

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

Stakeholder ID 2490 Name C Valder-Hogg

---

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:

---

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:

**Adding to existing settlements in many cases causes additional strain on already stretched infrastructure which cannot be easily expanded. An example being road which need to be wider but where land is not available to widen roads. Another is the reliance on the Central line where the capacity will not be increased to deal with expansion envisaged in the plan.**

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

**Clustering development in particular areas allows for coherent planning of infrastructure and amenities such as roads, railway stations, cycle routes, foot paths, health centres, shops and playing fields.**

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2490 Name C Valder-Hogg

---

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

Epping?

Yes

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

**Although lacking detail, local employment builds communities and reduces load on transport infrastructure.**

---

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:

Most of the proposed sites are green belt land worthy of preservation because they provide green spaces for walking and the connection of Epping to the forest. Some isolate blocks have significant numbers of trees which provide bird and bat flight paths into Epping and other wildlife movement routes. These need to be preserved to maintain the character of Epping. Some sites are beyond the current natural boundaries of Epping, and would significantly and would significantly change the character of the town if used and spoil its setting on the edge of the forest. The areas south of the town in open fields, if properly planned with new

infrastructure, could alleviate existing infrastructure problems and benefit Epping. Sites really need to be selected with a plan for Epping in mind rather than on the basis of landowners offering them.

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 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:

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

- 
7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Although agreeing in general, there is a clear need for new infrastructure to precede the building of new homes.

---

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

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

T1 B

Development should seek to provide and integrate with efficient and sustainable routes to employment & leisure locations BUT also link well with the wider transport network to enable rather than restrict communication and community links within and outwith the district. Currently I think B conflicts with Ai.

T1 F

Development should not have a detrimental effect on highway networks. While not having a severe impact on highways, the impact could be quite detrimental, and that should be avoided.

---