



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

Sta	keholder ID	3135	Name	Woodhouse Redacted	Massucci				
Method		Survey							
Dat	e								
		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 blicy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk				
Sui	rvey Respo	nse:							
1.	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 1:								
				ome of the proposal is made on the visio	s for Nazeing will not bring forward the vision for on for the District				
2.	Do you agre Disagree	e with the ove	erall vision that	the Draft Plan sets o	out for Epping Forest District?				
	Please explain your choice in Question 2:								
	See attached paper objecting to classification of Nazeing as a Small VillageRedacted								
3.	No opinion	ain your choice	pposals for devel	lopment around Har	ow?				

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





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:

Very difficult to say at this stage given that full details of employment land has still to be provided





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:

Please see attached submission

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:

....Redacted....

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

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed allocations in Nazeing will bring forward the required infrastructure especially in terms of alleviating HGV traffic in the centre of the village

- 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?

Draft Policy SP2

See comments contained in paper objecting to classification of Nazeing as a Small village Draft Policy P10 Nazeing

See paper attached in response to Q6 and attachments as listed therein, namely:- LN/001 LN/002 LN/003 D3095 002 Illustrative residential layout Access drawing and Site photographs which will be forwarded separately as the consultation portal appears not to allow multiple uploads