

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

Stakeholder ID 2704 Name Robert Williams

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:

This doesn't give any information on how it will be paid for or how the already overloaded road system will be hit by yet more traffic. This means that the plans are certainly not going to be beneficial to future generations, let alone those of us here already.

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:

This is the destruction of Green Belt, by any other name. Why not use the ample Brownfield areas that exist in the locality? Road building at these sites is cheaper as well. As Harlow seems to wish to expand, why not build there, as long as it doesn't encroach into other villages?

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The plan's aims seem to be at odds with this proposal. Harlow is surrounded by the Green Belt, so it must not be built on, especially in such an intensive way.

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

Stakeholder ID 2704

Name Robert

Williams

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:

More business equals more industry equals more traffic, especially lorries. The area won't be a business district for long with daily gridlock occurring. Industry will move out very quickly, leaving people without jobs or money. The traffic situation is hugely damaging to the area already, without more load placed on it by this plan.

---

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:

**Nazeing is within Green Belt. What's wrong with developing brownfield sites, as previously stated? At least with these, traffic increase can be better managed with carefully routed roads and investment in new**

drainage/flood control measures needed around here. This is extremely important- traffic is already strangling trade and industry in the area. We need to control what is going on now, before we add even more pressure.

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:

As with the previous question, the problem is that past and current infrastructure planning has brought about a situation where there are traffic jams seven days a week, several times a day, flooding is rife, sewage contamination is common and repairs to all this just compounds an already intolerable situation further. The developers MUST invest in this vital infrastructure BEFORE ANY housebuilding begins. It is the responsibility of the Local Authority to ensure developers are controlled and made to build a sustainable ENVIRONMENT, not just build houses to sell at a profit. The proposed plan has no teeth when it comes to this huge issue.

---

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

Sustainability' by definition, should EXCLUDE building on Green Belt land. If this land can be developed in this way, it renders the whole idea of a Green Belt worthless. Now we are living in the "enlightened" 21st century, shouldn't we put our money where our mouth is, for our future generations, and use any other land than this? It's hypocritical to do anything else. There is a reason why the Green Belt exists- We respect our wildlife in the UK, we have a sustainable agriculture industry, we care about our future and that of our offspring. We also know that a small erosion of standards, a small slackening of rules, invariably leads to further erosion. As it is, we have lost untold swathes of Green Belt, most of it in the South East! It seems that Local Authorities simply pick and choose when to apply the rules when it suits them. It's time our Local Authority set an example to others and preserve its own Green Belt, draw up a new plan to use brownfield sites and integrate new infrastructure for the area into this, to permanently improve the life of the area for the time period they themselves have set out.

---

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

As an overview, there is a glaring lack of good research evident in producing this plan. If this had been done right first time (an investment of taxpayers' money, rather than a waste) it would have been very obvious that Green Belt could be spared in favor of developing brownfield sites. Also glaringly obvious is the scant regard paid to infrastructure development. Specifically, the control of existing and proposed infrastructure. This area

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

is pretty much all minor roads, with a huge amount of traffic. This is the current situation and it's not working. Add more homes, businesses, industry and it doesn't take a genius to work out the effect on the movement of people. Roads are the arteries of business and industry. Strangle/block/cut off these and you kill business. Adding more homes and industry here, without creating proper, carefully designed infrastructure, would be a selfish act of greed and will only do harm to the people living here now and in the future.

---