, particularly residential use located to the east of the Airfield from noise and non compatible development. SR-0036 - This is a site of grade 2 agricultural land and there is not sufficient justification for its removal from the food chain. Please see previous comments regarding Food Security and loss of valuable agricultural land. SR-O158A - This is a significant site of well farmed grade 2 agricultural land and there is no justification for removing this site of the best and most versatile land from the Country's food production industry. SR-O417 - The masterplan identifies constraints on development - the need to protect sensitive uses particularly residential east of the Airfield from noise and non compatible development. GRT N 06 - SR -0036 The site identified is too close to the settled community.

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

There have been issues in the past in relation to this site. This site is also grade 2 agricultural land and should not be withdrawn from that use. In addition the proposed development could impact upon the setting of a listed building. SR-512 - St Clements is a listed building and development on this site would impact upon its setting. It is north of Vicarage Lane West and therefore a stronger boundary would be retained if this site was excluded. Alteration to the Green Belt Boundary - Tempest Mead - I accept that this development area should be taken out of the Green Belt and support the identification of the area green hatched as District Open Land. However, I do not accept the further alteration to the Green Belt west of Station Road, which would take an area out of the Green Belt. This area should also be retained as District Open Land or the boundary should run along the west of Station Road and not allow a further area of green belt to be developed and I would not support that.

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**

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?

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

**Insufficient information given.**

---

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?