

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

Stakeholder ID 2664      Name Akin      Tahsin

---

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:

**Draft plan is flawed, as there is no details of infrastructure, including sewage, traffic, roads, schools etc. No details of funding to support this growth. Plans not specific for people living in the area. Also green belt land rather than brownfield land. The policy must surely be to use up brownfield sites not greenbelt?**

---

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:

**Again the policy must be to use existing Brownfield sites not Green belt, which if used will be lost for ever. If the councils policy is such, then build more properties in Harlow, as there is more of a requirement for them, and they appear to want this. why not possible to create another village or town in less dense parts of Epping Forest district.**

---

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**The proposal is flawed, as the developments proposed are on greenbelt land**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2664

Name Akin

Tahsin

---

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?

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

SR-0580 and SR-0151 sites are in a very narrow country lane (Hoe Lane) which is not suitable for large forms of transport. Nazeing is coming under considerable use of heavy goods vehicles as we speak, which is causing other issues, like congestion/traffic problems and even speeding in the area. The roads are becoming increasingly dangerous for our children, which is unacceptable. New or expanded employment sites will have an adverse effect to the whole infrastructure of our village, and this must not be allowed to happen. Most of the employment force in Nazeing, travel into the area to work.

---

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), and SR-0473 are on Grade 1-3 Greenbelt, again Epping forest District Council have ignored the Derelict and Brownfield sites, instead opting for Greenbelt land which if used would be lost for ever. Rather than concentrating on bringing the infrastructure up to date to reduce the pressure on the already strained infrastructure, EFDC are adding to it with the proposed 220 houses in the local plan, not including the 80 plus currently approved developments in the area. There is a major requirement to address the ongoing excessive that Nazeing is facing at present, like the growing traffic, including the use of our roads by the large HGV lorries, which not only damage our roads, but add to the traffic congestion, and is a constant

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

threat to our children. The constant flooding, the poorly maintained sewers and the rainwater run offs which cause the effluent to escape from the damaged sewer systems and causing contamination of waterways. The unacceptable excessive power cuts to our area (this is now 2016 not 1970s). The of public transport, lack of police in the area. rather than dealing with the above, **....Redacted....** Surely it would be prudent to get the infrastructure right first and then to look at the best way to serve the community?

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:

The Arup Assessment is correct, so should be discarded. It shows that our school has vacancies, which is not correct and also shows the areas around the proposed development sites as uncongested at the peak time of the day. Confirmation must be given by EFDC that the Developer Levies must be spent on the infrastructure of Nazeing (schools, roads, sewers etc) A clear plan and assessment must be developed for the delivery of the infrastructure, including responsibilities, prior to the implementation of any plan.

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

Threat to the natural beauty of the area, including destruction of wildlife. Again EFDC are suggesting Greenbelt land to be used rather than Brownfield sites and other derelict sites, and do not give reasons why. There will be a massive impact on the environment, the landscape and the beauty of the area.

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

There is no plan for the deteriorating public transport system, which is promoting more usage of cars, causing traffic problems, including pollution. There seems to be a lack of research and assessment of the areas, regarding the infrastructure and the plan to extend Nazeing. There should be a consultation with the whole population of Nazeing, which would benefit the area. **....Redacted....**

---

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