

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

Stakeholder ID 3082 Name Christopher Brewer

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 draft plan is not beneficial for the current residents or future residents who live in the area. It provides no information or commitment to services, infrastructure or funding to support growth or provision of services, which have currently been withdrawn (bus services)

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:

Building on green belt land is irreversible, brownfield sites should be utilised instead.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Again the Harlow development is using green belt land, which is irreversible. brownfield sites within the district should be used. Also the proposal doesn't appear to cover the aims of the plan. Is that a mistake??

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

Stakeholder ID 3082

Name Christopher

Brewer

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?

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:

The sites SR-00580 & SR-0151 are in the very narrow Hoe Lane, which is unsuitable for lorries. Any new or expanded employment sites near villages such as Nazeing should not increase heavy goods traffic through the village as it is clear that it is not policed given the over weight goods vehicles, which are allowed into restricted areas without penalty.

---

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 sites SR-0011, SR-0300 (A,B&C) and SR-0473 are grade 1-3 Green Belt. EFDC appears to have ignored brownfield land and chosen sites only from land of those who want to lose our green belt. The proposal of 220 houses on top of the 80+ approved developments will increase pressure on the infrastructure, which has not

been comprehensively addressed in the plan with regard to increased services demand, road safety, schools, public transport, traffic control & policing of heavy goods vehicles.

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:

There has been little assessment of sewerage, drainage and flooding. Any proposals should be in place before any proposals are considered and approved. The ARUP assessment appears to be flawed as it shows local schools having vacancies that don't exist and the areas around proposed developments as uncongested at peak times which is clearly wrong based upon local observations.

---

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

The local plan fails to demonstrate or provide adequate justification for the need to build on primary/grade 1-3 green belt land in preference to previously developed or derelict land. This is contrary to National Guidance in National Planning Policy Framework. It impacts upon environment, nature, the character of the villages and landscapes which already exist. It is also a threat to wildlife and land currently used to produce food, which has been steadily declining for decades.

---

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

There appears to be inadequate depth of research and investigation with particular reference to the development of Nazeing. Older residents may not get the chance to put forward their opinion as questionnaires have not been posted with the facility to return, some residents are not computer literate or possess the equipment to state their opinion. A thorough review should take place with the emphasis on preserving our green belt and developing brownfield options. Preserving the villages character and landscape should be paramount. EFDC have shown no tendency to provide sufficient public transport or consider the impact of all the infrastructures in the past and now apparently in the future.

---

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