

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

Stakeholder ID 2699 Name maria Lawrence

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:

Whilst the vision involves protecting our green belt and environment, this is not at all supported by the draft local plan. I find it hard to believe that the vision genuinely seeks to ensure an enhanced quality of life for existing residents when the infrastructure will be severely compromised by introducing such a huge number of houses, and therefore people.

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:

There is no justification whatsoever for increasing the size of the village of Theydon Bois by 23%. Again I am totally opposed to the disregard with which our green belt is being treated. I'm at a loss to understand the relationship between the council's proposals and government thinking. Theydon Bois does not have the capacity to introduce so many new families, all wanting school places, GP surgeries, etc. It would be much more logical to distribute housing allocation and other development around larger towns with strong existing infrastructure and facilities.

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

Stakeholder ID 2699

Name maria

Lawrence

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Although more logical and sustainable to focus new development in and around towns, I am opposed to any proposal that encroaches into the green belt which is such an important and valued part of our area.

---

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

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I have considerable misgivings regarding any proposed shopping areas that are likely to severely undermine the existing retail facilities, and ultimately irreversibly change the look and feel of our environment. Many local areas have already lost much of their charm and appeal as a result of such changes, and I fear that our towns and villages will suffer the same fate by many of the proposals.

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The council's plans for employment development on green belt sites are not sustainable and the impact these would have on the infrastructure, particularly in terms of public transport and roads, would be utterly disastrous. Our transport links are already under immense pressure and do not meet current needs, let alone future needs should these proposals be allowed.

---

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:

**Absolutely not. Four of the sites proposed in Theydon Bois are on green belt land; areas that have already been identified as suffering high or very high levels of harm should they be allocated for housing. To say the rural character of our village will be undermined is a massive understatement. Our character, identity, and the very appeal that draws visitors into Theydon Bois will be lost. Surely this loss of character does not comply with what EFDC wishes us to believe is its "Vision"? Developing sites based purely on what has been**

offered by landowners is an entirely pot-luck method, and is not a sensible or sustainable method for development.

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 is vague and fails to state the specific requirements for the infrastructure. There seems to be nothing in place to ensure the necessary infrastructure will be available and ready to use in the right place and 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.

The appraisal does not support the wide dispersal of development in and around our towns and villages. The Central Line is already struggling to cope with the amount of commuters that use the services into London on a daily basis, and conditions at peak times are frankly unacceptable in terms of over-crowding. This will only become worse if the population increases, and additional residents in Theydon Bois would mean we have to use facilities in Epping and Loughton more and more. This will result in more car use, adding to the existing congestion and air pollution, further damaging our collective health and general living conditions. This is not to mention the inevitable damage to our roads, which already seems to be a problem judging by the endless roadworks in the local area. The Sustainability Appraisal contradicts itself by first stating the approach to the green belt sites will protect the most high value sites from development, and then that high quality green belt land will be lost. Housing numbers alone are not classed as a very special circumstance for developing the green belt in term of Case Law. All clear and defensible green belt boundaries should be maintained.

---

## 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?

I am concerned by the vagueness of the policies, eg: \* there are no detailed green belt policies to define disproportionate extensions to properties in the green belt \* what is meant by the term "materially larger"? \* how do we approach redevelopment of previously developed land in the green belt? \* there is no mention of parking provision - another part of our infrastructure that is already under pressure We need to ensure that the local and rural characters of villages such as Theydon Bois are maintained or improved. Any other approach would have adverse effects on generations to come, and lose something about this special place to live that simply would not be retrievable. Please don't allow our towns and villages to become yet more places that "used to be nice" to live in!

---