

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

Stakeholder ID 2178 Name john mccaffrey

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:

How will "the vision of an enhanced quality of life" equate with more people in an already congested area?. Building extra homes/businesses in line with Government projections is not a local solution, but one that is being foisted on the current inhabitants. Past experience has illustrated the proposals that meet original criteria are soon watered down due to costs/profit for the developer. (witness the Churchill site).

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:

All developers/builders prefer the option of large sites, as they are more profitable. Why can't new developments be spread accross the whole district. There are 4 types of settlement in EFD. Why can't the some of the smaller settlements absorb a small proportion. eg. 2/3 in a small hamlet (30):5-10 in a small village (11) :10-20 in a large village. This could possibly absorb up to 300 dwellings and have a smaller large scale impact on public services such as schools/hospitals and roads.The land on these small scale developments could be for self build.

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

Stakeholder ID 2178 Name john mccaffrey

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

**Disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

Although I live in Loughton I still visit Harlow regularly. Traffic is a terrible and so is parking, making visits to the hospital a nightmare. Has the Council considered a new garden village to be built that could be more self sufficient in terms of services?

---

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?

**Yes**

Waltham Abbey?

**No**

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The draft plan doesn't really change anything in my opinion

---

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

**Strongly disagree**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Creation of new employment sites will add to the already congested roads . What use is being made of existing brownfield sites eg. the Clinton cards site. What happened to all the small businesses on the Langston road site, currently being cleared.

---

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

**urban intensification will destroy the leafy environment of 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)

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

### 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:

Recognising the need, but not being able to dictate or control it achieves nothing. Why build new dwellings but not have sufficient schools/hospitals transport facilities etc. A lot of the green spaces is not usable for the public, so spaces such as jessel green are used. building houses denies people that ability. That makes these spaces more valuable. Building over car parks, especially Loughton, would destroy the open aspect of the area, create extra traffic in an already congested part of town, and add to the already congested Transport system

---

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)