



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

Sta	ikeholder ID	2173	Name	Gary	Thomas	Planning Works Ltd	
Method		Survey					
Da	te						
		elements of th	ne full response suc	h as formatting a	nd images may not app	ponses to the Draft Local Plan Consultati pear accurately. Should you wish to revie sult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	
Su	rvey Respo	nse:					
1.	Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?						
	No opinion						
	Please expla	ain your choi	ce in Question 1:				
2.	Do you agre	e with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping Fo	prest District?	
	Please expla	ain your choi	ce in Question 2:				
3.	Do you agre	e with the pr	roposals for deve	opment around	Harlow?		
	No opinion						
	Please expla	ain your choi	ce in Question 3:				

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

Stakeholder ID 2173 Name Gary Thomas





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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Draft Policy E1 seeks to protect and retain all employment sites irrespective of individual site circumstances. The loss of an employment site will only be contemplated under the policy approach if it can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of it being used for employment use. However the loss of an employment site might bring about other benefits which are more beneficial and/or desirable that its retention. For example the redevelopment of a site that is incompatible with its surroundings might be regarded as achieving greater social and environmental benefits than its retention. Re-use of such a site for another employment use may result in the land being inefficiently used or unnecessarily constrained by, for example, placing restrictions on hours of operation or the type of activities permissible. The policy approach should reflect those circumstances where the continued employment use of a site may not be the best land use outcome and therefore adopt a more flexible approach to the balance of retaining sites.

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

Thomas

Stakeholder ID 2173 Name Gary





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 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

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

Stakeholder ID 2173

Name Gary

Thomas





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?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

- 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)

Stakeholder ID 2173

Name Gary

Thomas