



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

Sta	keholder ID	3878	Name	Jon and Mandy Salt
Me	thod	Survey		
Dat	te			
		elements of th	e full response suc	ation from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation ch as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review contact the Planning Policy team: <a href="mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk">ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk</a>
Su	rvey Respoi	nse:		
1.	Do you agree	e with the ov	erall vision that	the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?
	Strongly dis	agree		
	Please expla	in your choic	ce in Question 1:	
	developmer Your propos hospital, wh	nt. You proposal to develo nilst providir	ose many Greer p on Green Belt ng no evidence t	In is in contradiction to a large number of the proposed sites for in Belt sites for development, which is in contradiction to protecting it. It is sites, remove our leisure centre (sports centre) and develop on our chat the environment and facilities of Epping will be protected sition to its own principles.
2.	Do you agree		verall vision that	the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?
	Please expla	in your choic	ce in Question 2:	
				reen Belt land does not represent a limited release. Rather you propose d sites from the residents of the Epping Forest District.
3.	Do you agree	e with the pr	oposals for deve	lopment around Harlow?
	Please expla	in your choid	ce in Question 3:	

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

Stakeholder ID 3878 Name Jon and Mandy Salt





4.	Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in
	Epping?
	Yes
	Buckhurst Hill?
	Loughton Broadway?
	Chipping Ongar?
	Loughton High Road?
	Waltham Abbey?
	Please explain your choice in Question 4:
	We support initiatives designed to protect and encourage retail within Epping which do not destroy Green Belt Land.
5.	Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?
	No opinion
	Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Salt

Stakeholder ID 3878 Name Jon and Mandy





6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

Please see the enclosed letter which details our reasons for disagreeing with the proposed sites. (missing letter)

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

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?

## Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

The council have provided no proposed for the delivery of any new infrastructure within Epping. Vague statements are not a plan. Without providing any specific details of how existing infrastructure will be

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

Stakeholder ID 3878 Name Jon and Mandy Salt





protected, enhanced or how new infrastructure will be delivered, I'm afraid we have to strongly disagree. Please provide a transparent and specific infrastructure delivery plan.

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

There is currently too much uncertainty in this report. e.g. air quality, biodiversity, climate change, community & well being have all concluded to have neutral effects if the plan goes ahead. Air quality with increased traffic especially needs much more research. It also claims there is capacity on the underground, however was this looked at over the period of a day and not at peak community times? We can't imagine there is much capacity in the morning rush hour without more trains being in service. We are very concerned about the uncertainty in this report as residents of Epping with Children who use the facilities in this town.

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)