



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

Sta	keholder ID	2187	Name	Christopher	Drew			
Method		Survey						
Da	te							
		elements of the	full response suc	h as formatting and in	's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation nages may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review ollicy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk			
Su	rvey Respor	nse:						
1.	Do you agree	e with the ove	rall vision that	the Draft Plan sets o	out for Epping Forest District?			
	Strongly dis	agree						
	Please explain your choice in Question 1:							
			ne proposed ex sals for Buckh		ent onto greenbelt throughout the district, and the			
2.	, ,		rall vision that	the Draft Plan sets o	out for Epping Forest District?			
	Strongly dis	· ·						
	•	•	in Question 2:					
					achment onto Green Belt land. This is only allowable reen Belt encroachment do NOT qualify.			
3.	No opinion			lopment around Harl	ow?			
	Please expla	iin your choice	in Question 3:					

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

Stakeholder ID 2187 Name Christopher Drew





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:

I cannot see the justification for extending the existing retail area of Buckhurst Hill.

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Some of proposed plans involve unjustified encroachment onto Green Belt land, and I strongly object to this.

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

Stakeholder ID 2187 Name Christopher Drew





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:

Please see the attached document

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)

Stakeholder ID 2187 Name Christopher Drew





No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/gravity_forms/3-fce9873862dde780a40e3cbe24771a88/2016/12/Epping-Forest-District-Plan-Comments.pdf

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

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The contents of chapter 6 are far too vague to constitute a plan worthy of comment. More detail needed please!

- An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.
- Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?SP5

As indicated elsewhere, I strongly object to ANY encroachment onto Green Belt. It is evident to me that the arguments put forward to justify the encroachment are spurious. The whole point of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. Growing population does NOT constitute the "exceptional" circumstances required in law.

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