

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

Stakeholder ID	3036	Name	Trevor	Harvey
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: <a href="https://docs.org/licenses/lice

Survey Response:

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

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

loss of many clear and definable green belt boundries

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

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

ill thought out and no justification for 60 houses around TBs

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

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

more suitable option but any use of green belt in not welcome.

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





- Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in... 4. Epping? No **Buckhurst Hill?** No Loughton Broadway? Yes Chipping Ongar? No opinion Loughton High Road? Yes Waltham Abbey? Yes Please explain your choice in Question 4: must not undermine existing local shops ect within the smaller places in the district
- 5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development? Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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

Harvey





Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area? 6. Epping (Draft Policy P 1): No Please provide reasons for your view on Epping: plans for employment development on green belt sites are not sustainable and will have adverse impacts on transport ect 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: Chiqwell (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:

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

Stakeholder ID 3036

Harvev





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:

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

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

no provisions to ensure the infrastructure needed will be in the right placses

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

interim sustainability app does not support dispersible of development in and around the large and small villages. re Theydon Bois transport links are already at capacity. The large increase in Theydon B population will increase damage to roads add to congestion thru more car journeys ect.

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?

Lacking in green belt policies to define disproportionate properties development. What we need is a consistent approach at district level and more details regarding design and infrastructure. and parking provision is not mentioned in the policies of the plan

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

Harvev