

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

Stakeholder ID 3131 Name Linda Ames

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Whilst the vision sounds admirable it is not supported by the way the plan has been achieved. We not only need to protect the Green belt we need to protect the quality of life and the environment of existing residents. In any case the plan singularly fails to protect the green belt or to ensure sufficient services to cope with additional residents in this area.

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:

Just putting extra housing pro-rata into existing settlements does not address the issue of the sustainability of these settlements to absorb the new homes. Some settlements (usually the bigger towns) have more capacity to absorb greater numbers of homes - Theydon is tightly restricted in its ability to absorb more homes - the central Line cannot take more passengers and parking issues are a daily aggravation.

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

Stakeholder ID 3131 Name Linda Ames

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

**Strongly agree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow is best-placed to absorb more homes and has the potential to increase services and facilities to provide the infrastructure needed. New road links to the M11 already planned will make this more feasible. House prices are more reasonable allowing access for more people to buy in this area.

---

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

Epping?

Yes

Buckhurst Hill?

Yes

Loughton Broadway?

Yes

Chipping Ongar?

Yes

Loughton High Road?

Yes

Waltham Abbey?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

Please don't forget the smaller shops in areas such as Theydon Bois - these are vital to local people and cut down the need to use cars which is vital - Please sort out some additional parking in these areas to stimulate local shopping

---

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

EFDC's choice of new sites do not appear to be sustainable in that they will detrimentally affect transport and infrastructure. New employment sites should be near the larger centre of population to make it easier for people to get to and from work.

---

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:

Several of the sites in Theydon Bois are in the Green belt which is contrary to your initial statement about the aims of the plan. The proposed 360 new houses for Theydon would result in almost 25% increase in the size of the village which is far too many to be absorbed into a small community which is already quite obviously

suffering from over developme - e.g. p[arking problems, traffic problems, local school and surgery overloaded.  
So much for your "Vision"!

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?

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

**There is not enough detail given - as usual I fear development will take place and local people and authorities will have to run after to fill the gaps in services**

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

**It does not seem to support development of smaller villages - for sustainability reasons. In this area the underground cannot cope with more passengers and there is no additional provision for commuter parking anyway - traffic through the village is extremely dangerous at peak times especially where Tesco is on the main road (why has no-one addressed the parking on double-yellow lines outside the shop?!) As mentioned before school;s and health services are already over-subscribed.**

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

**No-where is parking, which is one of the major issues for residents on a day-to-day basis addressed in the plan. Your Policies are vague and open to interpretations**

---

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