



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

Sta	keholder ID	2897	Name	Michael	brandt		
Method		Survey					
Dat	e						
		elements of th	e full response suc	h as formatting and		to the Draft Local Plan Consultation curately. Should you wish to review pingforestdc.gov.uk	
Sur	vey Respo	nse:					
1.	Do you agre Strongly dis		erall vision that	the Draft Plan set	s out for Epping Forest D	istrict?	
	Please expla	ain your choid	ce in Question 1:				
	we do not have enough infrastructure to support all the extra houses and people						
2.	Do you agre	e with the ov	erall vision that	the Draft Plan set	s out for Epping Forest D	istrict?	
	Strongly dis	agree					
	Please expla	ain your choid	ce in Question 2:				
			and being releas ly destroyed	ed.greenbelt me	ans greenbelt otherwise	in future years all our	
3.	Do you agre	e with the pr	oposals for deve	lopment around H	arlow?		
	Strongly dis	agree					
	Please expla	ain your choic	ce in Question 3:				
	this is green	n belt land					

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

Stakeholder ID 2897 Name Michael brandt





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:							
	roads not able to handle heavy traffic							

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

Stakeholder ID 2897

Name Michael

brandt





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:

infrastructure cannot sustain the extra volume

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)

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

Stakeholder ID 2897 Name Michael brandt





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?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

no assessments have been made if all this will work if this gets to ever be developed it will be for the worse for everyone.

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

green belt land should stay green belt land impact on all the surrounding enviroment

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan? against any greenbelt land being used Nazing will loose its rural character have brownfield sites ever been considered for this project

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

Stakeholder ID 2897 Name Michael brandt