

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

Stakeholder ID 3073 Name PETER Hacker

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 does nothing to protect the green belt, it only satisfy the governments requirement to build houses**

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 to build on Green Belt land around Theydon Bois and is not in line with policy**

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

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**Not at the expense of Green Belt land**

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

Stakeholder ID 3073

Name PETER

Hacker

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:

Primary shopping area's could be achieved by re-generating existing shopping area's so long as they do not undermine existing facilities found in smaller local retails area's. The re-generation of Romford Shopping area as an example

---

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Not at the expense of Green Belt land, which by definition would not be in close proximity to any transport infrastructure which could be found on the periphery of established 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:

The sites encroach onto Green Belt land and would significantly expand the village towards the size and character of a town. The infrastructure of the village already suffers from regular power cuts, a primary school that is full, the rail network (Central Line) is already close to capacity during rush hours and

encourages those from outside the village to park along the restricted Abridge Road (B172) causing danger. To increase the village by 360 homes would result in an increase population of approximately 1400 people.

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 does not give adequate details of the proposed infrastructure and it would be difficult to see how transport (Central Line) could be improved to meet additional demand as it is already at capacity.

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

As previously stated, the village of Theydon Bois is not equipped to cope with any increase in population, primarily, the transport links are either at capacity or very poor, the school is at full capacity, the surrounding road network is only designed to meet the requirements of a village and is now, in places, being used as a commuter car park by non-residents which EDFC highways department appears to be ignoring as there is no apparent enforcement (Abridge Rad B172) and causing danger to motorist in the vicinity. Land designated as "Green Belt" land has been so titled to protect it from development. The government requirement to build houses is not sufficient enough reason or "very special circumstance" to justify development

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

The character of villages such as Theydon Bois should be maintained, the draft local plan does nothing to protect this area and once any area of the Green Belt has been developed, it would create a precedence for any future development in similar locations.

---

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

