

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

Stakeholder ID 2518 Name Sanjeev Shah

Method Survey

Date

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Additional housing alongside supporting infrastructure benefits the community through increased dynamism and opportunity. Focussing on small-scale developments and re-use of previously developed land is sensible and sensitive to community feelings towards the green open spaces of the district. I agree with the vision to enhance the local economy, particularly tourism and research and development industries.

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Agree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

My view is that Green Belt land should be protected where possible, and existing sites further developed. Where Green Belt land is released, my preference is to see it used for new, world class schools. I believe this would be a significant plus for the research and development professionals the district seeks to attract.

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

No opinion

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2518 Name Sanjeev Shah

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:

Overall my view is supportive of sustainable growth and dynamism for the district. Employment site growth ought to be in line with housing, education and health projections.

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)

Yes

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Proposed sites are primarily small-scale developments with existing use. This is sensible, and I would support additional similar sites. I would like to see alternative proposals for Limes Estate (SR0557). Given the need for primary and secondary schools in the area, I believe best use of this site is for a very high standard school. For example a branch of a top national school, or an international school such as Lycee Francais or TASIS. This

would raise Chigwell's profile further, attract highly skilled professionals, and be coherent with the local plan objective to enhance growth and employment in research and development.

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:

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

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

1. I would like to see sites that are suitable for new schools being identified and allocated at inception of the Local Plan. 2. Alternative funding methods for infrastructure should be explored. For example, in the realm of education, partnership with established schools may be a more viable option. This is particularly so given that many proposed development sites are small and lack economies of scale, hence would be more cost-sensitive.

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)