

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

Stakeholder ID 3922 Name H F Pennington

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

But: I broadly agree with the principle overall, to ensure enhanced quality of life for people in the District, but the weight of allocation of houses and land to accommodate them falls disproportionately upon Epping, North Weald and Theydon Bois, leading to their inevitability of invasion of the the Green Belt and major problems of providing necessary infrastructure. Also, why cannot recent housing additions in Epping (tower Road, St Margarets) be set against the requirement as set by Government.

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:

Even limited release of Green Belt land contradicts intention stated in Para1 above since using the Black Hole of very special circumstances to release the land creates a precedence, and as stated above disproportionate allocation of housing land to Epping, North Weald and Theydon Bois leads to inevitability of invasion of Green Belt land.

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

Stakeholder ID 3922 Name H F Pennington

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

But. Agree that Harlow can accept a degree of expansion, in that major infrastructure exists for incorporation into such developments. However, the caveat is that: a) Green Belt land should not be allocated. B) The vision of F Gibberd to have green spaces with the new town, and to avoid mass urbanisation should be respected.

---

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The plan (as understood so far) for St John's site development seems sensible, but some of the housing needs could surely be absorbed within that plan.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Obviously Epping and other communities must sustain employment opportunities so that future generations will identify with the towns and not all have to go into London to work.

---

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

As i have stated in a letter to the Planning Policy team (4 Dec 2016), I strongly object to site SR-0132ci (pages 121 and 122 of document). The site was inadequately defined originally and, although subsequently amended to 'and land west of Bury Lane' it was / is not made clear what council's proposals are for the use of the large space of Green Belt west of Bury Lane as against the Epping Sports Club site. The impression given is, im sure, inadvertently, of allocation of Green Belt land by stealth. My view is that neither part of this site SR-0132ic should be re-allocated for housing development, for environmental reasons and for infrastructure reasons.

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

Epping is already frequently grid-locked by traffic and cannot take some 2,000 more vehicles. Building over car parks surely only means that the new residents will fill the parking spaces provided beneath, which are already inadequate to cope with commuter and local needs.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The draft local plan does not include Infrastructure Plan, certainly not in any detail.

---

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

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

Short term sustainability is difficult if the environment and identity of local towns and villages are to be sustained against proposals in the current plan, let alone long-term sustainability, where one can only envisage mass urbanisation to cope with exponential growth in demand for housing within reach of London.

---

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