



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

Stakeholder ID	2506	Name	Samantha	Wickers	
Method	Survey				
Date					
	e elements of the	full response suc	ch as formatting and i	's database of responses to the Draft Local Pla nages may not appear accurately. Should you volicy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	
Survey Respo	onse:				
Agree	ee with the over			out for Epping Forest District?	
•	3			s an 'enhanced quality of life'	
2. Do you agr		rall vision that	the Draft Plan sets	out for Epping Forest District?	
0.5	lain your choice	in Question 2:			
	sals for Loughto naracter of our		ng into over develo	oed areas that will take away our green	spaces and
, ,	ee with the prop	oosals for deve	lopment around Ha	low?	
Agree Please exp	lain your choice	in Question 3.			
•	a much better o			he infrastructure has been properly con	sidered -

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





4.	Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in					
	Epping?					
	Yes					
	Buckhurst Hill?					
	Yes					
	Loughton Broadway?					
	Yes					
	Chipping Ongar? Yes					
	Yes					
	Waltham Abbey?					
	Yes					
	Please explain your choice in Question 4:					
	The plan needs to support our town centres - lower rates and prevent yet more hairdressers, barbers and estate agents taking over shop units					
5.	Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development? Agree Please explain your choice in Question 5:					
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					
	Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:					
	The plan will see housing build over our green spaces and car parks, fundamentally altering the character of the area for the worse. NO ONE WANTS THIS. The local infrastructure in no way supports this scale of					

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





overcrowded development. Why has the council not considered a garden village development elsewhere as other councils are?

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 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)

No opinion

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

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





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

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The district council has no control over schools, new roads, doctors etc. And there will be no spare land for any of these potential new facilities anyway!

- 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?

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