



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

Stakeholder ID	4797	Name	julie	Sellwood		
Method	Survey					
Date						
	elements of th	ne full response suc	ch as formatting a	uncil's database of respon nd images may not appear ng Policy team: <u>Idfconsult</u>	accurately. Should	you wish to review
Survey Respo	nse:					
1. Do you agre	e with the ov	verall vision that	the Draft Plan s	ets out for Epping Fores	st District?	

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Housing to be for people that already live here and their offspring children - not for people outside the district. Existing infrastructure won't cope - it will need expansion - Report does not say how this will be expanded and where the funding will come from. Will it be us existing residents?

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:

Green Belt should not be released at all - this is destruction to the Green Belt. You should not develop the densely populated areas further - you should develop the non-Green Belt less densely populated areas.

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

No. No - this will result in loss of Green Belt and should not be permitted. Only develop non-Green Belt areas and in particular those areas of low housing density.

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

Stakeholder ID 4797 Name julie Sellwood





4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

Loughton Broadway?

Chipping Ongar?

Loughton High Road?

Waltham Abbey?

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

No significant increase in housing preferred in Epping. Therefore existing Epping Town Centre and shops can remain as at present - i.e no increase in Epping Town Centre and Shops. We have lived in Epping for 2 generations and live here because we like it as it is.

5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

I wonder why in the fairly recent past a number of "employment sites" in Epping Area have been cleared to make way for housing. Now it is proposed that employment sites are created. The previous disposed of employment sites seems to have been very short sighted. If the amount housing in Epping can be kept to an absolute minimum for the reasons previously stated it is hoped that further employment sites will not be required. No more employment sites to be disposed of.

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:

Comments restricted to Epping Area only. Other areas to be commented only by residents in those areas that would ber greater affected and more able to comment on proposals likely to affect them. In general there

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

Stakeholder ID 4797





seems to be insufficient information and detail to be able to get a good assessment of the implications. Hopefully more detailed information will follow during the consultation.

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:

There is a good balance at present and whilst the infrastructure is at capacity at the moment, it is nevertheless coping. It is preferred there be no increase in infrastructure and to achieve this "goal" that there be no significant increase in housing in Epping - and most certainly no development of any sort on Green Belt.

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

Stakeholder ID 4797 Name julie Sellwood





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

Presumably still being prepared by EFDC.

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)