

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

Stakeholder ID    2615                      Name                      Jonathan                      Lawn

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:

The considerations given are largely appropriate. My concerns are over the specific implementation. There is also a significant problem with the approach that aims to gain wide-ranging permission for permanent changes where the actual requirements are uncertain. Since the plan needs to be long term, it should be clear about which elements would be implemented without further consultation or justification, and which are simply a matter of agreeing an approach and a plan of record. The Plan also takes a passive approach to the overall population growth of the area, which seems inappropriate, given the more active approach taken on where the growth takes place. The current implication that the specifics in the Plan must be agreed en masse is not an appropriate approach.

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:

In theory, this policy is sound. In practice, there are concerns over the lack of regulation and explicit commitments to protect the Green Belt, and that long-term planning will be used as a justification for short-termist exploitation. In particular, weak evidence is being used to authorise extensive, permanent changes to the Green Belt now. It would be more appropriate, given the uncertainty (and in fact unknowability) future requirements to agree a phased approach now, with the more extreme phases (including most of the Green Belt deregulation around our villages) being included only in later phases, when all options in the previous phases have been exhausted. The process of creating a full plan but implementing the least controversial elements first, whilst constantly monitoring the requirements and reassessing the plan is known as "agile" in industry, and it is highly beneficial when dealing with shifting requirements. It also seems inappropriate to

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

Stakeholder ID    2615                      Name    Jonathan                      Lawn

give specific plans for removal of regulation (areas of Green Belt) but only vague plans for the infrastructure changes required to mitigate the effects of the population increases.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Harlow could benefit from extensive regeneration.

---

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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

High employment rates are highly desirable, but actively encouraging employment opportunity growth will drive the demand for housing, which is not desirable. Existing sites are likely to be sufficient.

---

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

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:

Many brown-field sites in the centre and west seem to have been ignored, and these should be regenerated and used in preference to any Green Belt sites. Specifically, SR0300a and SR0300b are in an area of very low density, and are therefore not suitable for the planned 50 homes. Maintaining the feel of this area along Middle St is important to the rural character of Nazeing. Infrastructure improvements need to be planned and committed to in advance of any growth in the village. In particular, further measures are needed to reduce unnecessary congestion through the village (by diverting heavy traffic and prioritising and issues on the access roads to Broxbourne, Hoddesdon, Harlow and Waltham Abbey); frequent bus services must be available on

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

these roads for access to employment, retail, sports, leisure, health and transport amenities; safe cycle access to these destinations should also be improved; Nazeing Primary School is near capacity and requires significant investment to grow. Unfortunately, the failure of the ARUP site selection report to highlight these issues throws into doubt its accuracy across the board. If this is the best information available then it makes it clear that the District Council must consider its evidence base to be weak, and to not rely on it to make premature, permanent decisions, instead incrementally assessing the effect of individual changes to Green Belt regulation. Also, given that Nazeing is losing its best site for a community centre (identified as part of the "Vision for Nazeing") and its bus services, it puts into question the ability or determination of local government to implement the the infrastructure changes required.

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:

The plan mentions important infrastructure, but there are not enough safeguards documented in relation to the IDP for any given site: the IDP should cover all infrastructure, it should assess against a locally agreed plan, it should include binding commitments on who will deliver what, any failure must result in heavy penalties including forfeiture of all permissions. The locally agreed plan for each settlement should include changes to not only cope with new housing but to correct existing failures in the infrastructure, by leveraging new developments and through public works.

- 
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?

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