

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

Stakeholder ID 2470 Name Deborah Freeland

---

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:

I can see no details on infrastructure/funding to support the future of any housing developments detailed in the DLP. (Draft Local Plan) The infrastructure/funding must have content to support current residents as well as future new residents living in the area as a result of additional housing and I cannot see this? The DLP says it's for 'the people', but without detail of above, how can it be?

---

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 word 'release' is used very glibly by EPDC here. Once 'released' the Green Belt land will be gone forever. Have the council considered I wonder: Increasing number of proposals in Harlow, which seemingly wants to expand? Creating a new town in a part of the county with lower population numbers than Nazeing? Building on one of several areas of derelict/Brownfield land around the village?

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

EFDC need to explain how their proposed developments are compatible with the stated aims of the plan. The areas around Harlow sited for development are on Green Belt land.

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

Stakeholder ID 2470

Name Deborah

Freeland

---

---

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:

The new sites SR-0580 and SR-0151 are in Hoe Lane, **....Redacted....**. Lorries already thunder past our home morning, noon and night to access industrial areas in Hoddesdon. Roads are constantly in need of repair as they are not built for this kind of traffic. Hoe Lane, sited, is very narrow and totally unsuitable for lorries and volumes of traffic. Any expanded or new employment sites in and around Nazeing must have controls imposed to restrict heavy lorry movement in order not to add to volume of heavy goods vehicles already passing through 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:

The proposed sites are grade 1-3 Green Belt. SR0011, SR0300(A,B,C), SR0473. There are already major problems in current infrastructure: Rainwater run off Road Safety Flash Flooding Poorly maintained sewers Over subscribed school Lack of public transport All difficulties mentioned in list above will be severely heightened if 220 additional houses, along with 80 already approved, are built in Nazeing. I suspect the draft plan to create something in the region of 600 additional vehicles traveling through my village daily. ....Redacted.... there only has to be a tiny incident on any of the major roads surrounding the area - M11, A10, M25 and I have total 'gridlock' outside my house through sheer volume of

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

traffic. Nazeing cannot cope with any additional numbers of vehicles on a daily basis. EFDC has ignored Brownfield/derelict land in favor of Green Belt land. Why?

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:

Commitment is needed that EFDC would spend developer levies for infrastructure expenditure on mitigation of impacts of the development. There must be full and open assessments in all aspects of upgrading to sewerage, drainage, flooding prevention and water supply before occupation. Such assessments must state monitoring procedures and responsibilities before and developments on the EFDC plan are approved. ARUP have carried out an assessment. Local school is shown as having vacancies. Such vacancies do not exist. Areas around proposed development sites are shown as uncongested at peak times. Simply incorrect. Whole village is congested at peak times.

---

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

National guidance in National Planning and Policy Framework suggests that there must be adequate justification to build on Grade 1 - 3 Green Belt land in preference to Brownfield/derelict land already in existence. EFDC draft local plan seems to have overlooked this point? The Local Plan does not clearly demonstrate the need to build on Primary Green Belt. EFDC do not seem to have considered the impact these proposals would have on the character of our village, threat to wildlife, and destruction of land already used to produced food.

---

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

I believe that the plan needs to be revisited as far as Nazeing is concerned. EFDC should look more carefully at the village of Nazeing considering development of Brownfield/derelict sites in order to preserve our Green Belt land which gives our village its character. The plan is huge and there simply seems to have been a lack of in-depth research in siting the areas for development in Nazeing. The already high volume of traffic through the village is being severely impacted upon by the reduction of local bus services to the area, which will only increase if proposals in the DLP were to go ahead.

---

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