

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

Stakeholder ID    1941                      Name                      Reg                      Bailey

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 plan addresses housing needs in some detail but entirely fails to deal with the necessary infrastructure developments.

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:

A "limited" release of Greenbelt land is simply unacceptable when there is a considerable area of brownfield site land that could be developed. Greenbelt land is very attractive (ie profitable) for developers as there is no clean up work necessary, but once released, it is gone forever, and the community is left with ugly brownfield sites. The Council could really set a great example and serve its own community best by releasing and pressurizing redevelopment of brownfield acreage.

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

T development around Harlow is Greenbelt land. The proposal is not in line with the overall aim of the the rest of the Plan.

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

Stakeholder ID    1941                      Name    Reg                      Bailey

---

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?

Yes

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

These are local to my home, and I would be happy to see local businesses be able to thrive in these locations.

---

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Quality of life in areas such as Nazeing are much affected by vehicle movement. SR-0580 and SR- 0151 lie on Hoe Lane, a narrow lane best suited to light traffic, and residents already suffer from excessive heavy vehicle movements. Since it appears that most industrial development in the village already is served by migratory workers we will simply increase all traffic through what is already a very congested village.

---

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:

Firstly sites SR-0011,SR-0300 ( A,B, and C),SR-0473 are grade 1-3 Greenbelt land. Secondly, derelict and brownfield sites seem to have been ignored and sites chosen where owners have already sought to sell their greenbelt land. There are some 80 plus approved developments already in place and the plan calls for a further 220 houses which will substantially increase pressure on infrastructure, and this is unacknowledged in the plan, so presumably will come as a great surprise to planners and Councillors at some point in the future. Thirdly, no mention is made of the impact on the community of failing infrastructure, due to flooding and water run off, over subscribed schools, need to upgrade swewearge, road safety, and lasck of public transport

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

and other services. Finally, the traffic system already locks up on a regular basis on relatively minor roads, there are no proposals to deal with an extra 500-600 extra vehicles that would be generated by this quantity of extra houses.

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 lack of any comprehensive evaluation of infrastructure needs including drainage, sewerage, water run off, flood prevention is extremely concerning. This must be rectified before any occupation. The ARUP assessment is a joke. To show the local school having vacancies which do exist, and to argue that the areas around the proposed developments is uncongested at peak times is beyond a joke. I hope a fee was not paid for that information as the examiner clearly did not get out of bed before writing that down!

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

The ISA needs to address why: no demonstration has been made of the need to develop primary Greenbelt land, no demonstration of the need to develop Greenbelt land Grade 1-3 in preference to brownfield (either derelict or previously developed) sites has been, and this is at odds with National Guidance in the National Planning Framework, and no real consideration has been given to the destruction of the character of this village, its landscape or environment.

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

**Overall**

This is disappointing, showing poor or inadequate research in producing a good local plan. Too much emphasis has been placed on producing homes on greenbelt sites, seemingly heavily influenced by a few keen sellers of land, with little or no thought of credible answers to the infrastructure issues. The deterioration of public transport services is exacerbating the need for car usage on already crowded roads with pollution and congestion barely mentioned, much less solutions offered. This is disappointing.

---

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