

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

Stakeholder ID 2069 Name Barbara Houghton

---

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:

How can the vision be to protect the Green Belt when you plan to erode the boundaries in such a way. I fear the loss of what makes our area special by over building in the small communities.

---

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:

How is it sensible to spread development over the region, when so many of the smaller villages and hamlets do not have the necessary infrastructure to support these massive increases in numbers. Government policy would suggest that focusing on the towns that have schools/road and health care structure already in place is a more coherent route to development.

---

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

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Why urbanise more areas when there are towns that already have this infrastructure in place.

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2069

Name Barbara

Houghton

---

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No opinion

Loughton Broadway?

No opinion

Chipping Ongar?

No opinion

Loughton High Road?

No opinion

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Epping can't cope with the trough-traffic headed for m11/m25 as it is. A shopping centre would result in more traffic and bring the road network to a standstill. Waltham Abbey has dual carriageways and is more geared to coping with the numbers of shoppers that would result.

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

It seems more likely that a focused development of towns ; providing state of the transport, infrastructure and workforce would be more likely to produce sustainable employment growth than a half baked plan to try to develop small pockets of employment. Do one or two areas really well rather than many sites half-baked.

---

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:

This planned development would mean that the village grow by 23% and would have a grave impact on the rural character of the village. It would destroy the character, not reflecting the so called 'vision' of your plan. four of the selected sites are in Green Belt which stops the South East becoming on huge urban sprawl. It was designed to protect the countryside from the blight of Urban Creep. It must be upheld at all costs.

Deforestation, loss of farm land, loss of enjoyable open spaces, are all things that the government pledge to protect. This seems an illogical proposal.

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

**There is scant detail on provision and timing of infrastructure. It is pointless building new homes before improving roads/health care facilities/parking etc . this is why it is more sensible to focus growth in towns that are more geared to coping with this expansion, thanks to previous investment.**

---

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

**I do not feel that the interim sustainability Appaisal does support the spread of development across villages with our district. The roads in Theydon at peak times in the morning and evening are already creaking, but add a quarter again and it would become impossible. The narrow roads do not lend themselves to safe cycling. The underground station is already nearing capacity in peak times. Bus services on these narrow streets will add to the congestion especially in the vicinity of the tube station. loss of high quality Green belt land in small villages that have inadequate infrastructure makes no sense and displays a lack of clear thinking within the council.**

---

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?  
green belt/infrastructure provision

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

These outrageous plans to wipe away the Green Belt and blight the countryside must be reconsidered. Its fine to say that employment would be generated and infrastructure provide, but what employment? what infrastructure? where will people park? More houses in Theydon will be more people commuting to London. It will not mean more local jobs of a sustainable manner. Farmland will be effected by any necessary road and car park development. this will be common to many of the small villages. Congestion on small country lanes will result. The whole plan really needs a re-think.

---

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