

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

Stakeholder ID 2156 Name Robert Cheverton

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 plans do not consider the infrastructure impact of the growth in housing and don't show funding for any infrastructure schemes to address this

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 plans identify use of green belt land which should be protected at all costs. Setting a precedent for allowing building on prime green belt could cause a major impact around the whole of London. Brownfield sites should be used instead.

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

Strongly agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

The development around Harlow is on Green Belt land which must be protected. This particular proposal is also in conflict with the stated aims of the plan

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

Stakeholder ID 2156

Name Robert

Cheverton

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:

The proposed site is down a very narrow lane that is currently unsuitable for lorries. The new industrial traffic should not be allowed to cause additional heavy goods traffic through Nazeing village and controls must be put in place for any new sites to prevent heavy goods traffic from using local village roads. Infrastructure impact and impact of additional traffic should also be considered.

---

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:

Comprehensive infrastructure impact assessment must be carried out to address transport, water, flood, sewage, electricity, gas and telecomms upgrades. Plans must be in place before any development can be approved. The cost impact of any changes must be absorbed by developers with commitment from EFDC that those funds will not be used on other projects. The ARUP assessment is not credible (e.g. states there is not congestion at peak times).

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

**No opinion**

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

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:

Plan does not demonstrate a need to develop on prime greenbelt land and approval would set a dangerous precedent for developing other sites. The plan does not demonstrate that appropriate consideration has been given for developing alternate brownfield sites in the local area. The development would completely change the rural nature of the area and impact the local environment, village atmosphere and the overall character of the local landscape.

---

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

There appears to have been inadequate local research, more research and local engagement should be considered in future. There needs to be a full investigation of why brownfield site developments have not been considered as this is a key government strategy whereas building on green belt is not. Local public transport links and general infrastructure and traffic impact needs to be a major component in any future plans and discussions.

---

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