

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

Stakeholder ID 2677 Name Kiera McEvoy

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

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:

No. The draft local plan does not protect the green belt. This would result in losing many definable green belt boundaries. I do not agree that the proposed housing numbers are needed as it will encourage inward migration from London. The sites are only in the local plan because the landowners have made them available, not because they are part of an effective sustainable development strategy. This means there are no proper restraints to control the overall vision.

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:

No. The incursions into the green belt have been poorly thought through and there is no detailed justification for hundreds of new houses to be built around Theydon Bois. Central Government and Epping Forest policy states when green belt boundaries are being drawn up the local planning authorities should take into account promoting sustainable patterns of development. The local plan locates housing etc around the District regardless of size, open space, employment etc - this is wrong and does not promote sustainable patterns of development. None of the evidence produced by EFDC supports this approach and is not inline with Central Gov thinking. New development should be focused on towns as they already benefit from good infrastructure and they also have the space to provide additional development for, for example, more schools and doctors practices

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

Stakeholder ID 2677

Name Kiera

McEvoy

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I believe it is more sustainable to focus the development on towns. However, I disagree with any kind of approach that encroaches into the green belt

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:

No. New employment opportunities should be focused towards the larger towns which are keen to expand.

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:

No. Four of the sites are in the green belt and these have been identified as having a high or very high level of harm if allocated for new housing. They are located within the 'village envelope' or have clearly definable boundaries which should not be breached. This harm will result in encroachment into the countryside. The plan has no justification or reasoning which outweighs this harm so the green belt boundaries should therefore

not be changed as part of this plan. The sites are not part of the plan due being part of an effective sustainable development strategy - they are only included because of land owner permission

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:

Any requirements for infrastructure appear to be general, unspecific and difficult to quantify. The requirements for infrastructure only deal with the needs for new development which is unlikely to solve existing problems and shortfalls

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

This does not support the wide dispersal of development around villages in the district. For Theydon Bois the appraisal sets out the basis of assessing sites in the Green Belt was "to enable sufficient sites to be considered to maximise existing sustainable transport links within the settlement" This new development will cause problems as the transport links are already at capacity and therefore will create even more congestion and overcrowding. The wide dispersal of development sites will not perform well with the sustainability objectives. The villages identified will still have to rely on the larger towns for numerous facilities such as libraries, doctors and schools. This will lead to even more congestion as there will be a greater reliance on cars as transportation. It will also not help protect the strategic role of the Green Belt in these smaller settlements. The Sustainability Appraisal states that the approach to the Green Belt sites will protect the most high value sites from development. The document then contradicts itself by stating high quality Green Belt land will be lost and goes further still by stating that the loss of Green Belt land will have "significant negative effects" It is therefore not accepted that high quality Green Belt land should be undermined by the Sustainability Appraisal, and indeed such high quality Green Belt land provides a strategic role that should be considered as showstoppers to any development.

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?

The policies are severely lacking for example, there are no detailed Green Belt policies to define disproportionate extensions in the Green Belt, or direct what is meant by 'materially larger'. Also the policies are too general. How do we know the local character of Theydon Bois will be protected? There are very few visual links between the proposed sites and the existing village especially as they are separated by the railway.
