

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

Stakeholder ID 2854 Name marshall Vance

---

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 local plan is ever changing and is not revised in line with present requirement. ie the number of dwelling identified by area is incorrect. This means that some of the sites identified are not required and could be removed from the plan as the requirement has already been met.

[http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity\\_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/local-plan-analysis.xlsx](http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/local-plan-analysis.xlsx)

---

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

the local plan identifies sites and number of dwellings that would fit the site, but this is out of date as explained above.

---

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

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

agree

---

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

Stakeholder ID 2854

Name marshall

Vance

---

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

Epping?

**No opinion**

Buckhurst Hill?

**No**

Loughton Broadway?

**No opinion**

Chipping Ongar?

**No opinion**

Loughton High Road?

**No opinion**

Waltham Abbey?

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

The site identified is Lower Queens road. This would mean demolishing and exiting block of flats, destroying shops. This means in effect you are prepared to make families move, endangering job's, forcing children to find new school places, businesses to go bust and spend multi millions, just to create 11 dwellings that are not required as the demand can be met by other means. this is both socially and morally unjust.

---

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

**No opinion**

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

**no opion**

---

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**

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

these sites are not required as the housing demand can be met by revising the numbers required as of 2016, removing the excess identified from site location and spreading the remaining requirement over the next 17 years. call 0208 504 6349 for a full explanation of how to achieve this. ( see attached excel sheet)

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:

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

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?

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?

sr0225 not required sr0813 not required sr0176 not required. All 3 sites demand can be met over the next 17 years without involving any of these sites.

---