

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

Stakeholder ID	2790	Name	William	Kneller
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:

Means more residents but with no viable plans for the extra infrastructure needed. It means loss of open spaces and loss of parking areas in an already overcrowded area. The central line is already bursting at its seams. How are all these new residents supposed to travel.

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:

new building needs to be outside existing overcrowded areas.

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow? Please explain your choice in Question 3:

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

Stakeholder ID 2790





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?

Disagree Please explain your choice in Question 5: No real plans shown.

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

Kneller





Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area? 6. Epping (Draft Policy P 1): No opinion Please provide reasons for your view on Epping: Loughton (Draft Policy P 2) No Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton: Means loss of much needed open spaces. The chaos resulting from building on existing car parks is hard to imagine. There are no viable proposals fro extra transport for extra residents. 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 2790

Name William

Kneller





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?
 Strongly disagree
 Please explain your choice in Question 7:
 There are no specific proposals only waffle.
- 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)

Kneller