

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

Stakeholder ID    2009                      Name                      Dean                      Lester

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 vision states that the aims will not be at the expense of the preservation of Green Belt. This has been ignored in the draft local plan and would result in the loss of clearly marked Green Belt Boundaries**

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:

**The proposed move into Green Belt development has not been thought through in respect of housing in and around Theydon Bois. There has not been any viable justification for 360 new homes. The EFDC's approach to sustainable development in respect of Green Belt is clearly not in line with the views of government. New development should be focused on towns in the district where they will benefit from strong existing infrastructures.**

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

**Agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**I think it is more sustainable to focus development on towns as long as this approach doesn't encroach onto Green Belt**

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

Stakeholder ID    2009                      Name    Dean                      Lester

---

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:

I don't believe the plan for employment development on green Belt is sustainable and will have an adverse impact on transport links, infrastructure and local jobs. New Job opportunities should be directed towards larger allocated sites close to or in towns

---

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:

Four of the Theydon Bois sites are in the Green Belt. These have been identified as suffering a high or very high levels of harm should they be allocated for housing. This proposed encroachment into the countryside will destroy this village. 360 houses are disproportionate to the size of the village. In essence it doesn't comply with EFDC's 'vision'. The present and foreseeable infrastructure can't support this level of growth. As a

regular user of the underground service they are already stretched and School demand exceeds available places.

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:

The plan fails to clearly state what the specific requirements for infrastructure will be. There are no provisions to ensure that the infrastructure needed will be provided in the right place at the right time.

---

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

In respect of Theydon Bois, the Sustainability 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". The transport links are already at capacity and the underground station is poorly served by the existing road network, and bus services, such that new development designed and located to use the station will further add to the congestion and over-crowding already experienced around the station and on the trains. I disagree that the wide dispersal of development sites will perform well with a range of sustainability objectives. The large and small villages identified for such development will still have to rely on the larger settlements for a wide range of facilities. Libraries, secondary schools, doctors, dentists and employment opportunities. This all leads to greater dependence on cars and this will add to congestion and further damage to the local roads. It will also not help protect the strategic role of the Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal states that the loss of Green Belt land will have "significant negative effects". Case Law has concluded that housing numbers alone are not classed as very special circumstances, and planning applications that breach clear and well defined Green Belt boundaries should require a very strong case of very special circumstances, and even then permission for inappropriate development would be very unlikely to be forthcoming. It is therefore not accepted that high quality Green Belt land should be undermined by the Sustainability Appraisal.

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?

There are no detailed Green Belt policies such as to define disproportionate extensions in the Green Belt, or 'materially larger'. This all requires a consistent approach to be set at District level and not left to emerging guidance or even Neighbourhood plans. Design and the infrastructure policies are very general and not specific.

---