

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

Stakeholder ID 2660 Name Christine Morris

---

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:

**It all sounds very good but the draft plan does not appear to meet the aim of protecting green belt.**

---

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:

**Any new housing should not be on Green Belt.**

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**There should only be Green Belt Development when it is the ONLY option.**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2660

Name Christine

Morris

---

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:

There are significant problems with traffic in Nazeing, the proposal to develop existing sites implies that there will be further development of sites such as Hoe Lane, Nazeing, a country lane which is blighted by heavy traffic that travels through the centre of the village; locations such as these should be considered for housing which would ease the traffic issues. Any employment development should be located with easy access to traffic infrastructure. Nazeing employment should be developed on the Broxbourne side of the village, giving access to A10 and M25, so reducing additional traffic and congestion in the village.

---

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:

5 of the 6 are PRIME GREEN BELT There does not appear to be any rational behind the selections. Nazeing is not a typical village. As well as being blighted by traffic it is also suffers from neglected old nurseries/greenhouse sites which are eye-sores and the development of which would be beneficial to the character of the village. There seems no logic in locating sites to the south and east of the village; most of the resulting travel would be through the centre towards Broxbourne so if there has to be development it should be located to the west of the village. It is difficult to identify the sites in the documentation but the land between Langley Green and Nursery Road would be ideal and would allow potential development of the

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

Fernbank Nursery site behind the shops - I believe these are SR-0298 and SR-0160 respectively. There is also a parcel of land which separates Paynes Lane from the centre of the village (SR-0583) which has been derelict for years, I believe it is an old nursery site and would be ideal with easy access to Broxbourne, development would have minimal impact on the village and also remove an eye-sore.

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:

Cannot find much detail regarding infrastructure improvement. There are significant problems in Nazeing with sewers, flooding, power and traffic. A report also implies that there is no congestion around the proposed sites at peak times - this is not true of the southern sites on St Leonards Road where there are often significant queues and this casts doubt on the validity of the report.

---

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

It's been hard enough to find anything in these documents - but an Interim Sustainability Appraisal - where?

---

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

I have found it very difficult to obtain a questionnaire, it is very time consuming and difficult to find, read and understand the report and I believe this is a deliberate and probably very successful action to minimise the number of respondents!

---