



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

Sta	ikeholder ID	1656	Name	tonia	slack	
Me	thod	Survey				
Da	te					
		elements of the	e full response suc	h as formatting a	nd images may not appe	onses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation ear accurately. Should you wish to review ult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Su	rvey Respoi	nse:				
1.	Do you agree	e with the ov	erall vision that ee in Question 1:	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping For	rest District?
2.	Strongly dis	agree	e in Question 2:	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping For	rest District?
3.	No opinion	·	oposals for devel	lopment around	Harlow?	

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

Stakeholder ID 1656 Name tonia slack





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:

some of these sites could be used for housing. With the proximity of London and the huge south east jobs market there is no need to provide for employment in the area

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

Stakeholder ID 1656 Name tonia slack





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

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

I do not agree with the proposed site SR-0588 (The Limes Estate) This will NOT be 'visually unobtrusive'. It will eliminate the rural character of the Grange Hill. The proposed employment sites would be better locations for new housing. 210 houses is a vast number to add to an already densely populated area. The infrastructure will not be able to cope. There is already significant traffic congestion around Manor Road and public transport capacity is restricted as Grange Hill is on the 'Fairlop Loop' section of the Central Line. In addition





this small green space is much used and appreciated and as effectively the only park in the area should not be used for housing. It is a valuable resource in its current form.

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:

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:

The plan does not contain enough information in the infrastructure provision to allow a decision to be made

- 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 1656 Name tonia slack