



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

Sta	keholder ID	2645	Name	Colin	Bell			
Met	thod	Survey						
Dat	е							
		elements of the	e full response suc	ch as formatting a	nd images may not a	esponses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation ppear accurately. Should you wish to review onsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk		
Sur	vey Respo	nse:						
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:							
	Very little i Epping Fore		given on the i	nfrastructure th	at will be require	d to support the plan set out for		
2.	, ,	e with the ov	erall vision that	the Draft Plan so	ets out for Epping	Forest District?		
	Disagree							
	•	•	e in Question 2:					
	released in		t would therefo			ase the pressure for more to be are thoroughly the Brownfield sites		
2	De vou esse	o:the the o ww	anacala fan daya	lanmant around	Hawlau 2			
3.	, ,	-	oposais for deve	lopment around	Harlow?			
	Strongly dis	·	o in Ougstion 2.					
	•	•	e in Question 3:		oonfield -!+			
	Again the d	evelopments	around Harlow	would be on Gr	eenneia sites.			

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





4.	Do you agree with	the proposed	shopping ar	ea in
	, ,		11 0	

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?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

The infrastructure for the sites suggested in Nazeing will be insufficient to cope with the increased heavy goods traffic in the area.

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





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:

The sites suggested are all Greenbelt sites that will only benefit owners/developers who have no interest in the good of Nazeing. Development of some of these sites have been subject to ongoing building applications, which so far have been rejected or currently objected to on various grounds with major infrastructure problems. If houses must be built it would be more appropriate to explore the Brownfield sites available, providing some of the infrastructure problems can be addressed.

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

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





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:

It is essential that a complete assessment is undertaken to ensure that every aspect of the infrastructure is taken into consideration, as up to now many of these have been ignored/incorrectly reported when reviewing recent building applications.

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 local plans do not give good enough reasons as to why Greenbelt sites should be used in preference to previously developed/Brownfield sites. No consideration seems to have been given to the beauty of Nazeing that could be lost forever if the proposed sites are given building permission.

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

Only that a much thorough investigation should be considered in the case of Nazeing.

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