



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

Stakeholder ID	3141	Name	Robert	Penman	
Method	Survey				
Date					
	elements of th	e full response suc	ch as formatting an	cil's database of responses to the D images may not appear accurately Policy team: Idfconsult@eppingfor	. Should you wish to review
Survey Respo	nse:				
1. Do you agre	e with the ov	erall vision that	the Draft Plan se	s out for Epping Forest District?	
Strongly dis	sagree				
Please expla	ain your choid	ce in Question 1:			
The Goverr boundary li		will protect the	green belt, this	plan will drive a horse and cart	through the green belt
2. Do you agre		erall vision that	the Draft Plan se	s out for Epping Forest District?	
Please expla	ain your choid	ce in Question 2:			
This amour	nt of develop	ment is all out o	f proportion to t	ne size of our village.	
3. Do you agre	e with the nr	onosals for deve	lopment around I	arlow?	
No opinion	e with the pr	oposais for deve	iopinient around i	ariow:	
•	ain vour choic	ce in Question 3:			
•	•	elop adjacent t	o a larger town		
_		-	-		

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

Stakeholder ID 3141 Name Robert Penman





4.	Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in
	Epping?
	No
	Buckhurst Hill?
	No opinion
	Loughton Broadway?
	Yes
	Chipping Ongar?
	No opinion
	Loughton High Road?
	No opinion
	Waltham Abbey?
	No opinion
	Please explain your choice in Question 4:
	As long as there is cheep/free parking and does not jeopardise existing traders
5.	Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?
	Disagree
	Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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

Stakeholder ID 3141

Name Robert

Penman

Transport links ie the Central line cannot cope with any growth in traffic at all.





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

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

354 new homes in Theydon Bois is completely out of all proportion the the size of the village. It suffers from grid lock now in peak travel times. And once the green belt boundary line is broken the encroachment into the countryside will ruin the character for ever.

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)

Stakeholder ID 3141

Name Robert

Penman





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:

The track record on providing infrastructure investment anywhere has been extremely lacking in the past, and you still need space to implement something that is in short supply throughout the area.

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

With a proposed 23% increase in the number of dwellings the movement of transport would be at breaking point. Poor transport links will mean more car journeys and more air pollution travelling to other facilities.

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)

Stakeholder ID 3141 Name Robert Penman