



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

Stakeholder ID Method		2678 Survey	Name	Ann and John	Cane	
Da	te					
		elements of the full	l response suc	h as formatting and im	s database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation ages may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review licy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	
Su	rvey Respor	nse:				
1.	Do you agree Disagree	e with the overall	l vision that	the Draft Plan sets o	ut for Epping Forest District?	
	Please expla	in your choice in	Question 1:			
	However, th considered	nis approach has but it has choser	been ignore n 6 green be	ed as regards Nazein elt sites and no brow	re of villages and protect the Green Belt. g where 46 sites (mostly brown field) were nfield sites although there are sites of long-derelict en put forward for this	
2.	Do you agree	e with the overall	l vision that	the Draft Plan sets o	ut for Epping Forest District?	
	Please expla	in your choice in	Question 2:			
	dwellings or	n the site in St I	Leonards Ro		high level density of housing. Applications for 45 en rejected by the council three times so we can	
3.	, ,	e with the propos in your choice in		opment around Harlo	ow?	

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

Stakeholder ID 2678 Name Ann and John Cane





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?
	Please explain your choice in Question 5:

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

Cane

Stakeholder ID 2678 Name Ann and John





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:

In addition to the points raised above, the site in St Leonards Road needs the following consideration: - The entrance point is at a very narrow stretch of the B194 with traffic often coming at speed from the direction of Waltham Abbey including heavy lorries coming from the M25. It is also on a bend in the road with limited view in both directions - This stretch of road frequently suffers flooding in heavy rain which will be exacerbated if

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

Stakeholder ID 2678 Name Ann and John Cane





hard standing replaces the current agricultural land. Sewers have also been known to flood and need major repairs

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:

There is currently little space available in the local schools, no GP surgery or post office and a very limited bus service. Additional housing would result in the already congested roads becoming even more crowded and I doubt that these problems would be adequately addressed for the size of development proposed

- 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 2678 Name Ann and John Cane