

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

Stakeholder ID 2554      Name Linda      Richardson

---

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 local plan will erode the protection of the green belt, resulting in the loss of vitally important clear definable boundaries.

---

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:

Development on this scale is not in line with current government guidelines, it does not show regard for our green belt to take into account local facilities which are at full capacity already, i.e. Parking, GP surgery, and the primary school. We do not have employment opportunities for such a large number of homes, and do not have the capacity or infrastructure to cater for such an increase.

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow would be able to absorb a modest increase with minor adjustments. This would however need to ensure green belt is not affected, amenities and infrastructure are in place first. E.g. The hospital is already at full capacity. Is there an intention to improve employment opportunities, and policing?

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

Stakeholder ID 2554

Name Linda

Richardson

---

---

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

It is vital to protect and do everything possible to ensure local retailers are given as much support as possible, particularly those individuals who are not part of vast franchises and chains. These provide the areas with excellent quality goods, foods and services and must be cherished. We need to preserve the high streets. Initiatives such as free parking on weekends is vital to encourage people away from giant retail parks. We need to promote local and be proud of our local area. Characterless retail outlets will destroy places like Buckhurst Hill, Loughton and Epping which are a pleasure to visit. Primary shopping needs to be sympathetic to existing local facilities.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

This proposal is not sustainable, takes no account of the green belt, and would have a detrimental effect on the transport and infrastructure which is already struggling to cope.

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Having chosen to live in a small village for over 20 years, it is quite astonishing that the 4 sites show no regard for the green belt in and around the village which would suffer irreparable damage. 360 homes, an increase of 23%, would change the village beyond recognition and therefore does not comply with EFDC's vision. The

present roads only just cope with the traffic in and out of the village during peak times, the local school is full, and the demand on our surgery is at full capacity. Local utilities need careful consideration too.

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?

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The infrastructure provision is vague and non committal. Any new development need robust carefully thought out infrastructure plans put in before any development takes place not a cheap afterthought. At present nothing is in place to ensure adequate timely provision will be in place.

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

Large scale development in and around villages like Theydon Bois is not supported by the sustainability appraisal. Out train link is full to capacity in peak times, introducing 360 homes in an area where there is no employment will increase demand on this overcrowded service, increase car journeys on the overcrowded roads. Parking at the station which is poorly served by buses and roads is woefully inadequate already. Most homes will require 2 people in employment- 720 extra journeys a day in and out of the village. If 1/3 have young children that is 100 school places at least. 3 school classes. Completely changing the nature of the present school or is a new school envisage, if so where? Secondary places will also be needed too. Why are high quality sites even being considered for development, when there are alternatives like brown fields sites? All green belt areas must be preserves for future generations in their entirety. Housing is not a special consideration.

---

## 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?

**Parking provision- why is this not mentioned. With 360 homes, most with 2 cars surely parking must be a primary consideration in a village where there are serious restrictions already. Green belt policies on extensions to properties in the green belt- guidelines and rules need to be specific and enforced robustly to avoid further over development with no regard for the environment. Rules for the redevelopment of properties already in former green belt areas need to be detailed to ensure sympathetic development much in the same ways as a listed building.**

---