

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

Stakeholder ID 2999 Name AMANDA peck

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

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?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2999 Name AMANDA peck

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:

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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

there are too many units proposed for site SR-0557 limes estate (210 units). the estate would have been built with green space as amenity space to justify the taller blocks. building on the green space means that people could be crammed into this estate **....Redacted....** in the middle of the leafier, more expensive streets.

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:

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

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

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?

SP 5 green belt para 3.94

I am writing with regard to the proposed changes to the greenbelt in the proposed LDF close to Grange Hill Station. I attach an aerial photo and extract from Chapter 5 of the Draft Local Plan (Figure 5.16 site allocations for Chigwell) identifying the site. I am presuming that the intention is to remove the recently constructed residential development from the Green Belt and I support that. Figure 5.16, however, does not seem to follow the boundary of the residential development and includes a sliver of a field (or a green area at least) at the northern boundary in between the residential development and the cemetery. I am aware that there have been pre application discussions on this field for luxury old people's accommodation (Pegasus Housing) and do not support any release of this field from the greenbelt. Figure 5.16 could be interpreted as releasing a sliver of that greenfield site from the green belt and I am concerned that there will then be scope for the developer to argue for the release of the entire greenfield site. Can the boundary be amended to

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

clearly show the housing site only to avoid any confusion in the future with planning applications on the greenfield site please?
