Engagement Session	Commentor	Commenting On	Date Received	Comment	Section	Response
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 1	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	RE: quantum of SANG guidance – has 8ha per 1000 population been agreed with Natural England?	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 1	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Lack of clarity in the document on what constitutes SANGS.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 1	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	How will the delivery of SANGS be secured/provided for the Water Lane allocated site – is it to be provided on another allocation (ie. Latton Priory) and how would that work if so?	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 1	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Confusion over the multifunctionality of SANGS as green space and still being required to provide other open space within developments.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Clarification required on quantum of SANG provision and whether they are just required for larger sites.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Clarification required on whether the Landscape Framework is separate from the Strategic Masterplan.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Concerns around choice of precedent for SANG strategy – using the Thames based method instead of the East Coast RAMS strategy	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Clarification required around the Memorandum of Understanding mechanism bringing multiple landowners together	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Concerns over SANG identified in Strategy which are not within the Developers/Councils control	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	General acceptance of SANG principles, however concerns around the timing of publication of SANG principles and the impact on sites in the advanced masterplanning stages.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Cost is a barrier to the implementation of SANG, and clear direction required on including SANG in the design of masterplans.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	More definitive guidance on quantum of SANG - fundamental to delivering land and is currently halting progress. Mixed messages over quality/quantity and whether SANG is required beyond the Epping Forest SAC ZOI	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	SANG Principles: Appendix 3 sets out the principles for SANG. Are there any barriers or obstacles that you can see with these principles and your site?	19-Jun-20	Are SUDs included in the SANG guidelines? And is the protection of wildlife included?	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	Measuring quality: Section 3 sets out expectations of quality. How will you ensure and/or measure quality of green infrastructure on your site?	19-Jun-20	Requirement for further design guidance on green infrastructure in developments. Ongoing engagement with EFDC on design matters would prove beneficial	Section 3	Part 2 Landscape Led Design explores the Role of Design and Multifunctional Design in Green Infrastructure, and therefore should act as a guide for what the Council seeks in developments. Engagement with EFDC Officers is actively encouraged throughout the design and planning process.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	Measuring quality: Section 3 sets out expectations of quality. How will you ensure and/or measure quality of green infrastructure on your site?	19-Jun-20	Examples of landscape led design project include Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford – where Countryside worked with the local land trust and local authority to bring forward multi-functional open spaces, and Marham Park in Bury St Edmunds – where linking green and blue spaces via green corridors sets out a framework in which residential developments sit within.	Section 3	The Strategy has been amended to include good examples of Landscape-Led Design in masterplanning. Part 2 Landscape Led Design looks at stewardship models of new Green Infrastructure, where Beaulieu is used as a case study for Community Land Trusts.

Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	Measuring quality: Section 3 sets out expectations of quality. How will you ensure and/or measure quality of green infrastructure on your site?	19-Jun-20	Important to engage landscape and ecology officers early in the design process and need to integrate all relevant interest groups	Section 3	The Strategy actively encourages this approach throughout the design and planning process.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Measuring quality: Section 3 sets out expectations of quality. How will you ensure and/or measure quality of green infrastructure on your site?	19-Jun-20	Some agreed landscape led design would ensure a higher quality masterplan design process, whilst others were keen to understand in more detail what would be needed	Section 3	Part 2 Landscape Led Design explores the Role of Design and Multifunctional Design in Green Infrastructure, and therefore should act as a guide for what the Council seeks in developments. Engagement with EFDC Officers is actively encouraged throughout the design and planning process.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Measuring quality: Section 3 sets out expectations of quality. How will you ensure and/or measure quality of green infrastructure on your site?	19-Jun-20	Potential need for quality metrics in relation to biodiversity and ecology	Section 3	Whilst quality metrics are difficult to define, the Council has been developing a Green Infrastructure Sustainability 'checklist' in the EFDC Sustainability Guidance (due to be published Spring 2021). Links to the checklist can be found in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 2	Stewardship: Section 4 sets out stewardship models. What is your approach to long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure including biodiversity net gain?	19-Jun-20	Some shared experience of working with different stewardship models – primarily with land trusts and forms of management companies. Regarding smaller sites, less experience was held by group members	Section 4	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Stewardship: Section 4 sets out stewardship models. What is your approach to long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure including biodiversity net gain?	19-Jun-20	Concerns around cost of maintenance of open space and how those costs would be recovered	Section 4	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. Further information has also been included on potential funding sources for the creation and stewardship of Green Infrastructure.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Stewardship: Section 4 sets out stewardship models. What is your approach to long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure including biodiversity net gain?	19-Jun-20	Previous preference for management companies as a client – to ensure control over the provision and development of open space, whilst also maintaining their relationship to adjacent housing	Section 4	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. This report identified a number of preferred stewardship models, which are reflected in the Strategy.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Stewardship: Section 4 sets out stewardship models. What is your approach to long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure including biodiversity net gain?	19-Jun-20	Lessons learnt from group members in relation to stewardship – to consider right from masterplanning stage and develop in parallel to the design process	Section 4	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. Early engagement with the Council on the development of stewardship principles is strongly encouraged.
Developer Forum	Breakout Group 3	Stewardship: Section 4 sets out stewardship models. What is your approach to long term maintenance and management of green infrastructure including biodiversity net gain?	19-Jun-20	Ownership vs management – the stewardship of open space largely depends on local scenarios – some local authorities are willing to take on long term management. There appears to be a trend to steer away from traditional management companies as stewardship models	Section 4	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. This report identified a number of preferred stewardship models, which are reflected in the Strategy.
Developer Forum	Other comments	Other	19-Jun-20	Queries raised regarding the extent to which the requirement of SANG has been accounted for in EFDC's revised capacity analysis and whether the GI Strategy will be re-consulted upon or amended once the HRA work has been completed – and whether that would affect the approach to the scale of SANG		See overarching SANG response.
Youth Council Workshop	Group A	Think of a green space that you love visiting – and one or two words to sum it up e.g. picnic, huge trees, football	23-Jun-20	Local green space - secluded and easy to walk to, Roding Valley Meadows - close by with trees providing shade, Epping Forest - close enough to travel to alone, Richmond Park - a nice open space with wildlife, Connaught Water - lovely however parking is difficult and people park on verges		Comment noted. A number of these attributes are included in the SANG Guidance in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Youth Council Workshop	Group B	Think of a green space that you love visiting – and one or two words to sum it up e.g. picnic, huge trees, football	23-Jun-20	Local park - big open space with grass, Green space near home - range of activities for all ages, Fields near home - space to walk and climb trees, The Forest - dog walking, fresh air, place to chill, Fields and forest behind home - peaceful and fresh air.		Comment noted. A number of these attributes are included in the SANG Guidance in Part 3 of the Strategy.

Youth Council Workshop	Group A	How many of you visit Epping Forest? What would make you want to go to new outdoor spaces instead of the forest?	23-Jun-20	Majority have visited. Refreshments, a centre or facilities, open and nice views, wildlife to photograph, activities such as white water rafting, live music/outdoor concerts during evenings, accessible by public transport, outdoor lidos or other exercise/social aspects.		Comment noted. Whilst the desire for the range of activities identified to be provided they would, for the main part, be inappropriate within a SANG.
Youth Council Workshop	Group B	How many of you visit Epping Forest? What would make you want to go to new outdoor spaces instead of the forest?	23-Jun-20	Approx. 3 have visited. Spaces to chill, large open space, somewhere explorable, isolated and calm away from town, connected to nature, tree houses and picnic areas, enclosed spaces to walk dogs safely with agility space		Comment noted. A number of these attributes are included in the SANG Guidance in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Youth Council Workshop	Group A	What is the main thing that adults forget when designing or considering green and blue spaces for young people?	23-Jun-20	To include signposting/information stands, unique elements such as 'listening bench', Bike stands/cyclist friendly amenities, Youth shelters		The Strategy highlights such design considerations for young people in Part 2: Landscape Led Design
Youth Council Workshop	Group B	What is the main thing that adults forget when designing or considering green and blue spaces for young people?	23-Jun-20	Provide information/history of the place, Too many restrictions, Spaces for young children and older children, Make it exciting/draw people in, Skate parks, Safety/security and maintenance		The Strategy highlights such design considerations for young people in Part 2: Landscape Led Design
Youth Council Workshop	Group A	Are you involved with any of these kinds of projects or would you like to be?	23-Jun-20	Some take part and many would like to take part in Allotments, Epping in Bloom, Countrycare		Comment noted.
Youth Council Workshop	Group B	Are you involved with any of these kinds of projects or would you like to be?	23-Jun-20	Some go litter picking. Many would like to be more involved.		Comment noted.
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 1	Looking at the SANGS principles – do you think that the principles we have identified for the creation of SANG will create an attractive alternative to the Epping Forest for residents? If not, what do you think needs to be included?	02-Jul-20	Suggestion to design places without trees (as they take a long time to grow) instead create wetlands, meadows or other natural landscapes. Include walking trails. Pockets of small green spaces rather than one large open space.		SANGs will vary in character and landscape type across the District depending on microclimate conditions, existing landscape features, local character and design development processes.
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 2	Looking at the SANGS principles – do you think that the principles we have identified for the creation of SANG will create an attractive alternative to the Epping Forest for residents? If not, what do you think needs to be included?	02-Jul-20	Need to better understand the details of SANGS (size, distance). Need to consider who the users of the sites are. SANG should be away from the SAC - it should be large enough, meaningful and purposeful to encourage a wide range of activities.		See overarching SANG response.
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 1	In appendix 4 we have identified a number of potential sites for enhancement, are there any other sites that you think would work well as SANG and if so, what do you think needs to be done in terms of enhancement to make them an attractive alternative offer?	02-Jul-20	Lee Valley. Consider how people will get to the alternative sites.	Appendix 4	See overarching SANG response.
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 2	In appendix 4 we have identified a number of potential sites for enhancement, are there any other sites that you think would work well as SANG and if so, what do you think needs to be done in terms of enhancement to make them an attractive alternative offer?	02-Jul-20	Engine Shed, Hertford - could be used for cycling hub - and currently sits as empty space. Chigwell - on the border and an urban area. North Weald site and the Golf club - could work as extension to the SANG. Need to look at more sustainable areas - link infrastructure and transport links. Walking, cycling and hose riding should be encouraged. Built-in walking and cycle routes across developments. Consider allowing scooters and e-bikes within sites. Use of Countrycare. Include electric charging points in car parks/solar panel powering. Could mirror HGGT's STC across the larger sites	Appendix 4	Comment noted. The guidance in the Strategy supports policies within the eemerging Local Plan which seek to achieve reductions in vehicle use. The provision of Electirc Vehicle Charging points is not a matter for this Strategy but rather the Council's adopted Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy (IAPMS).
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 1	Thinking about the project pages in Appendix 1 (Movement and Wayfinding, Roadside and Wildflowers, Tree planting – A Call for sites, Community Greenspace Improvements) and the opportunities identified in Appendix 2 in relation to different parts of the District (strategic allocations and communities) have we missed anything or are you aware of particular priorities for projects in your local area?	02-Jul-20	Concerns around the inclusion of sculptures - need to be sympathetic to the environment. Traditional EF signage to be used in strategic locations. Questions around placement, scale and size of tree planting and look at use of funding, Hedgerow, Tree Wardens.	Appendix 1 & Appendix 2	Comment noted. The provision of Art in the Landscape will need to respond positively to its surroundings and this is reflected in the Strategy.
Members Workshop	Breakout Room 2	Thinking about the project pages in Appendix 1 (Movement and Wayfinding, Roadside and Wildflowers, Tree planting – A Call for sites, Community Greenspace Improvements) and the opportunities identified in Appendix 2 in relation to different parts of the District (strategic allocations and communities) have we missed anything or are you aware of particular priorities for projects in your local area?	02-Jul-20	Limes Farm is a good example to start exploring sustainability (tree planting to mitigate car pollution). Two Brewers in Chigwell have walking routes which can be combined as a rest stop - connect walking routes/where the London Loop breaks. Consider art local to Epping/show off local skills. Get landowners to lease small parts of (under-utilised land) for public use (create smaller versions of wooded forested area). Composter toilets should be encouraged. Consider connecting Essex forest & landowners. Community engagement is vital. All SANGS should have a water feature of some sort	Appendix 1 & Appendix 2	These helpful comments are noted and will be considered further as part of the development of specific projects.
Members Workshop	Other comments	Other	02-Jul-20	How does Lee Valley fit into the strategy?		The Strategy has been amended to include information on and references to the Lee Valley Regional Park including in relation to the Waltham Abbey North Masterplan Area.
Members Workshop	Other comments	Other	02-Jul-20	Concerns around the cost of SANGs to local council/residents		See overarching SANG response.
Members Workshop	Other comments	Other	02-Jul-20	The GI Strategy document is not reaching people - needs more publicity		Despite the restrictions created by the COVID-19 crisis the consultation undertaken was in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community involvement. The Council will engage with residents and local community organisations on individual projects where appropriate in due course.

Members Workshop	Other comments	Other	02-Jul-20	Need a clear definition of SANG and how long it lasts i.e. is there a protection to a SANG?		See overarching SANG response.
Members Workshop	Other comments	Other	02-Jul-20	How can we attract landowners to lease their land for SANGS and how can we encourage farmers to increase biodiversity?		See overarching SANG response. The government is developing proposals through the Environment Bill and is undertaking a review of subsidies to farmers including to increase biodiversity.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Disagree with car park charging within the forest for a number of reasons	Para 1.26	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Funding mechanisms are implausible		Further information on funding mechanisms has been provided in Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Lack of info on SSSI in the District - suggest a list or map of them?		Mapping has been updated in the Strategy, including on Page 32 of the Strategy Primer where all SSSI sites within the District have been highlighted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Photographic example used does not represent the area's true condition	Page 25	The image provides an example of how Public Rights of Way (PRoW) can be clearly identified through agricultural fields to avoid damage to crops whilst maintaining access.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	The Wayfinding Strategy should seek input from people who use footpaths (example included)	Page 59	The 'Movement and Wayfinding' project has been updated to include local ramblers groups as Key Stakeholders
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Dispute that Epping South is a green infrastructure asset		The South of Epping Masterplan Area has been included as it is a Strategic Masterplan site rather thn a green infrastructure asset.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Quite a lot of the Strategy is interwoven with the Local Plan. Is there an intention to reserve the former, until the later has been resolved?		The Strategy will help to inform the implementation of relevant policies within the emerging Local Plan. There is no legal requirement to wait until the adoption of the Local Plan before endorsing the Strategy as a material consideration in planning related matters because of the advanced stage of the Plan. References to the Strategy are being proposed to the Inspector as part of any Main Modifications.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Lack of Tree Preservation Orders mentioned. Suggest list map or of 'local interest' trees		The Strategy makes reference to 'protected trees' which would include those covered by Tree Preservation Orders and those within Conservation Areas. As there are a signifiant number of such trees it would be impractial to either list or map such assets and there would be a potential that such information would become out of date very quickly.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Air Quality is mentioned but not emphasised. Suggest reference to the District's AQMA		The Strategy has been amended to include reference to the Council's adopted Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy which provides more information on air quality considerations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Unclear what "well connected" means	2.41	This is a commonly used phrase and relates to, primarily, being able to get between places and key destinations easily.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Society	Feedback on the document	19-Jun-20	Suggestion to include "other green measures" for which the Council has plans/responsibilities		The Strategy has been amended to include more projects and associated information.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peter Gedling	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Suggest a summary of the document be issues		The Strategy has been amended to make it more succinct and easier to navigate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peter Gedling	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Constant use of unfamiliar abbreviations		A Glossary has been included in the Appendices of the Strategy.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Peter Gedling	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Not user friendly to members of the public	The Strategy has been restructured into a Primer and four Parts, specifically aimed at different audiences to make it more user-friendly.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The document is not specific enough to Epping Forest and its community and it should be written in 'plain English' with technical terms fully explained	The Strategy has been revised to improve readability and ease of use. Opportunities to make it more specific to Epping Forest District and its landscapes have also been taken.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The document lacks real vision for the future and provides no detail of how it will provide environmental provision.	The Council considers that the Strategy as revised sets out a clear and focussed Vision for Green and Blue Infrastructure provision in the District, and how this will be achieved.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Hypocritical to use Jessel Green as an illustration of the green spaces when it was only saved from developers by residents.	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The District has allowed development on the green space on the corner of Rectory Lane and Borders Lane in Loughton which is incongruent with the protection and enhancement of green spaces.	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The current District plans are to allow further building on the Forest's borders (Latton Priory and North Weald Bassett) inflicting more environmental damage to the ancient woodland of Epping Forest, instead of expanding it to protect the environment.	The allocation of sites for development is not a matter for the Strategy. The Strategy identifies ways in which these sites (and others) can make a positive contribution to the District's Green and Blue Infrastructure assets and ensure that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the Epping Forest arising from development.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The District's solution is to restrict access to the Forest and introduce parking charges. Imposition of parking charges favours the wealthy and deprives disadvantaged people, fuelling social injustice and inequality and is contrary to the common rights. Using financial constraints to restrict access to one of the most valuable common areas is abhorrent.	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The document provides no vision, specific information or aspiration as to how the inadequacy of the current provision of parks and playgrounds would be rectified.	The Council's aspirations and expectations for children's and young people's outdoor spaces are set out in Part 2: Landscape Led Design.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	There are no 'formal' parks within the area that provide a pleasant environment to walk with prams/pushchairs or suitable terrain for elderly residents. Suggest the strategy addresses this even if it does not intend to provide such a facility for its residents.	The Strategy makes it clear that enhancements to existing, and provision of new, assets should be designed to make them accessible to all.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The strategy gives no indication of the vision for young adults i.e. locations or how facilities can be provided.	The Council's aspirations and expectations for children's and young people's outdoor spaces are set out in Part 2: Landscape Led Design.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Appears the District is keen to change the culture of allotments to multi-use spaces and the document specifically mentions children's play areas. Rather than multi-functional, is the District trying to gain financially viable land and move allotments not in line with environmental objectives but for financial reasons?	Part 2: Landscape Led Design in the Strategy refers to the inclusion of productive landscape principles as an element of multi-functional design for new spaces. No change to the culture of existing allotments is proposed.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	This section does not focus enough on rectifying the deficiencies already in existence that need addressing across the District, it is only devoted to the ongoing development that the District is proposing.	Implementation	The revised Strategy has Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network identifies deliverable projects aimed at enhancing the District's Green Infrastructure assets.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The report needs to specify what exactly stewardship options mean. Stewardship needs to be explored more honestly and open with full details of what exactly it would mean for all housing across the District.	Implementation	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The provision of Green Strategy for the building expansion programme across the District seems inadequate. It appears to place a 'catch all' approach with Developers having little or no constraints on what they provide.		The Strategy provides guidance on what is required on development sites of all sizes. This supports achieving the delivery of Green Infrastructure and other requirements set out in the Council's emerging Local Plan, including site specific requirements.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Developers can give an undertaking to make provisions but as the building programme proceeds the initial promises do not materialise and there is no enforcement by District Councils to ensure they adhere to initial details.		Developments are required to be built out in accordance with the plans approved at the detailed planning application stage. These are secured through planning conditions and S106 planning obligations. The Council's Planning Enforcement service will investigate and take appropriate action when it is aware that a breach has occurred.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Suggest details of what green spaces Developers are providing are listed in full in the document, as well as what provisions are being put in place to ensure Developers meet the initial undertaking by the District.		The provision of this level of detail is not appropriate for a Strategy of this nature nor would it be possible, as the Strategic Masterplans are in the early stages of design development. This level of detail will be required as part of any planning application submitted to the Council for planning permission.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	Failure to recognise that the Queens Rooms land in North Weald Bassett was donated to the village and should not be used by Developers, seeking to make a profit, to avoid providing full and adequate provision of green spaces on the new development sites. Suggest details of Developers provisions for the land in North Weald Bassett is detailed fully in the document as well as how the Developers are meeting their obligation to provide green spaces for new residents.		Development proposals will need to be supported by sufficent evidence to demonstrate that any off-site provision is justified and is beneficial to achieving overall place-making objectives. The provision of this level of detail is not appropriate for a Strategy of this nature nor would it be possible, as the Strategic Masterplans are in the early stages of design development. This level of detail will be required as part of any planning application submitted to the Council for planning permission.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jean Juniper	Feedback on the document	23-Jun-20	The document conveys an impression of a strategy dictated by finance, rather than vision and forward thinking.		Comment noted. It is unfortunate if this is the impression that is given as this is not the purpose of the Strategy. It is important to note, however, that the Council has to have regard to the deliverability of the Strategy and ensure that it is not including requirements which would render development schemes unviable within the context of other planning obligations including for the delivery of affordable housing. The Council considers that the Strategy achieves this balance.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Generally in support of references in the strategy to multifunctional use of green space which is in accordance with a number of emerging proposals for Waltham Abbey North Masterplan.		Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Unclear what assumptions the viability assessment has made in respect of any over/extra costs for the design of green infrastructure. This would need to take into account both the implementation costs for the green infrastructure, and potentially the long term stewardship costs, if that were to require maintenance payments.		The provision of Green Infrastructure was considered as part of the viability assessment undertaken as part of the emerging Local Plan. See also the response to Comment 75 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Concerns around the general assumption that SANG provision (a) needs to be at a level of 8 ha per 1000 population and (b) would be provided on-site. The Waltham Abbey Masterplan is obviously of a finite size (approx. 32 ha), and is required to deliver 740 new homes, a local centre, 5 pitches for gypsy and travellers and all of the necessary physical site infrastructure. At 8ha per 1000, the guidance in Appendix 3 would suggest that a SANG of some 14 ha would be required. This is not far short of half of the allocated site.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Natural England's approach to relieving recreational pressure on the Essex Coast is much more relevant due to the size of the site, and is far more likely to be deliverable within (and adjoining) the strategic development sites.		See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Were advised at the recent Developer Forum that the Council considers a hybrid approach between the Thames Basin SANG methodology and the Essex Coast methodology would be pursued, they believe that the Essex Coast RAMS approach should be adopted.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Phase 2 Planning OBO Mrs Louise Barr and Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	29-Jun-20	Should the Council continue with SANG provision in the manner currently set out, then the Strategy needs to be clear as to (a) what the total green infrastructure requirements for sites are, taking in to account the 'dovetailing' of different multifunctional uses (b) that the Strategy can be flexible as to the area of land required for SANGs and whether SANG provision is provided on-site, off-site (by either the Council or the developer), or through a combination of both.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Vincent Gorbing OBO Wates Development	Feedback on the document	01-Jul-20	The strategy lacks coherent detail on how much SANG will be needed and where		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Vincent Gorbing OBO Wates Development	Feedback on the document	01-Jul-20	Lack of clarity evident in the section on SEMPA		The draft Strategy included a similar level of detail for the SEMPA site as for the other Masterplan sites. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	The proposals lack an explicit strategy to protect existing Urban Open Space or a strategy to join up existing and proposed green spaces		Existing urban open spaces will be protected in accordance with the relevant policies contained in the emerging Local Plan. The Strategy identifies the Council's expectations as to how existing and new Green Infrastructure in the District can be integrated and connected.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	No space in Loughton for SANGS or other new green spaces		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	Vital that existing green spaces are protected and not lost to wholesale or piecemeal development. Any Urban Open Spaces affected by allocation must be immediately withdrawn from it in order to make the Strategy intelligible and consistent (for example Luctons Field)		This is not a matter for the Strategy. See also response to Comment 84 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	The document does not address the overall air quality problem in the SAC		The Strategy has been amended to make specific reference to the Council's adopted Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	Disagree with the allocation of 12 acres of land at Luctons Field for intensive development		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	Inappropriate to suggest using Jessel Green as a SANG because it is already public amenity space.		Jessel Green was included as it had been suggested by residents as an alternative space to Epping Forest in response to the Epping Forest Visitors Survey 2019. It is now referenced as an amenity space
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Residents Association	Feedback on the document	08-Jul-20	If the Council is serious about protecting play areas, then a further reason for protecting from future development at Rochford Green is that it has a children's play area which is regularly used by residents.	Para 3.38	This is not a matter for the Strategy. See also response to Comment 84 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	The document would benefit from quantitative analysis of trends in population growth, employment patterns, car use and air quality over the last thirty years		The Strategy has been developed using the Local Plan Evidence Base, which contains a wealth of relevant data on the profile of the District.
Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	An early glossary of terms would be helpful covering e.g. GI, SANG, Ramsar		A Glossary has been included in the Appendices of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Suggest using 'obesity' rather than 'Childhood obesity'		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Loneliness is an important issue but is only one aspect of 'mental wellbeing'		The Strategy recognises that there are a number of aspects of 'mental wellbeing' that Green Infrastructure can be important to.
Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	It would be helpful if the document contained more detail on firm, achievable proposals. A rationalisation of the PRoW network, for example, would be sensible.		The Strategy has been amended to incorprate all projects into the relevant Parts, removing them from the Appendices. This ensures they are easily found by those wishing to undertake such projects. Further information in relation to timelines for delivery have been included. These will be used by the Council to monitor progress.
Draft v2 - June 2020	West Essex Ramblers	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	The North Weald Millennium walks are mentioned – but the Hastingwood walk has never been walkable due to the lack of a footpath north-south through Sewalds Hall.		This walk is publicised by North Weald Bassett Parish Council and the route is shown on Essex County Council's interactive Public Rights of Way map. The Council will raise this issue with Essex County Council.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Hertfordshire County Council should be included in the list of partners going forward	Para 1.32	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	A very clear and useful structure for each project to follow which could also be embedded in the main text of Section 4 further once the good practice cases are prioritised, as already referred to in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.7	Appendix 1	Comments welcomed. The Strategy has been amended to incorprated all projects into the relevant Parts, removing them from the Appendices. This ensures they are easily found by those wishing to undertake such projects. Further information in relation to timelines for delivery have been included. These will be used by the Council to monitor progress.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Realising and delivering on the opportunities listed in paragraphs 1.21 and 1.24 is very important	Appendix 2	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Details of Epping Forest's "Sites for Enhancement" and related green infrastructure elements is a very useful list of potential projects that could again be prioritised and showcased in the main text further	Appendix 4	Comment noted. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	Any appropriate elements of the Historic Environment which are identified and conserved as part of Green Infrastructure should be considered holistically with those in Hertfordshire. It is considered that a separate paragraph or section would be appropriate, considering the historic environment plays a large role in the landscapes we see and enjoy today		The Strategy has been amended to include the role that Green Infrastructure can play in revealing and enhancing the historic environment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	It would be useful to consider the emerging work of the Hertfordshire Growth Board in the context of the draft Epping Forest GI Strategy		Comment noted however it is not clear in what way this work should be considered within the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	The document should consider the changing landscape in relation to COVID-19 and the impact this will have on ways of working		The long-term effects arising from COVID-19 are not yet known. However, the Strategy is an important tool in responding to the need for high-quality Green Infrastructure which has been highlighted by the pandemic. Furthermore there is sufficient flexibility within the Strategy to be able to respond to changing needs and attitudes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Xavier Preston, Hertfordshire County Council	Feedback on the document	13-Jul-20	The vision and delivery mechanisms will need to be robust to ensure success for nature in our communities		Comment noted. The Strategy has been amended to include more information on delivery.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carter Jonas OBO Pigeon Investment Management	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Cannot see how this Strategy can be used to help shape and steer the emerging Local Plan – reasons set out fully		The Strategy has been developed in part to inform the implementation of relevant policies within the emerging Local Plan. There is no legal requirement to wait until the adoption of the Local Plan before endorsing the Strategy as a material consideration in planning related matters because of the advanced stage of the Plan. References to the Strategy are proposed as part of the Main Modifications stage.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Carter Jonas OBO Pigeon Investment Management	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Generally agree with the multi-functional approach, however have significant reservations in respect of the statement made in paragraph 3.9.	Para 3.9	Paragraph 3.9 has been removed recognising that the requirement for off-site contributions will be considered on a case by case basis. The Council considers that on-site provision should always be the 'default' position. Only in exceptional circumstances would off-site contributions be acceptable and such an approach would need to be clearly justified.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carter Jonas OBO Pigeon Investment Management	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	If financial contributions are to be made there would be a significant risk that the green spaces to be created will be delivered after the new development areas are occupied		See response to Comment 106 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carter Jonas OBO Pigeon Investment Management	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Because this Strategy is being published so late in the Draft Local Plan preparation process it is not possible to consider the strengths and weakness of the planned locations for growth in terms of their potential contribution to GI against reasonable alternatives	Appendix 2	The Strategy supports the implementation of policies within the emerging Local Plan. The planned locations for growth were determined using a robust site selection methodology which incorporated a wide range of considerations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carter Jonas OBO Pigeon Investment Management	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Example of South Epping used to illustrate concerns associated with the retrofitting of this Strategy to pre-selected allocations – key observations outlined fully		See response to comment 108 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Historic England	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Request to amend paragraph 1.13 to highlight the role of GI in: Improving the setting of heritage assets; Improving access to heritage assets; Creating a sense of place and tangible links with local history; Creating linkages between heritage assets and other green infrastructure	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Historic England	Feedback on the document	14-Jul-20	Expect to see the historic environment properly referenced in the interventions outlined in this strategy, with explicit consideration of: The role that Green Infrastructure can play in conserving and enhancing the historic environment; The setting of heritage assets, including any opportunities for enhancement; Opportunities for improved access to heritage assets	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Contains no details of proposed routes for additional walking and cycling paths in the area		Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network includes a Movement and Wayfinding District-wide project setting out a brief to improving existing routes. The Council will be working with local communities and relevant organisations to identify potential projects. In addition Part 2: Landscape Led Design sets out the Council's expectations for new movement routes as part of a multifunctional design approach, and Part 3 'Strategic Allocations' also identifies potential opportunities. The inclusion of proposed routes would therefore be premature to identify and include within the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Reference to "A map showing the location of the assets for the area will be provided in the final document". But no detailed drawing of routes, widths, surfaces, junctions, supporting infrastructure provided.		The assets referred to are those Green Infrastructure Assets that already exist in the area. The level of detail suggested is not appropriate for inclusion in a high-level Strategy such as this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The photographs culled from other locations are misleading. Where are we to have an Edible Bus Stops, (page 76) or multifunctional spaces like the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, Stratford, (page 32)?		Many of the images in Part 2: Landscape Led Design are included as examples that could be incorporated, including as part of the Strategic Masterplan areas, with the intention of demonstrating how places that have succeeded in achieving multifunctional design and helping to inspire such approaches within the District. Locations and designers of case studies are listed clearly.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Increased traffic generation acknowledged in the document but no firm proposals for separation of modes made. Unlikely to be a satisfactory solution for the South Epping proposals.		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns re: conflict between EFDC and Forest Conservators		The Council has been working in partnership with the Conservators of Epping Forest, including in the development of this Strategy, and will continue to do so. It is important to recognise that the Council and the Conservators have different roles and responsibilities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Contains no information on how the proposals are to be funded		The Strategy has been amended to provide further information on funding mechanisms.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Need to explain why the Forest cannot be enlarged to both alleviate those pressures and cater for increasing demands		The Epping Forest is a protected, ecologically significant ancient woodland, the attributes of which cannot be replicated. In this Strategy, we have provided guidance on the approach that the Council will take to ensure the provision of viable alternative greenspaces so that new development does not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Forest. The City of London Corporation has also, over a number of decades, purchased land adjacent to the Forest to act as 'buffer lands' in order to protect it.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Too many abbreviated terminologies		A Glossary has been appended to the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The strategy needs to clarify whether it means the removal of Green Belt status from more land in the District once it becomes for recreational use		This is not a matter for the Strategy but is rather a site-specific planning matter.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Should demonstrate the degree of active support amongst the Partners		A range of key stakeholders were consulted on the draft Strategy and, whilst they made detailed comments on the contents, were supportive of the purpose of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Need to plan for travel by motor vehicles – High Beech and Chingford, reflects this problem. Dog walkers parking at the village hall in North Weald is another example		Comment noted. This not a matter for the Strategy. The Council's approach to planning for travel is set out in the Council's emerging Local Plan and the policies within it.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roger Anthony	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Funding is weakly covered in the strategy		The Strategy has been amended to provide further information on funding mechanisms.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The GI Strategy should not add additional layers of unnecessary complexity or otherwise duplicate work that is being taken forward via separate processes		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns re: the appropriateness of the detailed requirements that the GI Strategy suggests will be necessary to demonstrate an acceptable SANG design		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Paragraphs 1.5 to 1.30 set out specific proposals to apply to the Water Lane and Latton Priory Garden Town Masterplan Areas – the strategy should acknowledge that only at the reserved matters/ detailed planning stage will a granular level of detail become feasible	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The document should be revised to confirm expressly that aspirational future linkage (Appendix 2) does not pre-suppose the route of the link road, which will need to be provided (through Latton Priory) on an alignment that it acceptable to the Highways Authority, Historic England, Natural England, and others	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	It should be understood that whilst there is potential to provide additional SANG land at Latton Priory, the arising capacity for mitigation will be prioritised for development taking place within the masterplan area		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	It should be made clear that, if there is residual SANG capacity (which is potentially able to mitigate the impacts of development) elsewhere within the district, the SANG will remain under private ownership and the use of this resource will be subject to the usual commercial arrangements		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.3 represents an additional requirement, which has not been previously discussed with the promoters of the strategic allocations	Appendix 3	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Paragraphs 1.18 to 1.34 sets out a range of detailed requirements to be included in a Landscape Framework, this approach is prescriptive and potentially problematic as the level of detail envisaged would not be compatible with the strategic masterplans being prepared, nor would it be achievable with the parameters of an application for outline planning Permission. The level of detail provided should simply be equivalent to that which Natural England deems necessary (at a particular stage in the planning) to assess whether a proposed SANG is likely to be effective at mitigating impacts on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation	Appendix 3	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. Also see the overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Boyer Planning OBO CEG and Hallam Land	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	If a proposed SANG is shown to be effective as a form of mitigation, it follows that it meets the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010). Therefore not appropriate for the Council to introduce policies or guidance, that require SANG to achieve more than this. However, this does not preclude the potential to integrate SANG provision within a holistic scheme design to promote good practice and achieve additional benefits.	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	A clearer timeline for implementation required	The Strategy has been amended to include more information on delivery, including an indication as to how much Green Infrastructure is to be implemented, and by when, based on the latest information available where it relates to specific development proposals.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Requirement for a clearer funding outline	The Strategy has been amended to provide further information on funding mechanisms.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns around the differential between the two key elements, e.g. SANGS and the Green & Blue plans	SANGs are a specific type of GI which are intended to provide residents with an alternative recreational offer to the Epping Forest and therefore have an important role to play in the future provision of GI in the District. The Strategy makes it clear that SANG should integrate with, and complement, the District's wider Green and Blue Infrastructure networks.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	It will be impossible to achieve the level of development proposed and also achieve the relatively modest environmental ambitions contained in the document	The Council considers that through the application of the policies in its emerging Local Plan, supported by this Strategy, development will make a meaningful contribution towards Green Infrastructure and environmental enhancements.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns around the "fallout" from Covid	The long-term effects arising from COVID-19 are not yet know. However, the Strategy is an important tool in responding to the need for high-quality Green Infrastructure which has been highlighted by the pandemic. Furthermore there is sufficient flexibility within the Strategy to be able to respond to changing needs and attitudes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns around how the strategy can be delivered and how it can be effectively monitored	The Strategy has been amended to include information on delivery and how the Strategy will be monitored.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Bedford House Community Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Concerns around the fact that EFDC and several other authorities are using same "Epping Forest and its buffer lands" in proposed plans, without adding to the land available for the purpose, in many ways increasing the impact rather than reducing it	The policies contained in the Council's emerging Local Plan and the Strategy set out how development arising in the District will respond to Epping Forest SAC considerations. This includes a requirement for the provision of new spaces which will add to the amount of land available for recreational uses. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Although there are references to improving and enhancing the existing natural 'assets' of the District, there does not seem to be a clear strategy	The Strategy identifies a range of mechanisms for doing this including in Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network and through the design and implementation of development sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Need more emphasis on assessing and protecting what is already there before development takes place or before disturbing/destroying part of an environmentally important landscape to create new, tailor made, activity environments on a large scale	The Landscape-Led approach within the Strategy supports this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Need comprehensive surveys covering the existing landscape and not just the obvious assets of Epping Forest	The Strategy has been developed using the Local Plan Evidence Base, which contains a wealth of relevant information on our District, including a detailed assessment its existing Green and Blue Infrastructure assets. Links have been provided in the Strategy to this evidence base.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Where are the mature trees, hedgerows, natural grasslands and meadows etc?	The Strategy has been developed using the Local Plan Evidence Base, which contains a wealth of relevant information on our District, including a detailed assessment its existing Green and Blue Infrastructure assets. Links have been provided in the Strategy to this evidence base.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The importance of residential garden as green corridors in urban areas, which ultimately connect with the wider countryside have been overlooked	The Strategy has been amended to include information for developers of smaller sites and homeowners as to how they can contribute to the provision of Green and Blue Infrastructure. This includes the importance of gardens as green corridors, and how they can be enhanced.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Do not agree with the multi-functional approach and concerned about the emphasis on providing alternative sites (SANGs) primarily for dog walkers in an attempt to attract them away from Epping Forest	The purpose of SANG is to provide an alternative destination for visitors of the Epping Forest, many of which are dog walkers as evidenced by 2017 and 2019 Epping Forest Visitor Surveys. Therefore, in order to be effective, SANG need to be designed to attract such users.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	I have doubts about the concept of linking SANGs with the wider network of footpaths	SANG should be easily accessible by foot, and to provide a range of walking, cycling and where appropriate horse riding opportunities, Therefore they must connect into the PROW network either using existing networks or through the creation of new links.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Do not want to see a SANG with a car park close to a station – it will encourage more commuters to drive to a station	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Separate cycle routes would be preferable although these can work with walking routes	Comment noted. This will be a matter for the detailed design of individual projects based on the site specific circumstances. However, the Strategy reflects Essex County Council's (as Highways Authority) preferred approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Cyclists do use the main trackway alongside Theydon Wood	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	There are also shared trackways along the Lea Valley with varying degrees of success	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	All for planting new trees but they need to be the 'right trees in the right places	The Council will use the 'Right Tree Right Place' principle in tree planting work going forward in the 'Tree Planting - A Call for Sites' project.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Farmers/landowners should be encouraged to plant strips of wild flowers at field boundaries and maintain hedgerows (rather than grubbing them out) which will create and improve the connectivity of green corridors	Comment noted. The Council has no control over the removal of a hedgerows unless it falls within the definition of a protected hedgerow set out in legislation.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	There is a real opportunity for landowners to work with schools – a project, which involved schoolchildren planting/improving hedgerows has been successfully carried out for many years in Theydon Bois Parish with the support of the local landowner	Work currently being undertaken by the Council for the 'Tree Planting - A Call for Sites' project will begin to involve local schools in the coming months.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Encouraging natural play in areas such as woodlands will need to be carefully monitored as this must not be to the detriment of the existing wildlife	Comment noted. This is recognised within the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	How are Blue infrastructures monitored to ensure that they are well managed?	This is a matter for the relevant responsible body depending on the type of Blue Infrastructure. Where appropriate this is included within the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Suggest including a list of contacts to advise who is responsible for ditches, watercourses, rivers and would deal with blocked or overgrown streams, an invasive species or potential contamination issue	Weblinks have been included within the Strategy where appropriate. Specific maintenance issues are not applicable to the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Susan Warren	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Public Rights of Way – list how these are monitored and who is responsible for their maintenance in the document	This information can be found in the Movement and Wayfinding project in Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network, under 1.2 Stewardship for District-Wide Projects

Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The Copped Hall and Warley's sites that are outlined as proposals are not deliverable	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Need to retain agricultural land for food production – taking food producing land and turning it into non- productive space is short sighted and a mistake	The Council recognises the importance of food production and has taken a balanced approach in retaining agricultural land whilst providing for the needs of future communities and support the District's environmental needs.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The strategy is unable to deliver enough open accessible green space with the current high demand for open natural green space and the extreme pressure on Epping Forest	The Council considers that through the application of the policies in its emerging Local Plan, supported by this Strategy, development will make a meaningful contribution towards the provision of natural greenspace. Also see the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The sites suggested in the strategy would mean car travel for the majority of users to visit which is contradictory to the point of accessible natural green space	SANG should be easily accessible by foot, therefore there is an emphasis on connecting sites with communities and to the PROW network. See also overaching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Lack of understanding of the pressures and influence this strategy proposes towards the Epping Forest SAC	The Strategy forms part of the Council's approach to managing the pressures on the Epping Forest SAC. The Strategy provides information on the issues that relate to the Forest and, in its role as a competent authority, the Council is very aware of the pressures on the Forest. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	There are no specific provisions for Loughton which is set to receive a some additional of development	The Strategy has been amended to include 'Part 4: Infrastructure Enhancement Projects' which makes specific provisions for Loughton. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	To suggest using sites in Copped Hall and Warlies would mean car journeys for anyone from Loughton straight through the Epping Forest SAC	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	It seems to have been overlooked that there is a railway line dividing access to the Roding Valley Nature Reserve as this area is not easily accessible for people north of the railway line	Comment noted. The Roding Valley Nature Reserve was put forward by a number of individuals in response to a question posed in the 2019 Epping Forest Visitor Survey.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Forum	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	EFDC could be forcing car parking charges onto the public for using the "peoples Forest"	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Support the development of better cycling and walking links specifically between Epping and North Weald	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Other heritage railway sites, such as the Nene Valley Railway, have successfully built paths alongside sections of their track	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	There is potential for a sympathetic path to open the existence of the Railway to a wider audience than would otherwise be the case and thereby drive the future success of the Railway and the local visitor economy	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The scope for such a trail to be useful as part of the Council's main transport infrastructure however must be limited	Comment noted. This will be explored further as part of the development of the sustainable transport solutions for the two North Weald Masterplan sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Support the development and enhancement of the local cycle paths and PRoW network	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The M11 and A414 barriers could be overcome with suitable funding and innovative ideas. See Thames River Path (section built out at Thames Barrier opposite Tate and Lyle factory), the new towpaths added to the canals and river network in and around the A12, Bow Interchange, and Mile End where a park was built in the air that now carries people and bicycles over the A12	These helpful examples are noted and will be reviewed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Ongar Railway	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The space under the bridge at Epping Ongar Railway is very limited and a solution could present itself, without too much diversion, to the place where the M11 crosses over the A414 for this. This point could be a useful junction to have a spur towards Latton Priory	This is a helpful suggestion and will be considered further in the development of the detailed proposals in relation to the Strategic Masterplan sites in North Weald Bassett and Latton Priory or as part of the District Wide Projects.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Supportive of multi-purpose green spaces however the document does not provide sufficient assurances that these aspirations can or will be met	The Council will require the integration of multi-functional design principles in relevant planning applications.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Proposed measures should ensure high quality Green Infrastructure is delivered alongside proposed growth in the District whilst complying with the District's general obligations as a competent authority under the Habitats Directive (article 6(3) and the Species and Habitats Regulations 2018 (Regulation 9(1))	The policies in the Council's emerging Local Plan will ensure that the timely provision of high quality Green Infrastructure is secured using appropriate mechanisms as part of the determination of planning applications. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The focus for SANGS should be on the total quantum of housing growth taking place over the District, to make an effective impact and to increasingly allow for a joined-up network for people and wildlife across the District	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The first priority on protecting the Epping Forest SAC from the impacts of development should be on 'avoidance' of activities which threaten the SAC, not on 'mitigation' measures	Under the Habitats Regulations there is no hierarchy and therefore avoidance and mitigation measures have equal priority. Also see overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Insufficient evidence in this document that the Council is able to comply with the Habitats Regulations 2017	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on the mitigation measures that the Council has adopted which, when considered collectively with the relevant Parts of this Strategy, ensures compliance with the Habitats Regulations. Also see overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	No provision made for a governance structure for agreeing and delivering Epping Forest SAC mitigation works	The Strategy has been amended to make reference to the mechanisms for delivering mitigation measures. See overarching SANG response. Governance mechanisms for the delivery of SAMMS measures are currently being developed in partnership with neighbouring local authorities and the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Lack of a hierarchy of SANGS delivery, and no clear guidance on how SANGS will be managed in perpetuity, puts wildlife and high quality provision for people at risk	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Heritage Trust	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	This Strategy needs to be agreed across the relevant London and Essex authorities and thus will need to address the regional requirements for SANGS	See overarching SANG response. Neighbouring authorities were consulted on the draft Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Riders Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Horse riders are only mentioned in the document as regular users only once – from then on everything concentrates on use by cyclists and walkers. Horse riders should be considered equally as long term users of both the Forest and the Buffer Lands	The Strategy has been amended to include reference to the needs of horse riders.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Riders Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	Many areas and how they are used for recreational purposes are not suitable for a 'one-size fits all' approach. Neither are they suitable for a 'formal park' approach. The whole attraction of areas to users such as these are that they are not formal or organised	Comment noted. The Strategy does not adopt a 'one size fits all' approach but rather recognises, and encourages, the need for locationally specific responses to the design of Green and Blue Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Riders Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The Buffer Lands, especially Warlies, are an area used by many horse riders, especially because it is a quieter, safer place to ride than many others due to the massive increase in cyclists and walkers. The plan you propose only encourages the expansion of cyclists and walkers to the detriment of horse riders	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Riders Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The document, whilst possibly fulfilling certain planning obligations doesn't truly reflect the nature of all the areas covered by it	The Strategy has sought to achieve a balance between reflecting the varied character of the District and its places and not being overly lengthy. The Landscape-Led approach contained within the Strategy requires an analysis of the local context to be undertaken at the first stages of designing a scheme.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Forest Riders Association	Feedback on the document	15-Jul-20	The approach needs to be more flexible and suitable for the needs according to the specific area and its current users, not an overall blanket approach	Comment noted. The Strategy does not adopt a 'one size fits all' approach but rather recognises, and encourages, the need for locationally specific responses to the provision of Green and Blue Infrastructure.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	2.41 Should be clearer that the work doesn't stop in 2033. For example, by adding "...and secured for the future" after "protected and enhanced"	The Vision	The Vision has been amended to reflect the Council's ambition to continue the protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure beyond the Local Plan period. The Delivery Plan also reflects this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	2.26 The action to be taken to improve the River Stort's ecological quality status to "good" is not discussed - it would be helpful to have an indication of action to be taken	The Vision	The Strategy now includes references and links to the River Stort Catchment Management Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	3.12 Management/upkeep – Introducing small wild animals to assist with land management might promote public interest in the environment and get individuals and/or groups involved in the management/use of these spaces	Multifunctionality	The appropriateness of this approach will be dependent on the nature of the asset being managed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	3.16 Local educational art programmes or undiscovered talent could provide input and/or create art in the Green and blue spaces which would be more cost effective and will help local talent	Multifunctionality	The Council will engage with local art programmes, educational facilities and artists in the implementation of the Art in the Landscape project, as detailed in Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	EFDC could partner with horticultural centres/Capel Manor for ideas/practical projects	Multifunctionality	The Council will engage with community groups and interested parties in all District-wide projects, as listed in Part 1: Enhancing Our Existing Network.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	3.46 Cycling and walking – Can modern leisure travel be safely accommodated in a shared space? E.g. e-scooters, roller blades, skateboards	Multifunctionality	Part 2: Landscape Led Design - Movement focusses on developing a network for all users whilst reognising that there will be a need to design out potential conflicts between user groups.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.13 The proposals will require considerable funding. S106 could only be used for projects related to the relevant development. Funding for stewardship bodies - including Parish Councils - is largely to come via S106. Other sources of funding such as the Heritage Lottery Fund are mentioned (page 102) but seem unlikely to provide a great deal. There is no commitment from EFDC itself for funds for this Strategy. Should consider post Corona virus implications/income for statutory authorities is likely to be reduced	Implementation	Further information on funding mechanisms has been provided in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.15 No mention of Roydon at all	Implementation	Roydon has now been included on the relevant map.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.22 Parish Councils are identified as a "vehicle for stewardship". What might this mean in practice? Clarity on this point is vital. Land-owners should also be considered as 'stewards' and be encouraged to participate in community projects using redundant land/barns/glasshouses which could provide an income	Implementation	The Strategy has been amended to include more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. This report identified a number of preferred stewardship models, which are now reflected in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Should be more emphasis on retaining the district's trees more penalties for those who wilfully destroy healthy trees	Implementation	The Strategy makes clear the importance of both retaining and adding trees across the District. Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) prevent wilfull damage or cutting down of trees and if not adhered to the responsible person can face having to pay significant fines.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There needs to a district wide focus on the strategic use of/quantity of dog waste bins	Implementation	This is not a matter for the Strategy. However, such provision will need to be considered as part of the design of new spaces where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Community Greenspace Improvements – Is there a possibility of a limited number of licences (with conditions) for mobile food and drink units, at particular locations, to encourage visitors?	Appendix 2	This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Roydon Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	An important piece of blue infrastructure in the village of Roydon is threatened by proposals for the Village 7 development, part of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. A route for walkers and cyclists to and from Roydon station along the towpath of the Stort		This is not a matter for the Strategy. Any changes to assets will need to be agreed by the River and Canal Trust who own the towpaths.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There are hardly any definite proposals		The Strategy identifies a wide range of proposals. However, in order to make this clearer the Strategy has been revised to incorprate all projects into the relevant Parts, removing them from the Appendices. This ensures they are easily found.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Much of the emphasis is on the provision of multipurpose SANGs, but the incompatibility of Children's play space and free running dogs is highlighted in the reference to Gunpowder Park on P106. There is a need for both		The guidance contained in Part 3.2 of the Strategy reflects this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Would like to see more emphasis on the retention of existing green corridors when sites are developed		Comment noted. The Strategy reflects this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Not much about Blue Infrastructure – nothing about fishing, boating or access to the Rivers Stort or Roding		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to the water course apparently suggest the flow is uphill - the 'mature planted setting' is a rather polite way of describing the overgrown and litter strewn stretch alongside Brook Road	4.6	The Strategy is referring to the watercourse which runs diagonally across the eastern part of the Masterplan area.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The listing of Amenity Green spaces in Epping is confusing. Assume 'Central Avenue North' is the same patch shown in the picture on Page 41 where it is identified (correctly) as Centre Green. Where is the Green Space in Station Road? Hemnall St is both Good and Average	4.9	The Strategy has been amended to remove any potential confusion
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The 18th Century Map shows Coopersale House, not Coopersale Hall		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The allotments picture is not Meadow Road but is of the Lower Bury lane site. The picture is at the Tower Rd end, showing the Town Council plots. The Lower Bury Lane end of the site (not owned by the council) is largely uncultivated and overgrown with brambles.	Page 42	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Tony Carr	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	A number of sites are listed, do these all still exist? The Coopersale allotment site, and others across the district, were scheduled for housing in the original plan	Page 91	The Strategy refers to sites which exist and which are not proposed for development.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	EPP.R2 it is not shown on the maps. This is misleading and the maps should be updated to include Site EPP.R2	Page 54	Mapping for South of Epping Masterplan Area has now been provided, clearly showing both sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Page 89 states that a map of the SEMPA will be provided in the final GIS. The missing map should be provided to allow representations to be made ahead of the final document being published	Appendix 2	The map referred to related to the map of existing Green Infrastructure assets in Epping parish. The lack of its provision was not material to the consideration of the Strategy and, as it was of a factual nature, there is nothing for representations to be made in its regard. Consequently there is no requirement to reconsult further prior to the adoption of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	To ensure that masterplan areas can deliver the housing required under the emerging Local Plan, TFP considers that the SANG guidance should include options for financial contributions to off-site measures such as the creation of SANG elsewhere or the enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way; and include details of the full range of uses that SANG can encompass.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Map on page 65: the dot should be moved so that it relates to both sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2. At present it is misleading.	Appendix 2	The map has been amended.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.1 (page 88) typo - build should be built	Appendix 2	0
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.6 and 4.7 (page 90) the report should note that the existing setting of the listed buildings at Gardeners Farm comprises an urbanised context at the edge of the built-up area of Epping, near to electricity pylons and the M25	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.12 (page 91) the currently unattractive underpasses for walkers and cyclists could be improved as part of the development of the SEMPA	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	4.13 (page 91) the development of the SEMPA provides an opportunity to improve walking and cycling provision from the south of Epping to the High Street	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	SANG guidance - it should be made clear when the Landscape Framework will be required in the planning process (presumably at the masterplan stage)	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.6 and 1.7 (page 96) to ensure masterplan areas can deliver the housing required under the emerging Local Plan the SANG guidance should include options for financial contributions to off-site measures such as the creation of SANG elsewhere or the enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way; and include details of the full range of uses that SANG can encompass	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Lock Associates OBO the Fairfield Partnership	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.34 (page 100) any SANG provided on the SEMPA to be for local use and consider it inappropriate to provide any additional car parking to serve the SANG.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraphs 4.20-4.23 the document makes it clear that the community needs to be at the heart of this stewardship to ensure success and proposes a number of options. The strategy is brief and vague about how these models may work and the costs involved with such options. It is suggested that there a number of funding options but does not detail what these are	Stewardship	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. Early engagement with the Council on the development of stewardship principles is strongly encouraged.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Ongoing concern in relation to the lack of inter-relationship between different policy documents and the impacts and costs to the development of individual approaches	Stewardship	See overarching SANG response which clarifies the interrelationships and which are now reflected in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unclear whether the Stewardship options have opportunities to involve the existing residents in the management of spaces	Stewardship	The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship of new and existing Green Infrastructure in the Strategy, including referencing the HGGT Stewardship Report published June 2020. Early engagement with the Council on the development of stewardship principles is strongly encouraged.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Draws attention to the importance of the Green Wedges planned by Frederick Gibberd. however the illustration shown in the Strategy does not properly include development on the parcels at Water Lane	Para 1.4	Mapping has been updated in the Strategy, clearly showing all development parcels for Water Lane.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.4: additions would be helpful concerning the modern day uses of Green Wedges, such as their multiple uses, their potential additional use for recreation, drainage, wildlife, pedestrian, linear play, access, or urban agriculture, as such multiple uses benefit both Water Lane and Latton Priory	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The extension of the local green link at Water Lane on the plan underplays its importance as a key element of the Harlow master plan, and the graphic should be strengthened	Page 74	Mapping has been updated in the Strategy, clearly showing the extension of the green link between Water Lane parcels.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The principle of green infrastructure set out in Paragraph 1.5 and 1.6, must also refer to the principle of SANGS and urban agriculture in the list in Paragraph 1.6	Para 1.5 & 1.6	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Additions are required in that the principle of the Green Wedges has been diluted by modern development, and the condition of some of these spaces is poor	Para 1.7	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No information to explain what Nazeing Common is, whether the change from agriculture is appropriate or how it is to come about	Para 1.10 & 1.18	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Nazeing Common Conservation Area is one of the big landscape attractors mentioned, when coming from Harlow it can only be accessed through Water Lane	Para 1.22	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Local footpaths radiating out from Water Lane will be used to provide this access to Nazeing Common and these footpaths should be both managed for increased use, where possible extended, and identified on a plan in the Strategy, such as that on page 74		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	This plan should be extended to the west to include Nazeing Common and how the Strategy deals with the Common. The new plan will show that Water lane is well linked by local footpaths and that the Common can and should be recognised and enjoyed by walkers (this is one of the key benefits of the Water Lane sites)		Mapping has been extended to include Nazeing Common,

Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The plan shows Epping Long Green in the key, but this is not on the plan. Instead it is shown on the plan on page 72. This needs to be corrected	Page 70	Mapping has been updated to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The plan is incomprehensible and needs a key	Page 75	Maps now have legible and correct keys.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Consideration needed to the potential introduction of the STC	Page 72	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.26 lacks clarity in terms of the SANG requirement in advance of the final SPA and Avoidance & Mitigation Strategy	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unclear where the Zone of Influence extends to and the quantum of SANG required at Water Lane		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Pegasus Group OBO Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Concern with agreeing a joint working approach across multiple sites and an MOU due to the possible time delay involved with each differing location and its requirements		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Majority of local residents are aware of the well-used network of public rights of way in the Parish however improvements in terms of wayfinding and improved maintenance would be supported	Movement and Wayfinding	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Essential that any reduction in maintenance of verges does not inadvertently cause a Highway Safety issue. These areas should not be left as 'uncut areas', but an active programme of wildflower management should be put in place	Roadside Flowers	The Strategy makes it clear that highway safety will need to be taken into consideration. The approach proposed would still be the subject of an active programme of management.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest the Parish Council should be included as a Key Stakeholder for this project. A full, comprehensive list of any such areas should be made publicly available, so it is clear to all members of the public why these areas are left uncut.	Roadside Flowers	The Strategy has been amended to reflect these comments.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Support tree planting and would actively engage with a call for sites. It is requested that Parish Councils should be included as a Key Stakeholder for this project	Tree planting – A Call for Sites:	Comments welcomed and the Strategy has been amended to make reference to parish and town councils as a key stakeholder.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	A potential site for tree planting is mooted under paragraph 2.26 of appendix 2 (page 82) of the report as being at 'North Weald Common'. As the custodians of this area, the Parish Council would support the starting of an open dialogue to discuss this possibility.	Tree planting – A Call for Sites:	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The strategy does not clearly identify exactly how this project would be managed, and which 'budget' would not need to be increased. Additional details should be included to establish exactly what this project entails.	Community Greenspace Improvements	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Artwork would need to have a meaningful attachment to a specific area, and sited where the risk of vandalism could be minimised.	Art in the Landscape	Comment noted. This will be a matter for the detailed design of individual projects based on the site specific circumstances.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Art which could be interactive and provides a connection to a specific walking route (i.e. an art trail), would provide a great opportunity for people of all ages to actively engage with the countryside.	Art in the Landscape	Comment noted and will be given further consideration as part of the implementation of this initiative.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The support of the above projects is done so on the basis that the three villages in North Weald Bassett already have well used and well connected public rights of way, however there are some very specific areas / routes which could actively be improved. The Parish Council is willing to engage with EFDC regarding these	Art in the Landscape	Comment noted and welcomed.

Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There has been an error in calculating exactly how Masterplan Areas, housing allocations, and an appropriate level of SANG fit together. The result is that one of two things now needs to happen: 1. The housing numbers should be reduced on each Masterplan site so that an appropriate provision of SANG can be provided on-site 2. SANG is provided elsewhere	Appendix 2 & 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The key for the maps on page 70 and 72 do not seem to be accurate with legends either missing or not applicable to the map itself	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	Maps now have legible and correct keys.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Stort Valley Way is not identified on the map on page 72, which makes it difficult to identify when reading paragraph 1.22 on page 73	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	Unfortunately, the scale of the maps makes it difficult to clearly show the Stort Valley, but other mapping in the Strategy can be used to orientate the sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The strategy does not provide the ability for children from North Weald, Hastingwood and Thornwood to cycle and/or walk to the new primary and secondary schools in Latton Priory	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	The Strategy has been amended to reflect the opportunity for the communities to be connected by walking and cycling facilities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There is no active and sustainable route for children in neighbouring villages to get to the Latton Priory site	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	See comment 251 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	If there are not to be any such links to/from Thornwood, Hastingwood or North Weald, the wording should be changed to make it clear that these are links for neighbourhoods within the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town, and not the surrounding areas as it currently suggests	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	See comment 251 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The 'possible future link' as detailed on the map of page 74 should be altered to make it a fixed project forming part of a clear plan, and not simply a possibility	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	Whilst the Council is keen to secure such a link this will need to be assessed further as part of the Masterplanning of the area.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 2.18 on page 80 'Millennium Walk 3' is not referenced under the Latton Priory Heading, only the North Weald heading, which doesn't make sense as Millennium Walk 3 has a great link between Thornwood and the new Latton Priory development site.	Strategic Allocations: Latton Priory	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The key on page 78 does not clearly reference all the markings on the associated map	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	Maps now have legible and correct keys.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The proposed Masterplan area on page 78 (indicated by yellow lines) actually includes the school and green area, so therefore technically these areas should have yellow lines too	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Consideration should be given to what any enhancement of the Memorial Playing Fields and surrounding play areas would mean to the current residents of both School Green Lane and Beamish Close in terms of access. And -consideration should be given to the legal status of this land, who manages it, and ensure that conversations have taken place to ensure the proposed use is consistent with the purposes of the land itself.	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	An explanation of the definition of an urban park should be included in the green infrastructure strategy document to clearly identify what this means	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 2.18 on page 80 of the document references a well-used walk known as 'Millennium Walk 1' through North Weald, this needs to be amended and moved to the 'Movement' section on page 81	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 2.20 (page 81) the last statement in this paragraph needs to clearly set out which organisation(s) would be responsible for exploring the opportunities for such links, as at present it simply states 'they should be explored'.	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unless there is substantial and sustained investment to make the North Weald Redoubt safe and accessible, it should not be included as part of any green loop	Strategic Allocations: North Weald Bassett	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Support the creation of open community allotments and orchard areas, however this would be in addition to, and not instead of, established and well used allotment sites		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Details of the bodies / parties that will be responsible for managing elements of the strategy, together with how both the projects and SANG will be funded is not clear		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	North Weald Bassett Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Strategy states that the document will be reviewed regularly (maximum every two years), however it does not confirm whether or not the updated document will be subject to a public consultation.		If the review results in material changes to the strategy it will be subject to public consultation
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document states that the Stort Valley has much to offer as well as the Stort Navigation, however both are to be 'ruined' by the new Harlow Garden Town development		The relationship between these waterbodies and new development will need to be addressed as part of the Masterplanning and detailed design of the development proposals.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	If the use of allotments are to be maximised throughout the District, an EFDC Officer should be employed to liaise with parish and town councils to ascertain available plots and direct residents to their nearest		The Council will give consideration to this proposal - this is not a matter for the strategy
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest the lack of facilities at North Weald is addressed with the £50,000 given to them for the checking facility (which eventually was not used and the money remains with NW)		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Page 15 if charging for the forest is implemented, it may force visitors to free areas, eg Roydon Playing Fields (RPF), the Stort Navigation etc causing consequential issues, litter etc.	Para 1.26	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Landowners /farmers should be added to the list	Para 1.32	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Concerned that funding will not be freely available following Covid	Para 1.33	Whilst the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on funding is as yet unknown, there are still likely to be opportunities to secure funding from different sources. In addition development proposals will be required to provide, or contribute towards the provision of Green Infrastructure where appropriate in order to be
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Would this impact on Roydon Playing Fields?	Para 1.40	This paragraph sets out the government's Strategy and is not therefore locationally specific.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Does this mean cycle routes will be widely promoted thus our Stort Navigation tow path will be inaccessible to walkers	Para 2.11	This paragraph is a statement of fact. Routes will need to be usable by walkers and where appropriate opportunities for cyclists will be explored where it is safe to do so and will need to be agreed with the River and Canal Trust.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	How does this fit in with Harlow Garden Town, Village 7 using the tow path as quick access to Roydon BR Station?	Para 2.11	See response to comment 272 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to the River Stort meandering and then refers to what should be named as the Stort Navigation, the River Stort is not the Navigation. They are 2 separate waterways.	Para 2.26	The Strategy has been amended to clarify this point.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	How will the significant improvements work with a significant development (Water Lane) pending?	Para 3.18	This is not a matter for the Strategy. Consideration of the relationship with existing assets in Harlow District will be a matter for consideration as part of the development of the detailed scheme for the Water Lane Masterplan Area.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	How far will this go when developers are expected to pay for infrastructure as well?	Para 4.13	A range of funding sources have been identified. The costs of Green Infrastructure provision have been considered as part of the Local Plan viability work.
Draft v2 - June 2020	The Roydon Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Will this put a financial burden on parish councils?	Para 4.22	It is not intended to place any additional financial burdens on parish and town councils.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The content of the strategy falls far short of the guidance hoped to see		The Strategy has sought to achieve a balance between providing sufficent guidance to support the integration of Green and Blue infrastructure as part of development proposals without being unnecessarily prescriptive or stifling innovation.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unclear exactly what the expectation for the Water Lane masterplan area is - is it expected to provide on-site SANG or not?		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Explains that the proposals at Appendix 2 are intended to provide a starting point rather than a complete set of parameters, however clear guidance is required	Para 4.19	The Strategy has sought to achieve a balance between providing sufficent guidance to support the integration of Green and Blue infrastructure as part of development proposals without being unnecessarily prescriptive or stifling innovation.

Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Deals with the Latton Priory and Water Lane Garden Communities together, but they do not clarify where the provision of SANG is expected	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No reference to the possibility of a 'Super SANG' at Latton Priory which will also cater for the Water Lane community (as discussed with Officers)	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No diagrammatic demonstration of the extent or location of a 'Super SANG', as the map on page 25 of the iteration of Appendix 2 presented to Cabinet in April 2020 did	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No corresponding reference made to Manor Oak Homes' work to show how SANG could be provided as part of the masterplan for their part of the Water Lane allocation		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	In the event that a SANG is to be provided on the West Sumners site, that space will have to be multifunctional in use as it would not be possible to provide for a SANG in addition to the provision of open space to meet the standards set out in the Council's 2017 Open Spaces Strategy and accommodate sustainable drainage		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need clarification on what the total green infrastructure requirement is at Water Lane and how this is expected to be split between the northern West Katherines section and the southern West Sumners section, taking into account the multifunctional uses of space		The Strategy is not intended to provide this level of detail. The quantum of green infrastructure will be a matter for the Masterplanning of the site and for consideration at the detailed planning application stage when the quantum of development is known.
Draft v2 - June 2020	AR Planning OBO Manor Oak Homes	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need clarification that the strategy can be flexible as to the area of land required for SANGs and whether SANG provision is provided on-site, off-site (e.g at Latton Priory), or through a combination of both.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	What plans are there to deal with the traffic in villages such as Nazeing, especially as there is likely to be increased numbers of people accessing the enhanced green spaces?		The enhancement of existing, and provision of new, routes for walking and cycling proposed as part of the Strategy will support the objective of supporting journeys by means other than the car.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There should be measures to properly enforce the current 30 mph speed limit which is regularly disregarded. A further improvement might be to reduce the speed limit on the roads through the village to 20 mph especially as the main routes are in the vicinity of the local primary school.		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Consideration should be made to have dedicated routes for cyclists and pedestrians.		The Strategy supports this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	It is important that any planned new developments in Nazeing should be in scale with the village and that the plans incorporate trees, local wildlife sites and green spaces in keeping the area		The scale of development is not a matter for the Strategy. The policies contained in the Council's emerging Local Plan, supported by this Strategy, seek to ensure that such features are incorporated in new development where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Important that public rights of way are not allowed to be swallowed up by development.		Public Rights of Way are legally protected.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest the improvements to the green spaces are maintained and should have increased security patrols and/or cameras to identify those fly tipping and exhibiting anti-social behaviour		The Strategy includes potential stewardship models to ensure that green spaces are appropriately mnaged.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Nazeing Parish Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest improvements to Public Transport links from local train and surrounding towns are incorporated in the Green Plan		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraphs 1.6-1.7 no justification is provided as to why this quantum is appropriate in the context of Epping Forest	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Request changes to the document's text to clarify that the exact quantum of SANG for each Masterplan Area is yet to be determined and that the quality of SANG offer and how it		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document is not clear whether the whole of each Masterplan Area, or only that element which falls within the Zone of Influence, is required to contribute to SANG		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Important that the document includes justification and clarification as to whether other site allocations which sit close to, but outside of, the Zone of Influence are similarly required to contribute to SANG		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document is ambiguous regarding the location of the NWBMA SANG		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The questionnaire for the consultation document states that where SANG are proposed to be located is set out in Appendix 2, however, this is not the case, Appendix 2 only lists the Strategic Masterplan Areas required to provide SANG with no clarity on location		See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The version of the consultation document which was approved for consultation by Cabinet on 26th March 2020 (EB149) included a plan showing the potential location for the NWBMA SANG. However, it no longer includes the plan. Therefore, the location of the SANG and how it is to be determined are unclear		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unclear how the Council will ensure that the SANG is genuinely deliverable and that any delay to the release of SANG land will not lead to delay of housing delivery on the allocated sites		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document does not explain how SANG will be funded – Section 106, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan or both?		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Would welcome confirmation on whether contributions will only be sought to mitigate each development site's own recreational impact in accordance with the tests of planning obligations		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Contributions should be sought from sites outside of Masterplan Areas, which will have an impact on the SAC and which would be mitigated by the SANG		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document includes parameters regarding the size for SANG and prescribes detail of what it should provide but does not specify location or delivery details		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	"Framework within which the strategic sites proposed in the emerging Local Plan should be developed to maximise Green and Blue Infrastructure opportunities and successfully integrate with the existing communities and places" – considerable detail in respect of North Weald Basset. It should either contain less detail or be clearer that these are not additional policy requirements to those contained in the emerging Local Plan policies	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Detailed guidance on the requirement of SANG including a Site Quality Checklist - too fine grained at this stage and a 'one-size-fits-all' approach which appears to go beyond that required by Natural England which is simply to mitigate recreational impact	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.5 implies that the Landscape Framework is required to be submitted with an application, but is not clear how this relates to the Strategic Masterplan	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Landscape Framework appears to be a duplication of the Strategic Masterplan and is considered unnecessary		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.34 says a car park is needed unless the SANG is within easy walking distance (c.400m) of the developments linked to it – seems slightly at odds with the suggestion that it should be within or "close" to Masterplan areas as it implies they could be further away	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sworders OBO Martin Eldred	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 2.13 and 2.28 question around whether or not the upgrading of the recreation ground within the NWBMA is genuinely achievable cannot be known at this stage prior to the Strategic Masterplan and without knowing how this relates to the wider site or SANG provision	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Canal & River Trust	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Request that the document include more references to the Canal & River Trust and its specific ownership of the Lee Navigation and River Stort, and their respective towpaths (such as on pages 27 and 28)		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anderson Group	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	In support of the document's proposals and provide additional evidence of how THYN R.1 can effectively balance new growth and the natural environment		Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggestion to include a timescale for the publication of the final Strategy and if it will include an action plan with timescales and identifying resources		The Strategy has been amended to include more information on indicative timescales for delivery.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Page 12 and elsewhere - all pictures should have captions		The Strategy has been updated to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Definition of 'typology' required or use of a different term	Para 1.15	The Strategy has change the term 'typology' to 'type' wherever possible.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Definition of 'Place Making' required or use of a different term (appreciate that this is a term in common use in certain circles but not everyone knows what it means)	Para 1.16	It is difficult to use a different term as this is the terminology used in, for example, Government policy and guidance. This term has been added to a glossary in the Appendices of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Please include a brief definition of 'Fields in Trust' and its standards	Para 2.5	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	"Minimum provision" – assume this means as recommended in the standards above but please clarify	Para 2.6	The Strategy has been amended to clarify this point.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Provide a brief definition of 'Play England'	Para 2.9	Reference to 'Play England' has now been removed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Lyndsay Swan	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Page 25 (and elsewhere) – 'Countrycare', not 'Country Care'.		The Strategy has been amended to correct this.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Main aim is the preservation of the existing GI assets – the new strategy should promote these		The Strategy supports the preservation of existing Green Infrastructure assets.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There should be a detailed map of the whole district prepared on the basis of the Ordnance Survey 1 in 25,000 scale		Mapping within the Strategy has been amended where appropriate or weblinks provided to be able to access data where the information can be more clearly displayed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	If the existing rights of way for horse riding, walking and cycling had been marked on the map near the proposed development areas, it would be clear where the points of pressure are going to be and where addition access should be provided		A weblink to Essex County Council's PRoW interactive map has now been included to assist in such analysis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Important that anyone in the built-up areas have access to safe play areas for children as well as easy circular routes for disabled and dog walkers		The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Play areas etc would be administered by either Parish Councils or amenity groups however huge cost implications – see closure of the Epping Green play area due to no budget for its maintenance		The Strategy has been amended to provide more information on stewardship arrangements that need to be put in place to avoid such issues.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Overriding consideration should be the maintenance and enhancement of the countryside		The Strategy supports this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Disappointing that there is no clear plan of providing open space for the development in North Weald and Epping South		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The use of Copt Hall and Warleys will result in considerably increased traffic through the forest		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois & District Rural Preservation Society	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There should have been consultation with the farming community		The documents were published for a 6 week period on the EFDC website in accordance with our Statement of Community Engagement, and we used letters, posters and social media to publicise.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.24 it would be helpful to publish the visitor surveys information so that site promoters and developers can base proposals for GI on that information where relevant and understand how those surveys relate to aspects of the GI Strategy	Para 1.24	Both the 2017 and 2019 Visitor Surveys are now available on the Council's website. The 2017 survey formed part of the Council's Local Plan Evidence base.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The strategy suggests there is a need for more natural and semi-natural green space. Whilst this objective is acknowledged, this should be considered in the approach to the provision of SANG	Para 2.6	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The strategy does not set out the full evidence and justification for the quantum or necessity for SANG provision for the Masterplan areas; see our comments at 2.7 below (also referred to in our comments on Appendix 3)	Para 4.6	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Unclear whether or not EFDC seek to amend the IDP prepared for the EFDLP to reflect the outcome of this consultation or that carried out in January of this year on the Updated Viability Evidence	Para 4.13	As the IDP is a 'live' document any changes considered necessary as a result of the adoption of the Strategy will be included within the next update.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There is no reference to the opportunity for stewardship to be undertaken by management companies. These would certainly have a role in future developments and should not be precluded	Para 4.22	Additional information has been provided on stewardship which identifies the Council's preferred approach. However, consideration will be given to alternative approaches if it can be clearly demonstrated that high quality, effective long-term management of assets can be provided using alternative mechanisms.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	It will be important to ensure that any SANG requirement is properly evidenced and justified	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	2.25 providing a Green Loop will require third party land, other developers and significant EFDC involvement	Appendix 2	Whilst this may be the case it is appropriate to identify this as an opportunity to be fully investigated.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.6 concerned that there is no compelling link, supported by documented evidence, between the Thames Basin Heath and Epping Forest to justify the requirement of 8ha per 1000 population. Suggest that this should be qualified at 1.6 in the terms set out at 1.15-1.17 of the main document	Appendix 3	The draft Strategy clearly set out the rationale for this requirement. See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Strutt & Parker OBO Countryside Properties	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.20 questionable whether a SANG should avoid areas of high nature conservation value in all circumstances. A holistic approach would be important to ensure functionality and attractiveness of a SANG	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There is an underlying assumption in the Strategy that access to existing Green Infrastructure in the Harlow district will be unrestricted. However, the vulnerability of outliers of ancient woodlands should be highlighted in the Strategy		The Strategy identifies the relevant Green Infrastructure assets. The relationship with existing Green Infrastructure in Harlow will be a matter for consideration as part of the Masterplanning and development of planning applications for the Garden Communities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The primary objective of making each strategic allocation self-sufficient in Green Infrastructure is currently not fully addressed in the Strategy		The combination of the requirements set out in the emerging Local Plan together with this Strategy support this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The proximity of the strategic allocations to Harlow's existing Green Wedges, for example, will introduce increased movement along strategic corridors. While there is a need to foster integrated and cohesive communities, there is also a need to agree future maintenance and management		See response to comments 341 and 342 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	States that much of Harlow is classed as 'park' and that these areas were identified by the Harlow Open Space and Green Infrastructure Study (2013) as having significant room for improvement – a more appropriate phrase would be that park spaces have "the potential to offer greater value". This would reflect a quote from the Study	Para 3.18	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.13 "the [Harlow Open Space] study showed that in terms of size 'Sumner, Kingsmoor and Staple Tye' is currently above the advised minimum size". This should be amended to state that it is provision, rather than size, which is being referred to	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Presumably the Sumners and Bush Fair areas are specifically mentioned in this paragraph due to their proximity to the southern strategic sites, but this needs explaining. If so, reference also needs to be made to the eastern Harlow neighbourhoods given their proximity to the East of Harlow strategic site		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment. The East of Harlow Garden Community falls within both Epping Forest and Harlow Districts and therefore has been assessed in a different manner to reflect this fact.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.14 "Amenity spaces and parks are of mixed quality, with 11 of the 25 parks assessed in the Harlow Open Space and Green Infrastructure Study (2013) falling below quality standards". However, the Study shows that across Harlow, 32 out of 55 parks & gardens are 'above quality' and 23 are 'below'. For amenity greenspaces, 12 out of 25 are 'above' and 13 are 'below'. Request that paragraph 1.14 is checked against the Study	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need to link more with Essex CC's work on GI	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	SPD could be required? Mention links with Essex Design Guide?	Para 1.4	The Council does not consider that such an approach would be proportionate or necessary.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	SPD also required?	Para 1.6	See comment 349 above. It will be adopted as a material planning consideration
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	"…biodiversity assets that have been lost over time…" – would be useful to explain what they have been lost to	Para 1.9	Further detail is contained in relevant parts of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Amenity greenspace - give a higher priority to ensure people have access to quality "everyday" landscapes. Housing developments often lack this. Older estates have pockets of open spaces that provide immediately located recourses in terms of openness, whereas new estates are more compact with nominal openness, often centrally located, but with poorer quality throughout. Older estates have both. Pandemic highlighted need for immediate quality spaces. This also relates to giving people more options to reduce pressure on Epping Forest.	Para 1.14	This paragraph is a direct quote from Natural England Guidance and therefore it is not appropriate to amend it. Nevertheless other parts of the Strategy recognise the importance of such spaces.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	ECC did work on this where they looked at how some smaller GI spaces fulfil only one function but still have high importance	Para 1.17	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need reference to Garden Town and development in/around Harlow.	Para 1.18	The Strategy makes reference to Harlow and the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town at appropriate points.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to MoU?	Para 1.19	It is not considered that reference to the Memorandum of Understanding would be appropriate to include at this point.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Interim Approach to Managing Recreational Pressures on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation – current status of this?	Para 1.23	The Strategy has been amended to clarify this point.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Consider effects of pandemic. Also cross-border opportunities?	Para 1.24	The long-term effects arising from COVID-19 are not yet know. However, the Strategy is an important tool in responding to the need for high-quality Green Infrastructure which has been highlighted by the pandemic. Furthermore there is sufficient flexibility within the Strategy to be able to respond to changing needs and attitudes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Introducing new car parking charges - Parking charges to deter use can be seen as contradiction with the acknowledgment of these spaces as a vital resource for health and wellbeing. SANGs should be in place before deterrents are considered. Lea Valley Park introduced parking fees which were described by locals as a 'tax on health'. Need to ensure there are not mixed messages	Para 1.26	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Mention Harlow specifically	Para 1.31	The Strategy makes reference to Harlow at appropriate points.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	GT involvement?	Para 1.33	The Strategy makes reference to the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town at appropriate points.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference GT sustainability guidance and checklist	Para 1.39	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference high % of GB in Epping	Para 2.3	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Outdoor play should focus on and promote encouraging environmental/natural play, not just prescribed play in equipped spaces. The pandemic (closed play areas) highlighted need to educate people on alternative ways for children to play as it is not a practice that is as abundant as it once was. Partially addressed in para 2.9	Para 2.6	This paragraph is a factual statement. The Strategy supports this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference Garden Town transport work/strategy and the STCs	Para 2.13	The Strategy references this in relation to the relevant strategic sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need reference to Essex Wildlife Trust	Para 2.17	Essex Wildlife Trust is identified in the Strategy as a key partner.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	"…working to secure improvements to water and air quality." Would this be through planning contributions?	Para 2.20	This will be achieved through the application of the Council's emerging Local Plan policies and other mechanisms set out in a number of relevant strategies.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Slightly disjointed paragraph - is it saying the sculptures are a visitor attraction?	Para 2.39	The Strategy has been amended to make this clearer.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Review in light of pandemic	Para 2.40	This paragraph provided factual information about the District's popultion profile based on 2011 Census data but has since been removed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	GI Vision Needs more reference to links to surrounding areas	Para 2.41	The Vision and objectives have been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Embedding landscape-led approach to design of GI & BI: A statement or policy may be needed here to ensure approach is definitely 'landscape-led'. Landscape professionals are essential at the very early stages of any development to ensure the existing landscape opportunities and constraints lead the design process.	Para 2.42	The Strategy has been amended at appropriate points to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Environment – Acknowledge here that there should be some human-free, nonaccessible spaces secured as part of the GI	Para 3.1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need more on benefits of lifting canopies to offset any possible negative views of this	Para 3.12	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference use of phone apps	Para 3.14	The Strategy has been amended at appropriate points to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Public Art SPD needed?	Para 3.16	The Council does not consider that such an approach would be proportionate or necessary to achieve this objective.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Be more specific here given the reference to improvements which are needed. Currently reads as though GI in Harlow is worse than it is in reality	Para 3.18	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to SANGs needed here? Regarding SANGs, it is important to ensure core character and integrity of the open space remains. Such sites should not be at risk of being perceived as sacrificial to protect SSSIs and should have sensitive enhancements and proportionate expectation of levels of use. These sites are of local significance	Para 3.21	More specific guidance is included in Part 3 of the Strategy including the attributes that need to be designed in to any provision.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Social – would be useful to reiterate what is deemed reasonable behaviour in outdoor spaces. Some people are not aware of the impact of their behaviour (e.g. littering, presence of dog faeces). Knowledge about the countryside code and natural/sensitive settings needs to be increased, e.g. through campaigning or education	Para 3.24	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Could make point here about GI's multi-functionality and importance of amenity space for informal activities which also incorporate a more natural fringe or buffer to them	Para 3.27	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Also helps with climate change and fewer 'miles travelled' for food etc.	Para 3.31	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Green roofs/walls for food growing? Food production for human consumption needs to be away from vehicle traffic areas, e.g. Community buildings away from roads. There was an edible bus stops scheme a few years ago which unfortunately had problems with exhaust fumes on fruit	Para 3.33	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No youth shelter shown in photo (referenced in text)	Para 3.40	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	“Smaller spaces can still be meaningful and can often have significant local value” – Arguably more meaningful as it is an "everyday" accessible resource. Acknowledging hierarchy of importance of spaces would mean a greater chance to ensure their existence and quality and take pressure off sensitive sites. What is outside people’s homes and down their streets is of high importance top them. This will be key in creating the first level of SANGs. Suggest change in the of the section to move away from "small spaces" to help highlight their true significance.	Para 3.42	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Pocket parks?	Para 3.43	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Need more on the balance of doing this versus lack of maintenance. Also update in light of pandemic	Para 3.44	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	More emphasis specifically on concept of retrofit Suds should be considered. Suggestions of where and how to retrofit SuDs schemes need to be identified. What incentive could be set up to encourage this?	Para 3.61	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	There's a lot covered in this section so needs a bit more breaking down and also references to STCs and the Garden Town transport work/strategy	Section 3: Movement	The Strategy has been amended to improve its readability.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to GT needed here	Para 4.3	References are included in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Reference to GT needed here	Para 4.12	References are included in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Key for maps? East of Harlow needs adding. Wrong annotation on these maps as the GT looks like it's just the district area of Harlow	Para 4.14-4.15 Maps	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Overlap with Local Plan requirements? True landscape led approach to masterplanning should let the landscape dictate what is achievable and appropriate, to ensure developments don’t work against the landscape	Para 4.18	This is intended to support the implementation of the requirements set out in the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	GT involvement?	Section 4: Stewardship?	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Roadside Flowers Project – Success – Important to acknowledge difference between a naturalised area (left to grow with flower species that are already there) versus introducing new non-naturalised species which may not be appropriate. Added benefit is lack of cost	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Tree Planting Call for Sites – Need to reference Essex Forest to a county-wide record of woodland gains. Partnership. Integral	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	East of Harlow needs referencing	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.4 "…Green Wedges were a major feature…" The Green Wedges in Harlow still are a major feature with significant influence on the design of the town. Reference to Harlow Local Plan would be useful	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.7 reference GI link to Harlow here.	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Check map is most up-to-date. Add GB to map and also add GW/GB to key	Page 68	Not considered necessary for this map.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Add GB to map and key	Page 70	Not considered necessary for this map.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.14 need to also reference the Strategy and what it says about improvements, links to wider areas etc.	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.17 add GB to map and key	Appendix 2	Not considered necessary for this map.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.19 most roads travel along/through the wedges rather than cutting across them. Useful to give examples of where they cut across	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.23 should also mention horse-riding here (and elsewhere) as importance of including horse-riding in these contexts was raised by the Bridleways Association in response to Harlow Local Plan	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.23 Bullet point 1 - in what way? Examples and locations would be useful	Appendix 2	This will be a matter for the development of the Masterplans for the Garden Communities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.26 "also available to provide a wider SANG offer if this was needed" – would be useful to give example of where, if possible	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Watts, Harlow District Council	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.16 "…strategic Landscape Framework." – who would produce this?	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Iceni Projects OBO Lands Improvement	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Lack of clarity regarding the quantum and location of SANG within the Masterplan areas		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Iceni Projects OBO Lands Improvement	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Potential vehicle and pedestrian access issues at the Copped Hall Park SANG, without further land up-take to secure alternative access from Epping High Street		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Iceni Projects OBO Lands Improvement	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Lack of clarity regarding the funding mechanisms and deliverability of the Sites for Enhancement	Appendix 4	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peer Group	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No explanation for why this consultation is not formally under the umbrella of the draft Local Plan or the ongoing Examination in Public		The Council committed to developing this Strategy during the Examination Hearings into the emerging Local Plan. The Inspector did not require the Strategy to be the subject of further consideration as part of the Examination.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peer Group	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The document is not robust and it will not make the submitted Plan sound		The Council considers that the Strategy is robust and appropriately supports the implementation of relevant emerging Local Plan policies.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peer Group	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	It fails to identify suitable land for the provision of SANG, it fails to identify a genuine alternative destination to the Epping Forest SAC and it fails to provide a strategy that would reduce the pressure of the Epping Forest SAC		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Peer Group	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Serious shortcomings in the approach to both the original site selection and the retrospective identification of SANG to the Council's preferred site allocations. The evidence clearly favours the provision of a SANG on the Ongar Park Estate in preference to the contrived provision as suggested in the GI consultation document		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Barwood Land	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.17 'the Council's planning policy approach supported by this strategy recognises the role of high quality design to bring open space to life'. It is vital to ensure that a flexible approach is applied when considering Green Infrastructure. A design led, site specific approach would deliver better quality GI taking account of local context	Section 1	The Strategy reflects this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Barwood Land	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Consideration should be given to a more flexible approach to developer contributions, by seeking off-site GI contributions from strategic allocations as an alternative to specific on-site GI contributions	Section 2	The Strategy has been developed in part to inform the implementation of relevant policies within the emerging Local Plan. There is no legal requirement to wait until the adoption of the Local Plan before endorsing the Strategy as a material consideration in planning related matters because of the advanced stage of the Plan. References to the Strategy are proposed as part of the Main Modifications stage.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Barwood Land	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Paragraph 3.9 'where provision cannot be accommodated on-site contributions toward the provision or enhancement of natural open space nearby, and links to them, will be required'. It is important to make clear that these linkages do not necessarily need to be physical linkages, but wayfinding or publicity could also play their part	Section 3	This has been removed as the Council recognises that such consideration will need to be made on a case-by-case basis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Barwood Land	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest the vehicle for stewardship is not so restrictive to avoid delays in development coming forward. Adding management Companies and The Wildlife Trust to these organisations may add flexibility and assist in securing a 'best fit' for managing these GI spaces.	Section 4	More information on stewardship has been provided. This sets out the Council's preferred approach but does not preclude alternative approaches if it can be demonstrated that these would be fit for purpose.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Smaller Green Spaces in urban areas are not recognised in the value that they may also have in terms of taking off pressure from Epping Forest		The Strategy reflects the importance of such spaces but they do not entirely replicate the recreational opportunities provided by larger scale provision.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Action should be taken to protect Green Spaces currently earmarked for development (Luctons Field in Loughton where outlined planning application includes a Green Space)		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The strategy excludes space for organised sport (football, cricket). E.g. cricket ground in the South Weald Country Park at Brentwood		Facilities for organised sport are addressed through the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy (EB714 and associated documents).
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	No reference to providing public toilets		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Blue Infrastructure: unlikely to open up more access to the River Roding as much of its banks are in private ownership		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Supportive of native tree planting, the development of wild flower meadows and suggest hedgerow planting where suitable. Suggest looking at linking up with the Green Arc scheme if possible		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The proposal to encourage charges in Epping Forest car parks will impact on urban area streets close to the Forest – having an adverse impact on the lives of residents living in those areas (see 1.26).		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Wixley	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest working with local interest groups such as the Epping Forest Heritage Trust, EFDC's Countrycare Tree Wardens and, if formal sport to be considered, then the Essex Playing Fields Association and Fields in Trust		A range of organisations have been identified within the Strategy. In relation to formal sports provision see response to Comment 419 above).
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Access to the open spaces must be inclusive and available to all users - young & old, fit and not-so-fit, for walkers/ pedestrians, runners, cyclists, horse-riders, mobility impaired users, dog walkers and families with buggies		The Strategy supports this approach and as been amended where necessary to make this clearer.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	All stiles must be removed from network to be replaced by gaps or accessible gates in keeping with the British Standard		The Strategy reflects this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The emphasis of the strategy appears to be on walking - this should be widened to seek to improve access for all types of users / potential users		The Strategy supports this approach and as been amended where necessary to make this clearer.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	An objective must be to improve linkages to facilitate short, medium and longer circular routes		The Strategy seeks to achieve this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Recognition of the physical barriers to walking, cycling AND horse riding (created by motorways, major dual carriageway roads and railway) is not sufficient – schemes to overcome these barriers must be included in development plans	2.12 and 2.13	The Council will explore opportunities to overcome these where appropriate and feasible as part of the detailed approaches developed for the Masterplan Areas.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Clarity required on the amount & quality of GI available for public use and the amount not available e.g. not all river / canal banks are open to the public.		Links to the Council's evidence base have been provided. However, not all of this data is available.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Essex Local Access Forum	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	1.33 maintenance - or lack of money for maintenance - of GI in public ownership is an issue. Volunteers can and do help but cannot tackle everything e.g. larger structures, working alongside vehicular roads	1.33	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Require a more detailed settlement-by-settlement analysis which, rather than indicating designated areas of 'green space', would specifically look at those aspects which relate to Green Infrastructure, including the existing 'links' between those spaces		Links to the Council's evidence base have been included where a parish by parish analysis can be viewed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	To preserve and protect the existing Green Infrastructure, these assets need to be identified and, preferably, evident on a clearly annotated map		Links to the Council's evidence base have been included where a parish by parish analysis can be viewed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Recognising how to manage and preserve important green spaces, without the need for significant expenditure, is key to understanding how any future green infrastructure, or SANG, may function in this District		The Strategy has been amended to include more information on approaches to stewardship. The Strategy already includes suggestions of approaches that can be taken for maintaining existing spaces.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The issues relating to the designation of new SANG have not been helped by dove-tailing the Habitats Regulation Assessment/Mitigation Strategy into the Appendices of this document		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Copped Hall Park is unlikely to be suitable for a 'strategic' SANG, given the likelihood that most visitors would be travelling by car, or motorised transport and, potentially, on roads which run through the forest		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	May be helpful to issue (and cross-reference) a separate 'Mitigation Strategy' for the Epping Forest SAC, to include clearly mapped 'Zones of Influence' (including an Exclusion Zone) and an explanation of the purpose of financial (or other) contributions to SAMM, SANG and Air Quality Mitigation. Pulling together these strands within a specific Policy Document (or SPD) would also		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The term 'in perpetuity' needs a recognised definition, as does the actual process for 'designating' SANG within Local Plan policy (ie. as this will result in a 'change of use' in planning terms, how will this be affected?)		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The requirement to designate SANG is likely to be too restrictive if only applied to the Masterplan sites, and other allocated sites may also need to make similar provision in the future		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	In terms of Projects, Chris Neilan (former head of the EFDC's Trees and Landscape Department) compiled an early draft of a 'Community Green Plan' – this may be the time to reconsider that initiative		Information gathered has been used to inform this strategy
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The absence of relevant plans, including those for the South Epping Masterplan site, is likely to cause some concern		This will be developed as part of the Masterplan
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The final document will need to factor in provision for the 'Monitoring' of the various aspects of the Strategy, and incorporate a process for Review		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Burn	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	A further review of the wording of the main Vision and Objections within the New Local Plan (2011-2033), may be helpful in order to ensure that the key features of the specific Vision and Objectives of this new Strategy are appropriately incorporated		The Vision and Objectives in the emerging Local Plan have informed the development of the Vision and Objectives of this Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	It would be helpful if the report made a more detailed reference to the Regional Park as this seems somewhat underplayed in the early sections of the current draft	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.21 joint working and linking of the Forest and Regional Park could become more relevant if proposals to open up some of the Forest's buffer lands to residents and visitors are actioned	Section 1	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.7 it is presumed Blue Infrastructure includes lakes?	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 1.6 'Why have a Strategy?' it would be helpful to reference the Lee Valley SPA in the first bullet point	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	It would be useful to include a section on the Lee Valley SPA to follow para 1.19 to 1.26	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The reference under 1.49 is somewhat lost and whilst issues of air quality are specific to the Forest and its ecology, recreational pressures do impact upon the habitats and species for which the SPA/Ramsar is designated	Section 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Suggest 're-wilding' is favoured over the BAPs – it should be the case that the two approaches can work together	Section 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The visitor offer of the Regional Park could be included under para 2.36 to 2.39	Section 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Para 3.54 should include the management of invasive non-native species (INNS) as part of best practice measures	Section 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Waltham Abbey North Masterplan Area will be of interest to the Authority – it will be useful to see the mapping for this area once this is ready	Appendix 2	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Authority's Landscape Strategy Guidelines may be of relevance	Appendix 2	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Mention should be made of the SPA alongside the Ramsar (note lower case needed for Ramsar) at para 3.7	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Heritage section 3.9 should note the role of the Park Authority in relation to the Abbey Gardens and reference the historic fishponds associated with the Abbey Church on the Cornmill Meadows (Cornmill Stream and Old River Lea SSSI)	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Would also be relevant to note the importance of tackling INNS on the Cobbins Brook under para 3.20	Appendix 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Could reflect that the Authority's adopted Area Proposals for Gunpowder Park are to create a more flexible visitor hub and provide the core range of services including refreshment facilities, an indoor public visitor space and park information point (5.A.3)	Appendix 4	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Proposals seeking to manage and enhance Gunpowder Park, Sewardstone Marsh and Patty Pool Mead as a key access to nature site with habitat improvements to be undertaken throughout	Appendix 4	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Existing wet woodland habitats at Osier Marsh and Sewardstone Marsh are to be managed to maintain and expand their special wildlife interest	Appendix 4	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Visitor access is to be enhanced by extending boardwalks and improving interpretation	Appendix 4	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Proposals also seek to manage the farmland within the area so as target specific wildlife groups for example invertebrates and birds	Appendix 4	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Claire Martin, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Floodplain grassland and fen habitat to be enhanced on Sewardstone Marsh and the wet grassland habitat of Patty Pool Mead to be improved to provide nesting opportunities for breeding waders	Appendix 4	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	Unconvinced that the Local Plan and associated documents will provide sufficient recreational space to avoid an impact on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation even when considered alongside Site Access Management and Monitoring ('SAMMs) measures		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	Absence of an assessment of SANG requirement and the identification of a quantity required		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	The key consideration in selecting Strategic SANGs should be in identifying suitable intercept locations, identifying an appropriate size and providing something of sufficient quality to draw people away from the forest		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	Note that Roding Valley Meadows is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest ('SSSI') in its own right and displacing recreational pressure from one protected site to another is generally not considered sustainable long term	Appendix 4	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	The information provided on SANG provision at Latton Priory is more limited than has previously been presented to us and consider the strategy would benefit from more detailed proposals (recognising that it may not have been appropriate to include them at this time)	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	Very limited information regarding the contribution of the Water Lane development or how impacts on other designated sites, in this case Harlow Woods SSSI, are going to be avoided	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	Limited information available on the provision of GI at all strategic sites and it remains unclear how SANGs are going to be accommodated alongside allocated housing numbers	Appendix 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jamie Melvin, Natural England	Feedback on the document	18-Jul-20	"The Strategy also recognises the importance of other cross-boundary opportunities to integrate Green and Blue Infrastructure by working with a range of partners including our neighbouring authorities within and outside of London." We consider that at this statement is not as well evidenced within the document and that there is still work to be done in this regard	Para 1.2	The Strategy makes reference at key points to the partners it is, or will be, working with.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Ongar Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	Would like the Strategy to include a project for Ongar in the rural North East part of the District - we have a proposal which coincidentally supports the vision and objectives of your Strategy, and would like to have the opportunity of presenting our ideas for inclusion in your finished Strategy		The Council would encourage Ongar Town Council to submit any proposals which it has developed which would support the delivery of projects identified in Part 1 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	The Strategy does not cover the issue of Green & Blue Infrastructure in Loughton or the rest of the southern parishes		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	It does not cover the biodiversity gain now required by law		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	The strategy is a contradiction in terms, as green spaces are proposed for development in Loughton (see the eleven acres of Luctons Fields LOU.R4)		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	No proposals to link in the Shaws in north-east Loughton (owned by Essex CC)		The propsals now contained in Part 4 of the Strategy will support this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	No word about linking up green corridors in Loughton, including to and from the Forest SAC		The proposals contained in Part 4 of the Strategy will support this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Loughton Town Council	Feedback on the document	20-Jul-20	The Strategy needs complete rewriting on Blue Infrastructure and should include the examples included in response		The GI Strategy's information on Blue Infrastructure has been revisted since consultation. Part 4 looks at site specific projects including the Roding Valley.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Upland Parish Council	Feedback on the document	24-Jul-20	The document lacks a comprehensive map of the area clearly outlining existing amenities and proposed development area adding to the difficulty of fully assessing this document		The Strategy now provides links to mapping sources.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Upland Parish Council	Feedback on the document	24-Jul-20	The proposed developments would be counter-productive and would increase the pollution risk		This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Upland Parish Council	Feedback on the document	24-Jul-20	No mention of common land or how this land might be usefully maintained for increasing the amenity it provides		The Strategy includes reference to Commons where this is appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Upland Parish Council	Feedback on the document	24-Jul-20	The parish does not have funds to support funding of play areas		The Strategy identifies potential sources for funding the maintenance of new play areas provided as part of new development which are intended not to place a cost burden on parish and town councils.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Epping Upland Parish Council	Feedback on the document	24-Jul-20	Farmers have not been consulted		The documents were published for a 6 week period on the EFDC website in accordance with our Statement of Community Engagement, and we used letters, posters and social media to publicise.
Draft v2 - June 2020	City of London Corporation (The Conservators of Epping Forest)	Feedback on the document	06-Aug-20	The strategy cannot be relied upon as mitigation for the recreation pressure on Epping Forest SAC as a result of the housing growth in Epping Forest District		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	City of London Corporation (The Conservators of Epping Forest)	Feedback on the document	06-Aug-20	No clear hectarage of SANGS anticipated, no list of SANGS site options and a SANGS tariff requirement is not set out as we believe it should be in this document		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	City of London Corporation (The Conservators of Epping Forest)	Feedback on the document	06-Aug-20	Need to divorce the SANGS strategy from the more aspirational G&BIS – a separate, comprehensive, clear and effective SANGS strategy is necessary		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	City of London Corporation (The Conservators of Epping Forest)	Feedback on the document	06-Aug-20	Need to set out the SANGS that will be delivered by developers and also a range of other infrastructure and greenspace provision that would provide for mitigation for smaller sites across a wide area. Detail of how existing sites might contribute to this, how mitigation will be funded and what requirements would be placed on developers need to be clearly set out		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	City of London Corporation (The Conservators of Epping Forest)	Feedback on the document	06-Aug-20	Concerned that there is no timetable for the decisions on governance of the SAC Oversight Group which would have an overview of SANGS provision regionally – mitigation will be best delivered if coordinated across local authorities		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Quinn Estates	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	North Weald Bassett Masterplan Area would enhance the GI Strategy and directly deliver and contribute to the key aims of the strategy by providing much needed SANG to serve the development and provide additional compensatory land to mitigate other development that impacts on the integrity of the SAC. The planning application can deliver much needed new homes and facilities early in the plan period and crucially demonstrates no net impact on the integrity of the SAC and the delivery of additional SANG capacity, of significant benefit to the Epping Forest District.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	The document raises relevant questions, some sections of the document seem to put too much emphasis on the needs of people, the needs of the environment should be given their due value. The principle of net biodiversity should be recognised.	Para 2.4	The Council considers that the Strategy provides an appropriate balance between the two elements and recognises the principle of net biodiversity gain and supports its achievement.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	All scrub has bidiversity value. Existing natural features should not be manicured. Some wilding would be welcome.	Para 3.12	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	The Harlow Art Trust should be consulted and asked to organise the commission of art works.	Para 3.16	Harlow Art Trust is now identifed as a key stakeholder in the Art in the Landscape section.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	Water Lane: The planning of planting individual trees and groups should as well as the retention of existing trees should be carried out early in the master plan stage; for example it should be established that an area bounded by a stream and the Epping Road on the southwestern edge should be planted in order to establish a strong edge to the development.	Appendix 2	This will be a matter for consideration at the Masterplanning and detailed planning application stages.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	Suggest dealing with pollution in Canons Brook which flows into the Stort		The Strategy has been amended to included reference to the River Stort Catchement Management Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Burgess	Feedback on the document	09-Jul-20	Land near the waterworks buildings at Roydon Village is a possible site for tree planting		The Council will include this suggestion in the list of potential sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Class Q	Survey response	26-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Please see appended Epping Rd Design & Access Statement. Our masterplan designs were built around the consultation GI and we feel the project could become exemplary of the new GI Strategy in action being delivered within new development.	Appendix 1	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Class Q	Survey response	26-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Forest?** More easily accessible, better children's facilities		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Class Q	Survey response	26-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** See appended Epping Rd Design & Access Statement	Appendix 2	Comment noted.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No	Section 2	Comment noted. See responses below.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Page 25 should take into consideration the provision of bridleways and opportunities to provide multi-user paths/routes	Movement	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	The strategy needs to be clear that it requires the provision of multi-user paths in the first instance and that the proposal will need to demonstrate why that approach to provision is not appropriate	Movement	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Needs to mention the need to factor in improvements to the path routes environment through creation of green routes and the contribution towards the creation of green corridors	Movement	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	There should also be a consideration for the improvements to the public realm noted the benefits for calming traffic is referenced under small spaces in section 3 but good for consistency	Movement	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	There is no mention of amenity greenspaces (i.e. village greens, sport fields etc), and those GI identified as others (i.e. allotments, community gardens, churchyards and cemeteries within this section	Quality & Quantity	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Needs to link back to the "What Does Green Infrastructure Include?" on page 12. If the classification of GI types used in Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Guide' are the GI types used for this strategy. If not, then the Strategy needs to be clear what GI classification types are in scope.	Quality & Quantity	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy (page 30)?** Yes - the only thing missing is connectivity to wilder landscape GI Network	Page 30	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	The Movement theme should include reference to green corridors, in that not only improving PROW and other routes to be attractive places to encourage active travel but acts as a green corridor connecting habitats and fragmented small spaces to wider landscape GI network and allows movement for wildlife too (Page 33; 3.7)	Page 33	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Similar with small spaces on page 46, which could be at risk of fragmentation – need to ensure connectivity to the wider landscape scale GI network has been considered and enabled	Page 46	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Movement on page 47 – another opportunity for the Council and partners to consider to address the issue of cluttering from signage is the use of digital interpretation (i.e. a mobile app) may be an option for strategic sites with a trail, site and biodiversity information, and advice (e.g. Bird Aware etc)	Page 47	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Provision for play and the examples of youth shelter and multi-purpose games facilities on page 44 – the diagram does not include environmental benefit. However, if the area as a whole is designed as a multi-purpose games facility then the greenery of its surrounding, whether woodland, garden and benches etc can in itself provide environmental benefits to biodiversity and connecting people with nature or just getting them to engage with the great outdoors and can act as a green corridor connecting GI throughout the development. GI and Grey Infrastructure should not be seen or designed in silo, but part of the EFDC landscape led approach.	Page 44	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Movement & Wayfinding – consider the raising awareness and promotion of these routes – one of the issues is people do not know these are there so part of the strategy is to include marketing / promotion and communication.	Page 59	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Roadside wildflowers – may be opportunity to expand the Special Roadside Verges scheme by Essex Highways and Place Services. Around 60 km of road verge across Essex have been designated as Special Roadside Verges - https://www.placeservices.co.uk/projects/special-roadside-verges/	Page 60	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this and the positive suggestion is welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Tree planting – Forest Initiative led by John Meehan, Head of Sustainability & Resilience, ECC, to plant 375000 trees in the next 5 years. Offers a good opportunity to coordinate schemes, as both projects seek to work with Parishes and communities to identify sites. https://www.essex.gov.uk/the-essex-forest-initiative	Page 61	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this and the positive suggestion is welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Opportunities should be taken to explore any (smaller) green spaces shown to be in isolation on how they can connect, whether it's through the streetscape to the other GI - the wider GI network.		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Ensuring the green space and sport/play facilities provides multi-purpose use and offers naturalised play that is open to all		Comments noted. The Strategy supports this approach.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Under the Role of Design, to re-emphasise that this approach must be integrated at the initial planning stage right through to delivery (construction)	Para 1.17	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Design of developments must be landscape led and cross disciplinary and must inform development proposals from their initial planning through their detailed design to the delivery phase and lifetime of the development	Para 3.3	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Correction to paragraph 1.48 The Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy, formerly known as the Green Essex Strategy, was signed off by Cabinet Member Action on 30 March 2020 and the call-in period ended on 2 April 2020. The strategy has now been adopted by ECC. The decision to rename the strategy was taken by ECC Political Leadership Team as they wanted the title to provide more clarity of what the strategy covered	Page 20	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Blue Infrastructure – paragraph 2.33 – it is recommended to make clear that the preferred approach to flood risk management schemes is naturalised solutions	Page 28	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this helpful suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	It is suggested that it would be helpful to consider the use of digital interpretation (i.e. a mobile app) as an alternative option for strategic sites with a trail, site and biodiversity information, and advice (e.g. Bird Aware etc).	Page 36	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this. A specific opportunity to develop this has been identified in Part 4 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jayne Rogers & Rich Cooke, Essex County Council	Survey response	14-Jul-20	ECC comments on the initial draft recommended a fuller review and link / coverage to other relevant strategies – some of this is evident (e.g. the Thames River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan) but others are still absent, e.g. those developed for the Lee Valley Regional Park; Garden Town documents (such as the Vision etc.). There may also be strategy related documents for the River Stort valley area. The relationship with the GI work for South Essex is also worth consideration in this context		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Warren	Survey response	14-Jul-20	The Vision and Objectives for this Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy should have been fully integrated with Air Quality and Atmospheric Pollution and especially the impact of Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulate Matter from vehicles on Epping Forest SAC	Vision & Objectives	This is a matter for the emerging Local Plan and the Council's adopted Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy which has now been referred to in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Warren	Survey response	14-Jul-20	You have clearly not demonstrated a Multi-functional approach to the provision of SANGS but have instead largely designated their usage for dog walkers and as alternative dog toilets away from Epping Forest		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Warren	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Horse riders have to pay to use the Forest and I think that should also apply to dog walkers		This is a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest. The Council will inform them of the suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Warren	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** No - Wary of land owners offering new sites for SANGS along with enabling housing development to offset the cost of giving up their land to create a SANG. Also, any SANG near a railway station or transport hub should not have a car park, as it will become popular with commuters for free or subsidised parking		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Warren	Survey response	14-Jul-20	Would like to see recognition of the role that back gardens play in towns and villages in providing continuous strips of green corridors which network together and provide wildlife corridors linking together built up areas with the open countryside		The Strategy has been amended to reflect this helpful suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	1.26 Car parking charges – It would be nice to see here a more thoughtful consideration of the various possibilities and a commitment to an overall reduction of vehicle traffic and air pollution	Section 2	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.3 "Further development will increase harm to the Epping Forest SAC if a suitable range of mitigation measures are not identified and implemented." Insert full stop after "SAC".	Section 2	As SAC is an acronym rather than an abbreviation a full stop would be incorrect.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.4 It's all very well raising the questions, what about providing some answers?	Section 2	The Strategy identifies the ways that these questions will be answered.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.6 Is this analysis aiming to provide cover for further development? Who says that the "minimum" is in fact acceptable? Why is it apparently wrong to be 18 times over some arbitrary minimum, when we have a truly exceptional situation?	Section 2	This is a statement of fact.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.12 suggest making a commitment that the "significant physical barriers" will be removed by specific dates	Section 2	This relates to strategic road and rail infrastructure and therefore it is not possible to remove them.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.17 What will be done about this?	Section 2	The Strategy identifies ways of responding to the climate crisis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.41 & 2.42 Vision and objectives – too generalised and open to interpretation. Suggest identifying specific locations in the district where these objectives will be applied	Section 2	This level of specificity is not appropriate for what are high-level objectives. However, they have been amended to make it clearer as to how they will be achieved.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No striking aim or vision in the document. Suggest a commitment that there will be no more development in the Green Belt or that there will be no further development within x miles of the Epping Forest boundaries	Vision & Objectives	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Para 1.19 "It is therefore imperative that the emerging Local Plan ensures that such pressures are avoided or mitigated so that new development does not cause harm to the integrity of the Epping Forest SAC." – where does the Local Plan actually do this? What are the examples? Specify the relevant actions defined in the Local Plan.	Vision & Objectives	This is provided for through Policy DM2 and site specific policies contained within the emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Meeting the minimum requirement or some arbitrary national benchmark is not an acceptable target.	Vision & Objectives	These are nationally accepted standards based on thorough research and are used by many local authorities as being appropriate to identify the quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure needed to support local communities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**We have identified a number of themes for projects which could be carried out across different parts of the District. Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - numbers refer to the relevant paragraphs in Appendix 4 Sites for Enhancement		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	· P101: "projects that should be brought forward" should read "will be brought forward"?	Page 101	These sites were identified by residents in response to the Epping Forest Visitor Survey and the Council was seeking views on their appropriateness for enhancement.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	"Potential enhancements and matters to be considered:" shows no commitment	Para 1.7, 1.9, etc.	This reflects the site-specific characteristics that any scheme would need to respond to. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	EFDC tried to implement major development on Jessel Green, which tests the credibility of the list.		Jessel Green was included as it had been suggested by residents as an alternative space to Epping Forest in response to the Epping Forest Visitors Survey 2019.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	What about the provision of new green sites, outside the Masterplan areas, not just "enhancements"?		See the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	"types of projects that could be delivered" shows no commitment	Appendix 1	The Strategy identifies a range of projects but makes it clear that the Council is keen for local communities to identify where these projects could take place.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Limited ambition. A short list which ducks completely some of the fundamental issues such as traffic, pollution, public transport, commuting	Appendix 1	These are not matters for the GI Strategy but rather the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The GI strategy is so vague that there seems little point recommending specific locations at this stage		The Strategy identifies a range of projects but makes it clear that the Council is keen for local communities to identify where these projects could take place.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Section 4 - South Epping - This section falls down when it comes to the future and what will actually be done, with big issues ducked	Appendix 2	The Strategy provides and appropriate level of detail and needs to be considered alongside the site-specific requirements set out in the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Fail to see what there is to visit in the South Epping Masterplan Area, and we do not see Copped Hall Park as an alternative to Epping Forest	Appendix 2	The South of Epping Masterplan Area has been included as it is a Strategic Masterplan site rather than a green infrastructure asset. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Strategic Allocations - Some key issues are avoided, notably the impact of significantly increased road traffic inevitably generated by the masterplan areas	Appendix 2	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Fundamental conflict between the housing developments envisaged in the Local Plan and the Green Infrastructure Strategy		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	"it is important that... we recognise the importance of... should be brought forward... opportunities... possibilities..." etc. these words do not convince – there needs to be a concrete demonstration, with examples and evidence, as to how the Local Plan developments will respect and further the green ambitions		See responses above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document should specify what powers EFDC has, and how it intends to use them, as well as how it will use its position to obtain concrete results. It should also list concrete measures of future success		Where appropriate this is set out in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document needs to have an Action Plan, focused on major issues, with specific, quantified commitments, and with timetable and deadlines		The Strategy has been amended to include further information on implementation where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	A drastic shortening and sharpening of the entire document required – suggest reducing its length by 50% and cutting out the consultants' section – for example most of Section 3		The Strategy has been amended in order to respond to this concern whilst recognising that it is important to retain information in relation to the requirements for development sites.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Geoffrey & Elizabeth King	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Need to introduce accountability		The Strategy identifies who will deliver Green Infrastructure enhancements and new provision where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Would be helpful to have a list of the Green Infrastructure assets in the District or, at least, the respective categories in which these are included	Section 2	The Strategy has been revised to make this cleared and links provided to the detailed assessments that have been undertaken on a parish by parish basis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.1 and 2.2 – the extent to which access to these landscape features is provided by virtue of the public, and permissive, rights of way, which are a key part of the existing Green Infrastructure network is not quantified	Section 2	As this is a high level assessment this level of detail would not be appropriate. However, a link to Essex County Council's Public Rights of Way Interactive map has now been provided to enable readers to access this more detailed information.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Little said with respect to those areas which are not specifically designated but which are preserved, in the natural landscape, by the provisions of Green Belt Policy	Section 2	Green Belt is a policy protection rather than an indication of environmental quality.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	2.10 and 'Movement' reference is made to "a series of shorter trails (which are) promoted by the Council's Country Care team and local organisations and groups including Parish and Town Councils and Local Access Forums". Notably, these also include the 'Oak Trail', which is the only waymarked trail within Epping Forest District promoted by the City of London	Section 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The Vision and Objectives were broadly supported but the specific reference to 'multi-functional' spaces is qualified by the answer given to the question below	Page 30	Comment noted. See response to Comment 564 below.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The 'Zones of Influence', with respect to Recreational Pressure, are not explained in detail in the Strategy	Page 30	The Strategy has been amended to address this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Many green areas within a settlement are primarily intended for one specific use – it may not be possible, or appropriate, to try to extend their facilities to other users	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that the multi-functional approach will not be approriate in all cases.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Paths used by both cyclists and pedestrians can be difficult to navigate and the two uses may not mix well.	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy reflects Essex County Council's preferred approach. The Strategy makes it clear that such networks will need to be designed so that they are safe for all users.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Areas intended for dog-walkers may not be suitable for such a multi-functional use within them	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that spaces should be designed to accommodate different users without causing conflict and the approach may not be appropriate in all cases.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Some disagreement with the suggestion which implies that the PRoW network could facilitate cyclists	Multi-functional Approach	See response to Comment 561.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Consideration could be given to the possibility of creating a wider Green Infrastructure network, which may include facilitating access routes through SANG, by linking public footpaths between the respective areas and, in some cases, between settlements	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy encourages this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Cycle ways are likely to remain a separate provision, and the surfacing of such paths would come at a greater expense than simply the maintenance (presently by Essex County Council) of the existing PRoW network	Multi-functional Approach	Comment noted. Investment in improved surfaces will be sought where appropriate to support the delivery of enhancements. The Strategy identifies a range of potential funding sources.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	It would helpful to encourage landowners, who still farm their land, to cut access routes for walkers through crops to avoid damage	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No details in the Strategy of how, or where, the Buffer Lands provision could be made	Multi-functional Approach	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Tree Planting - A Call for Sites - As suggested at EFDC's 2nd Green Infrastructure Workshop (held on 2nd July 2020) of further planting of street trees along the grass verges, and in the small green areas, within the established urban areas on both sides of our Village Green - suggest a match-funding scheme to assist with the finance of such a project	Appendix 1	This helpful suggestion will be explored further.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Tree Planting - A Call for Sites - The verge trees, which add to the greening of the local environs, are much appreciated by residents, as is the dedicated input from the local Tree Wardens	Appendix 1	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** With respect to the provision of SANG, Visitor Centres were felt to be inappropriate, in preference to small-scale facilities (such as a Tea Hut). Any signage in such areas should be made of natural materials and have only a low-key impact		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** New SANG could include woodland areas (as this provides part of the main attraction of Epping Forest), shelterbelt planting or hedgerows, and possibly wetlands		The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** Better signage and demarcation of footpaths, particularly when these cross wide open spaces and farmland		Comment noted. This approach is encouraged in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** Provision should be made to retain the 'Oak Trail' within the 'Landscape Framework'		The Strategy seeks the enhancement of routes not their removal.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** Concerns raised that the quality of the tracks for horse-riding has depreciated in recent years, including the Bobby Stones Wood Chip Track in Lippitts Hill, High Beech, which has not been resurfaced in recent years		This is a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** Provisions need to be made to deter users from littering (discreetly-placed dog waste bins, and litter bins, may need to be provided (and maintained) in order to encourage a more positive approach to the countryside)		Comments noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of Epping Forest?** Measures should be incorporated to make any new Parkland easier to access for parents with prams and those in wheelchairs, especially in areas of managed green space, where solid pathways should be included.		Comments noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Rather than 'enhancement', it was felt that the key objective of the Green Infrastructure Strategy should be to retain and preserve the existing Green Infrastructure, and to provide extra protection, where necessary		The Strategy, together with policies within the Council's emerging Local Plan, provide for the protection and retention of existing assets. Enhancements will be sought where it would be of beneficial.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No map is presently provided in the Appendices for the South Epping Masterplan site, so it is difficult to evaluate how the existing green infrastructure will be integrated into the new development and its respective SANG		Mapping specific to each Strategic Masterplan Area has now been provided.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Concerns raised that SAMMs (only briefly alluded to in the new Strategy), and any funding provided for such, could be utilised to restrict access to Epping Forest		Further information on SAMMS has been included. SAMMS relates to investment within the SAC to manage increased visitor pressure. Public access to the Forest is established through Acts of Parliament and its management is undertaken by the Conservators of Epping Forest and they will inform how best such funding can be spent in the interests of the Forest and its integrity.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Concerns that charging for Forest car parks could be used to deter access, whilst the recent implementation of a Temporary Transport Regulation Order, which has introduced red lines on roads around High Beech, is known to have led to some debate as to whether this will lead to long-term measures to further control		See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Concerns raised over the funding of new SANGs, and the long-term stewardship of such, with questions raised as to whether some of the larger sites suggested by EFDC (Warlies Park and Copped Hall Park) would be willing to participate in the scheme		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Unclear how S106 agreements could be used to secure such funding and whether this would be directed toward the provision of on-site, or off-site, SANG.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	How would SANGs be protected 'in perpetuity', and what period of time would be anticipated as being 'in perpetuity'? What provisions would be made to ensure that such areas were not built over during later plan periods?		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Unclear what scale of SANG is anticipated. Whilst Masterplan sites may provide SANG on-site, it is less clear how any off-site provision could be met		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Theydon Bois Parish Council	Survey response	16-Jul-20	SANG should be close to an existing settlement and visitors should not be reliant on car travel, especially if this requires driving along roads within the Epping Forest SAC. How could ease of access be secured for the less-able?		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Concerned that specific opportunities for local doorstep-accessible open spaces should be recognised in the Strategy, with specific regard to an opportunity within Chigwell		The Strategy identifies such opportunities as a general principle.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	The Chigwell Garden Centre site can provide a multi-functional area of public open space to benefit existing and future residents		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	Concerned that the Strategy is heavily reliant on the four strategic sites to deliver all the District's green infrastructure requirements		The Council considers that this is not the case. The Strategy, together with the implementation of the policies in the emerging Local Plan, including the identified site-specific requirements, sets out that new provision will be required as part of all new
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Feedback on the document	16-Jul-20	In relation to proposed SANGS – more opportunities should be explored in the other settlements within the District, to provide 'door-stop accessible' open space and ensure that communities outside of the strategic locations are not disadvantaged by having to travel by car to access GI		See overarching SANG response. See also response to Comment 586.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Does not highlight the deficit of open space within the District, nor on a settlement level in the same detail as within the Open Space Strategy (2017) (EB703)	Section 2	See response to Comment 596 below.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The importance of identifying opportunities for additional provision of open space within the settlements with an under-provision has been overlooked	Section 2	The application of the Council's Local Plan policies, supported by this Strategy, will ensure the provision of new GI in relation to new development.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The Strategy should be read in conjunction with the Open Space Strategy (2017) (EB703), which provides a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the open space provision within each settlement of the District	Section 2	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this helpful suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Do not consider this will be achievable in its current form	Vision & Objectives	The Council considers that the Strategy, together with the implementation of the policies in the emerging Local Plan will support the achievement of the Vision and Objectives.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	To achieve the Vision, the Strategy should seek to identify additional opportunities for GI within the District to provide communities with readily accessible areas without having to use the car	Vision & Objectives	See response to Comment 591 and 593.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	To be well-connected in accordance with the Vision, these would need to be provided across the District and not focused solely in the four strategic allocations	Vision & Objectives	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	There is no commitment to seeking opportunities for additional provision, despite this being an important element of the Strategy - additional 'door-step accessible' open space should form part of the Strategy in light of the significant other benefits this could provide to the District	Vision & Objectives	See response to Comment 588.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	We agree with the multi-functional approach but believe the four strategic locations should not be the only locations within the District considered capable of providing this – the Strategy expects a considerable level of GI at these locations, with less focus on other settlements within the District.	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy identifies this as a general principle to be applied across the District not just within the Strategic Allocations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The plan of the District in Appendix 2 of the Strategy shows the location of the four strategic allocations and existing areas of natural green space relative to the District as a whole. These are predominantly focused in the centre and the west of the District, leaving the North, east and south comparatively lacking	Multi-functional Approach	This is because much of the development proposed for allocation in the emerging Local Plan is located in these areas.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Identifying additional, second tier sites for recreational use has been missed	Appendix 1	The Council considers that an appropriate and deliverable range of projects have been identified.

Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Do not feel this is conducive to the Council's aspirations to deliver multi-functional space, as set out in Section 3 of the Strategy	Appendix 1	These are specific community based projects to enhance or add to existing Green Infrastructure as part of a package of approaches. Multi-functional spaces are not intended to be the only component of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The project pages do not cover the breadth of the Council's aspirations and we question how these will be delivered and thus how the Vision of the Strategy will be achieved.	Appendix 1	See response to Comment 600. A range of funding sources have been identified within the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Identification of suitable additional sites should be explored as part of the Strategy	Appendix 1	See response to Comment 588 and 591 above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The land to the North of Chigwell Garden Centre amounts to approximately 2.7ha of existing private amenity space that could be transformed into a multi-functional space for the benefit of existing and future residents, of all ages		Comment noted and can be considered as part of bringing forward the site
Draft v2 - June 2020	M Scott Property	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The redevelopment of Chigwell Garden Centre through the provision of a care home and a maximum of 65 dwellings as part of CHIG.R5 provides the potential deliver a sizeable area of multi-functional open space, which is 'door-step accessible'		Comment noted and can be considered as part of bringing forward the site
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Survey response	17-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Roadside wildflowers – agree cutting regimes should be relaxed and publicity to be given as to the reason		Comments noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Survey response	17-Jul-20	**Do you know any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Improvements to relief area at North Weald Memorial Playing Fields		Comment noted. This will be considered further when assessing the community based projects in consultation with North Weald Bassett Parish Council.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Survey response	17-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Wildflowers – orchids etc., tree planting, brook, pathways occasional benches		Comments noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Survey response	17-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Flood relief scheme Church Lane area		Comment noted. This helpful suggestion will be considered further when assessing the community based projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Survey response	17-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** North Weald Bassett site identified for housing etc. off Vicarage Lane West		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Anne Grigg	Feedback on the document	17-Jul-20	Action to implement schemes required		The Strategy identifies how these schemes will be implemented.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	No evidence in support of the assertions made in the latter part of paragraph 2.10, anecdotal evidence points to the contrary.	Page 25	A range of organisations promote walks including, for example the West Essex Ramblers, North Weald Bassett Parish Council and Buckhurst Hill Residents Association.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	Serious concerns about the section on blue infrastructure, specifically paras 2.28 to 2.35 - limited and ill-informed assessments were relied upon for the Local Plan and has repeated itself for this document	Page 28	This section provides an overview and links have now been provided to a range of detailed documents relevant to the Blue Infrastructure assets within the District. The emerging Local Plan has been developed using a robust evidence base which has been reviewed as acceptable by both the Environment Agency and the Local Plan Inspector.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	The wording "stuck in the craw" - comes across pompous and condescending	Vision & Objectives	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	The utilisation of the reinvigorated Green & Blue infrastructure might be enhanced by engagement with the people, particularly if they enjoy a sense of ownership with the end to initiative, strategy and process	Vision & Objectives	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	This whole section (or at least pages 32 to 47) which appears to be the creation of different author to other sections, could benefit from peer review or external benchmarking	Multi-functional Approach	Comment noted. The Strategy has been externally reviewed by the Council's Quality Review Panel and amendments have been made to the Strategy in order to address these concerns.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	Suggest this section is subject to an independent review/brainstorming and structural refinement before publication. It feels very much "constructed" and captured ecologically woke language. The "themes" don't work and and might be more powerful if crafted in a different way	Section 3	See response to Comment 615.

Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	Nervous about the potential over-zealous application of S106 funding mechanisms and the employment of "design experts". Would feel more comfortable if an external QS project manager was engaged to oversee implementation and specifically the appointment of specialist consultants	Project Pages	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	The locations and proposals described are impressive and it is easily to say we would want to visit them. But in reality consumer interia tends to dictate these things and is only broken with repeated communications, information, invitations and reaching out to engage with people individually.	Project Pages	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	The issue of trust between the Council and residents on 'consultation feedback' following the Local Plan consultation has markedly inhibited the residents' participation in this survey		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	North West Epping Residents Group	Survey response	17-Jul-20	Issues around the structure, purpose and intent of the survey - constrained format and self-limiting questions		The survey included opportunities to provide more information and the consultation did not preclude the opportunity to submit comments in other forms.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Ambrose Murphy	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No. The local plan itself is wrongheaded. 11,000 new houses will overwhelm existing infrastructure. The central line is at capacity. roads are constrained by the forest. traffic (pre-virus) and air quality are already serious problems. tinkering with green spaces in and among unsustainable development is not "strategic" - it's just wrong.	Vision & Objectives	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Ambrose Murphy	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Concerns around Epping south and North weald.	Appendix 1	The identification of these sites is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Ambrose Murphy	Survey response	05-Jun-20	Need to reduce the amount of development in the local plan and do no development without addressing infrastructure, access, air quality and traffic.	Further Comments	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kim Sharpington	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects [see project pages] could happen?** There should be a corridor maintained from London Lea Valley through to north weald and onwards to dunmow/Stansted.	Appendix 1	The Strategy encourages the creation of enhanced links of both a local and strategic nature.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kim Sharpington	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Flat pathways, ponds, tearoom		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kim Sharpington	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Disused North Weald Golf Course	Appendix 4	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - The former Leca Site, Mill Lane, High Ongar. After the extraction finished, it became a landfill site with the promise to be developed into a country park. It could be a real asset to the people of Ongar & District. We are surrounded by farmland but limited access for leisure purposes. The Leca site does have a footpath but again very limited access and no parking for visitors off Mill Lane. Before the landfill the quarry filled with water and a lake was forming, another lost opportunity.	Section 2	The Council will explore the remediation requirements for this site with Essex County Council as the Minerals and Waste Authority.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Perhaps more emphasis on providing cyle paths and to attract family use playgrounds with climbing frames etc wihich blend in with the countryside	Appendix 1	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects [Project Pages] could happen?** As previously mentioned the Leca Site on Mill Lane, High Ongar is an untapped resource.	Appendix 1	See response to 627.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Availability of Car Parks or frequent bus routes. Also toilet facilities.		Comment noted. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Leca site - former clay extraction site, subsequently landfilled. Mill Lane, High Ongar.	Appendix 4	See response to Comment 627.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sandra Dear	Survey response	05-Jun-20	Very keen to see the improvement of countryside for public community use but I doubt this will happen in my lifetime.	Further Comments	Comment noted.

Draft v2 - June 2020	David Hyder	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Lots of farmed green areas and the golf course north of north weald	Section 2	Links to the Council's Landscape Character Assessment and detailed parish by parish assessment of assets have been included. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Hyder	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Nothing aimed at cutting down traffic which is a huge item on green spaces	Appendix 1	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Hyder	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** By not building on them - they are already green spaces - the council is just trying to give the okay to building on these sites!		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Hyder	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** The Golf course at North weald (although earmarked for development)	Appendix 4	See overarching SANG response. The Golf Course is not a site proposed for allocation in the emerging Local Plan
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Hyder	Survey response	05-Jun-20	The entire document seems to have been produced to whitewash over areas the council wants to build on. These sites are already green, and do not warrant some faux greening efforts in which to blind people to believing these will be in any way green.	Further Comments	The Strategy is intended, in part, to provide further guidance for developers to ensure that new GI provision and/or enhancements are maximised as part of new development schemes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - The section looks to mislead by stating we have over 18 times the level of green space partly because of Epping Forest. Epping Forest is being used for the same provision by London boroughs and has bye law restrictions that means the actual aspect and provisions are different between council and forest land.	Section 2	This is a statement of fact. Parts of the Forest are located within the adjoining London Boroughs. As evidenced in the Epping Forest Visitor Surveys undertaken in 2017 and 2019 some residents from Epping Forest District use parts of the Forest located within those London Boroughs.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - The vision doesn't allow for a sudden dramatic change in people's habits	Vision & Objectives	The Council considers that the Vision provides sufficent flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - Multi function in practice means not quite suitable for any one specific - This is not working in Epping Forest and shouldn't be duplicated as a suitable provision.	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that a multi-functional approach will not be appropriate in all cases.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - Themes have changed since last year		It is not clear what this comment relates to as there has been no draft of the Strategy published in 2019.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects [projects pages] could happen?** Loughton - Alderton ward specifically has had absolutely no investment for decades on play are provisions and the only swing is tucked away in an inaccessible part of the ward for the majority of people. The only accessible green space for the vast majority of the ward has just been allocated for building so it's obvious this report is not working in tandem with development	Appendix 1	The Strategy now includes proposals to enhance the Roding Valley Playing Fields which adjoin Alderton Ward.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Are you saying that the district council is trying to draw people away from using the forest?		Yes. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** No - It's highly unlikely that you would be able to provide the unique character of an ancient woodland which is the attraction of Epping forest	Appendix 2/ Appendix 4	Comment noted. It is not intended to replicate the unique character of the Forest but rather create large areas of space which have a more natural character.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Borders Lane college field - rather than putting houses on it		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Morris	Survey response	05-Jun-20	The document seems to be somewhat outdated and heavily loaded to creating the desired response from the consultation	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carol Pummell	Survey response	05-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** None - Epping Forest should remain untouched. I use it for horse riding any new spaces would not be of any use to me	Project Pages	Comment noted. The Strategy is not proposing to make any changes to the Forest.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Hellen Blackwell	Survey response	06-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Bike riding along Epping New road. Many hundreds of cyclists now use this road. Imperative to build a proper dedicated cycle lane which links up with cycle loops of Waltham Forest etc. There should not be charges for car parks in forest. You have an	Appendix 1	The Council will explore this with Essex County Council in relation to wider transport initiatives. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Hellen Blackwell	Survey response	06-Jun-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** No - prefer the forest. Increasingly wary of large numbers of uncontrollable dogs of which there has been an huge increase in ownership in the area		Comments noted. The issue in relation to dogs will be raised with the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Hellen Blackwell	Survey response	06-Jun-20	The strategy is very ambitious and has a good vision. I just wonder who and how this is going to be funded !	Further Comments	Comments noted and welcomed. A range of funding sources have been identified in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janis Halford	Survey response	07-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - Found the document very difficult to read. A lot of it referred to Harlow, which as far as I know it is not part of the Epping forest district. Prefer the outside spaces to be natural - you refer to man made sculptures - no thank you! You cite the Olympic Park at Stratford, which personally I was very disappointed with as too much concrete. Nothing said about provision for crossing busy roads when walking in the forest - I do long walks in the forest, which necessitate crossing busy roads, some traffic islands or pedestrian crossings at key points i.e. Lincolns Lane/Gas Ride - Fairmeads (Epping New Rd); Mount Pleasant (Epping New Rd); Broadstrood (Goldings Hill); Jacks Hill/Long Running (Coppice Row); Woodridden Hill; Ambresbury Bank (Epping New Rd). These are very dangerous for pedestrians and a lot of people need to cross at these points		The Strategy has been amended in order to address such concerns. The helpful suggestions in relation to pedestrian crossing points will be explored further with Essex County Council as the Highway Authority.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janis Halford	Survey response	07-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** I do not agree with building on any of the green spaces in the area. This area is already over populated		This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janis Halford	Survey response	07-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - cannot fathom what you are planning to do as the document is difficult to follow. Suggest a summary with bullet points. Most people do not have the time to read through 100 plus pages, most of which does not appear to relate to Epping Forest district.		The Strategy has been amended in order to address such concerns.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janis Halford	Survey response	07-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Ability to do long walks (10 miles+) without having to walk through streets. Most of these walks seem very short.		Comment noted. The Strategy supports the creation of longer distance walks.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Fricker	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Needs more on promoting cycling / walking over car use. Excess traffic is one of the major issues impacting all areas of this strategy. Sign posting is not enough without better cycling facilities.	Appendix 1	Both the Strategy and the Council's emerging Local Plan support increasing walking and cycling opportunities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Fricker	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Roding Valley Meadows is already heavily used (increasingly so during Covid) and needs to balance protection for what the strategy recognises is a unique environment. If there are to be SANGs then they should encompass new land - protecting more and enhancing it. The Roding Meadows mentions public toilets - not sure where these are - certainly not on the Loughton side of the Roding. Having said that - there should be better provision for young people. The outdoor gym / table tennis have been good enhancements but there should be a suitable space for skating / rollerblading / bmx. This would also reduce abuse of the banks in the forest. An area that could be enhanced is the section from the bank of england print works towards theydon. This is relatively little used. The old bank of England Social club land could be a real example of land being made into a SANG	Appendix 1	The Strategy now includes a specific project to enhance the Roding Valley Playing Fields. See also overarching SANG response. The toilets are provided as part of the facilities at the Roding Valley Meadows Nature Reserve.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Fricker	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**If you do live near [a strategic allocation or site for enhancement] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** The forest is a completely different environment. I use green spaces all around me. I mostly use the meadows for exercise and short local walks. I use the forest for exercise and longer walks. I also visit some of the things in the forest. As a rule I try not to drive to the forest so this means I don't use it in the way some might if they drive places as a matter of course		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Fricker	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Why not the old Bank of England Social Club? Why not unlock / make public the private land around twin lakes in Buckhurst Hill? I would do away with at least one of the local golf courses in favour of something more open to the public / multiuse and environmentally diverse		See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Alan Fricker	Survey response	11-Jun-20	We need to have better designed towns in our district to reduce car traffic. There should be a shift to prioritising cycling, pedestrians and public shared vehicles	Further Comments	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** The residential "greens" in Debden need to be protected and given village green status. The plans to develop Jessel Green were appalling and should never have been entertained. These spaces are hugely valued and need to be protected.	Section 2	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision & Objectives within the Strategy?** Yes but they shouldn't start and stop with this plan. It feels like every bit of land is being put forward for development currently. It's unsustainable and is creating more of the pollution etc that this plan is trying to counterbalance. As well as enhancing green spaces, it would be great to have a network of cycle lanes in the district to get people out of cars thus improving air quality.	Vision & Objectives	The Vison has been amended to reflect this comment. The Strategy supports the enhancement of the District's walking and cycling network.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** None of the main projects are located in Debden - would like to see/discuss how some of the ideas outlined could be implemented on a smaller scale around the area I live. The Borders Lane site in Debden which is under threat from development could be used in a much more forward thinking way - it is next to Epping Forest College - why not develop the space in a way similar to OrganicLea in Chingford (a community growing project). The college could offer horticulture classes/apprenticeships from the site. It creates local organic food growing schemes and makes the area a place to visit rather than pass through.	Appendix 1	Two projects have now been identified which are located in close proximity to Debden. See also the overarching SANG response. The use of the Borders Lane site for housing is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects [project pages] could happen?** Ditch the Borders Lane housing development - make a community green space here instead	Project Pages	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Epping Forest is unrivalled in the area due its vastness and natural beauty - as long as people can use these spaces as a way to immerse themselves in nature they will be a success.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Laura Anderson	Survey response	11-Jun-20	Suggest the council has to rethink a great deal of its environmental policy overall as while the green spaces are excellent, they are pretty plaster over a bigger problem.	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Gascoigne	Survey response	12-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - You should not be building on green spaces just to meet central government targets - you do have enough brown field sites.	Vision & Objectives	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Gascoigne	Survey response	12-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - It is double speak for reducing the number and saving costs		Comment noted. The Council considers that the Strategy takes an appropriate approach to securing funding for projects and ensuring the efficeint and effective use of public money.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Gascoigne	Survey response	12-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - For a review to be effective you need to safeguard existing resources and only consider additional ones.		The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	David Gascoigne	Survey response	12-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Not publicising them so that they are not overwhelmed		The Council recognises that a balance needs to be achieved between ensuring that local residents are aware of opportunities in their area without those areas becoming overused.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - The strategy is not multi functional. Whole swathes of the District are ignored	Multi-functional Approach	The principles set out in the Strategy apply across the District. The provision of multi-functional spaces is one specific component of the Strategy, rather than the only one.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - The specific theme of preserving and enhancing GI in Loughton and Buckhurst Hill is ignored. The whole theme of improving heritage assets is not covered. The topic of EFDC ruining GI by its allocated sites in LPSV needs exhaustive study		The Strategy has been amended and now includes specific projects within the Loughton and Buckhurst Hill areas and greater reference to the need to improve the setting of heritage assets and access to them where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** They are not District wide	Appendix 1	These projects are intended to be implementable in suitable locations across the District
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Luctons Field needs to be withdrawn from LPSV and its benefit over the whole 11 acres recognised. There is no mention of enhancing the Forest-edge environment	Appendix 1	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Not being built on		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Luctons Field	Appendix 4	This site is a proposed housing allocation within the emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Pond	Survey response	13-Jun-20	**Do you have any further comments on the Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and its supporting appendices?** It is a poor piece of work concentrating on only a few sites around strategic allocations	Further Comments	Comment noted. The Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between initiatives that are not related directly to development proposals and maximising opportunities that can be secured as a result of that development.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - Nothing mentioned re for teenagers, kids cannot even train on Stonnards Park, or just turn up and have a match	Vision & Objectives	The Vision and Objectives relate to residents of all ages. Sports pitch provision is covered within the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - Epping not mentioned	Multi-functional Approach	The multi-functional approach is a District-wide proposition and is therefore applicable to Epping.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - There is not enough for young kids and teenagers		The Strategy seeks to address this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** The area needs a swimming pool, a sports athletic club and lots more sports for young children	Appendix 1	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Dog friendly		The guidance on SANG encourages the creation of dog-friendly spaces.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Epping Forest, High Beech, Coopersale		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Christopher Bostock	Survey response	14-Jun-20	More Cycling Routes through the Countryside required	Further Comments	The Strategy seeks to achieve this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Michael Stubbings	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - The area is already heavily over developed, Loughton was meant to give space for residents to enjoy, not become an annex to London.	Vision & Objectives	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Michael Stubbings	Survey response	14-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - The over development of an area must be taken into account, as this will effect the amenities supplied to residents	Multi-functional Approach	This is not a matter for the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elke Taylor	Survey response	15-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Jessel Green, Debden	Project Pages	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elke Taylor	Survey response	15-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** refreshments, seating, safe play area for children, animals, activities eg. football pitch, basketball court, table tennis, running, gym activities, water activities eg rowing, safe water for dogs, activities for dogs eg agility course, community events		Comment noted. A number of these facilities would not be appropriate to include as part of the provision of SANG.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elke Taylor	Survey response	15-Jun-20	Dont understand the point destroying green spaces and then put a strategy together to create new ones - protect what we have in the first place. Once they are gone they are gone forever.	Further Comments	This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Newis	Survey response	16-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - It involves too much management and not enough natural ecology	Vision & Objectives	The Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between both managed and natural spaces which reflects the broad definition of Green and Blue Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Newis	Survey response	16-Jun-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** I prefer the natural forest not some managed approximation thereof		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Paul Newis	Survey response	16-Jun-20	Cut it back by 80% and it would be more acceptable. Get it wrong and you spoil thousands of years of natural habitat.	Further Comments	The Strategy has been amended to make it more focused.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Hollingsworth	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - The green spaces, public rights of way and transport do not include horse riders	Vision & Objectives	It is not intended that the Vision should be specific to specific groups of users of Green Infrastructure but rather relates to all users.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Elizabeth Hollingsworth	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - horse riders not included	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy has been amended to make reference to horse riders where appropriate.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** Not sure you have adequately considered the green and blue infrastructure around Roydon, including the environment of the River Stort	Section 2	A link to the River Stort Catchment Management Plan has now been included.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Yes - but would like to see a recognition that 2033 is not the end of a process, and that improvements are to be secured for the future		The Vision has been amended to reflect this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - it seems that the needs of people, especially dog-walkers are to take priority over the needs of nature and the environment. Encouraging people into a space may well be incompatible with your duty to promote biodiversity. The environment should receive a higher priority.	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that a range of activities and different types of Green Infrastructure will need to be catered for - for both people and nature.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Would like to see a project specifically devoted to a nature-specific theme eg improved habitats for birds/bats/mammals; nest boxes for swifts or martins; you would need to take advice from relevant environmental groups as to what's most needed and do-able.	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to include guidance for small development sites which identifies opportunities to achieve this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** The availability of good birdwatching, especially if basic facilities (eg toilets) were available. I currently go to my local area and to the Lee Valley RP, as well as sites in Hertfordshire.		The provision of new SANG will have a more natural character which will attract birdlife and other fauna.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** Yes - I might visit to enjoy the countryside and for walks. I don't visit Epping Forest much due to its location, and it's not very good for birdwatching (surprisingly) in comparison with other sites in my area.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Janet Whybrow	Survey response	18-Jun-20	The implementation of the Strategy will require considerable funding. You are largely relying on S106 as a source of funds: but this can only be sought in respect of relevant developments. EFDC should allocate a budget for the Strategy's implementation. Maintaining the green spaces identified or improved under the Strategy will require ongoing funding and support for stewardship bodies, eg Parish Councils, if the spaces are not to become degraded due to neglect, litter or even fly-tipping.	Further Comments	A number of funding opportunities have been identified.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kevin Mason	Survey response	19-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Chigwell,in particular Chigwell Row Recreation ground and Chigwell Row Wood. Also land next to West Hatch School owned by Essex County Council off Chigwell Road between the road and the River Roding.	Section 2	The Strategy provides an overview of the District's GI assets. Links have now been provided to the more detailed assessments that have been undertaken on a parish by parish basis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kevin Mason	Survey response	19-Jun-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Tree planting projects should be in the form of hedgerows linking up existing wildlife sites.	Appendix 1	Opportunities to achieve this will depend on the nature of the specific tree planting project but such an approach would not be precluded where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kevin Mason	Survey response	19-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Quiet, few other people , wildlife fauna and flora, toilets, safe paths, cycle storage facilities, parking fees to be used for the upkeep of the green space.	Project Pages	Comment noted. A number of these attributes are included in the SANG Guidance in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Kevin Mason	Survey response	19-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Chigwell: between Chigwell road and the River Roding south of West Hatch school. Sheering: off Sheering Mill Lane by the River Stort		Further consideration will be given to these helpful suggestions as part of individual projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Brian McGhie	Survey response	22-Jun-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** The part of Epping Forest north of Epping Town, known as "The Lower Forest. Gernon Bushes EWT nature reserve, Coopersale. Swaines Green, part CoL, part town council, to the west of Epping Town	Section 2	The Strategy provides an overview of the District's GI assets. Links have now been provided to the more detailed assessments that have been undertaken on a parish by parish basis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Brian McGhie	Survey response	22-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The open area between Rectory Lane, Pyrles Lane and Hillyfields in Loughton would be ideal for tree planting and small recreational use		Further consideration will be given to these helpful suggestions as part of individual projects.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Brian McGhie	Survey response	22-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Flower rich meadows, Clean water/wetland areas that attract wildlife, Well maintained and well signposted footpaths.		Comment noted. A number of these attributes are included in the SANG Guidance in Part 3 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gillian Foster	Survey response	22-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - could end up with too much footfall	Multi-functional Approach	This will be a key consideration in the design of specific schemes and is acknowledged in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	A Lewcock	Survey response	23-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Good quality seating, recreational areas, possibly local entertainment/educational displays.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Len Banister	Survey response	25-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - Not in all cases - not in favour of increasing multi-use of Public Rights of Way or the 'sanitation' of footpaths by adding surface materials	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that the multi-functional approach will not be approriate in all cases.
Draft v2 - June 2021	Len Banister	Survey response	25-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** **S**uspicious of the notion of SANGs where space is used in 'mitigation' suggesting you have allowed something nasty elsewhere - assume that you are not thinking of encroaching on Forest Land. OK with opening up buffer land. The introduction of parking charges to Epping Forest would certainly deter people and lead to roadside parking e.g. Connaught Water where parking is inadequate.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Len Banister	Survey response	25-Jun-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Roding Valley		Roding Valley Playing Fields has now been included as an infrastructure enhancement project.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Len Banister	Survey response	25-Jun-20	One of the most important items is in 4.20 which emphasises sustainable management and maintenance - you could tie this to 'stewardship' from p 16.	Para 4.20	The Strategy now includes more detail in relation to approaches to stewardship which reflects this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Len Banister	Survey response	25-Jun-20	Don't like the notion of a hierarchy of footpaths (3.47) this eventually leads to selective low maintenance and eventual loss of amenity. The strict adherence to the Ramsar Convention has led to extensive limitation of public access to the Walthamstow Wetlands.	Para 3.47	This reflects the differing character and role of the PRoW network which does not inform approaches to maintenance or retention.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Adela Szafranska	Survey response	30-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - concerns around litter, noise, fires, cycling and footfall with regards local residents and wildlife		The approach requires the design of such spaces to avoid that such issues are avoided.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Adela Szafranska	Survey response	30-Jun-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - Too focused on providing for people - Connaught Waters used as a bad example of this.		The Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between both managed and natural spaces which reflects the broad definition of Green and Blue Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Adela Szafranska	Survey response	30-Jun-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Concerns that special fragile areas will be obliterated as a result of these projects.		The Strategy makes it clear that projects will only be acceptable where they do not cause harm to sensitive ecological sites and assets.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Adela Szafranska	Survey response	30-Jun-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** None - concerns around illegal activity such as drug dealing taking place due to unpoliced areas.		Comment noted. The Councill will make the Conservators of Epping Forest aware of these concerns.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Adela Szafranska	Survey response	30-Jun-20	Positive reaction to Section 2, negative to section 3	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Stewart Wilkins	Survey response	02-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Natural, areas for children, water rivers/stream, dog friendly		The guidance on SANG supports the creation of such attributes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	H.Cleminson	Survey response	02-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Accessibility		The guidance on SANG supports creating spaces that are accessible to all.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Malpass	Survey response	03-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Would be happy to see new facilities to enhance the lifestyle for children and young people in North Weald. The North Weald Mums recently submitted a proposal to the Parish Council regarding the possibility of building a multisports surface in the area of North Weald common, next to the playground installed by the North Weald Mums (in 2014).	Appendix 1	Comment noted and welcomed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** From the graph, Natural Space existing is 'off the scale' - why? Because of the unique location. Play existing is below national average - because of above. Why not sustain this level of support for future residents? i.e. - don't mess with it!	Para 2.6	This reflects the extent of the Epping Forest and Lee Valley Regional Park located within the District. New development will be required to make appropriate provision for play spaces.

Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Rewilding will not work where humans have introduced the like of Japanese Knotweed, Rhododendrons etc. Management would need to be continuous. Increase habitats by building over motorway cuttings similar to M25 at Epping.	Para 2.18	Rewilding will not be appropriate in all locations. Unfortunately covering over the M25 motorway is not a feasible or viable option.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Thames Water still discharge raw sewage into Cripsey brook when overwhelmed. This needs dealing with.	Para 2.25	Comment noted. The Council will raise this issue with Thames Water.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Mixing cycling with walking eg on the Lea navigation towpath is not a good idea. Towpaths were not designed for wheeled vehicles of any kind. Cycling on public roads is extremely unpleasant due to traffic volume, speed and road width, pot-holes and sunken ironworks.	Para 2.11	This reflects Essex County Council's preferred approach. Any improvements will need to be agreed with the River and Canal Trust.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** Social: People are not likely to use space and interact with nature if it's swarming with others. The forest is not a 'theme park' with litter bins, toilets, paved walkways etc. It's draw is its reputation and that it is an adventure!	Multi-functional Approach	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** Environment: More positive behaviour is needed in the countryside. Ban takeaways or instil an environmental levy in a planning application for such to control the rubbish/litter these business produce. Also push for higher fines, jail for fly-tippers. Art is not natural and not appreciated by anything other than humans. Trees on an allotment peripheral are beneficial but allotments are not playgrounds and should be treated with respect.	Multi-functional Approach	This is not a matter for the Strategy. The multi-functional approach seeks to ensure that a range of uses can be accommodated without creating conflicts between users. Art provision will need relate well to its context.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** Yes - except art		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Wet woodland in flood plains and man-made flood attenuation features do not look attractive when the ground is parched and cracked because of the Essex soil structure.	Para 3.11	Such initiatives can be successful when appropriately designed.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Removing scrub edges increases the chance of wind damage in the woodland.	Para 3.12	The Strategy makes it clear that removing scrub edges will only be acceptable where it would not affect ecological health.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Discovery is what it is all about! Make visitors work for it - don't hand it on a plate. Offer support material i.e. guides to certain species/trees etc and where they may be found and let them get on with it.	Para 3.13/14	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** High grade dead-tree carving would be acceptable. There is a danger to fill the area with junk that would also encourage vandalism	Para 3.16	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Parks require supervision to separate those who wish to sunbathe or admire flowerbeds from the children playing football, cricket or throwing Frisbees or skateboarding along the paths. Shade must be provided, litter removed drug use or ASB monitored and dealt with.	Para 3.2	See response to Comment 728.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Food production and play do not mix.	Para 3.27	If well-designed such an approach can be successful.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** All dwellings in a development should have sufficient land to enable food to be grown. Paving over with patios, concrete or decking should be banned.	Para 3.33	Comment noted. This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Youngsters like playing with sand and water.	Para 3.38	Comment noted.

Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Muga's are good use of space but need supervising. Youths like hiding in shelters normally for the wrong reasons	Para 3.4	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Create more visually interesting appearance by covering motorway cuttings.	Para 3.45	See response to Comment 724.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Cycling must be kept separate from walking.	Para 3.46	The Strategy reflects Essex County Council's preferred approach. The Strategy makes it clear that such networks will need to be designed so that they are safe for all users.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** If Suds mimic the natural drainage process - it hasn't quite worked with the illustration from Lewisham, clearly showing a dead tree on what looks like poor soil.	Para 3.62	The case study remains an excellent example of SuDS within a greenspace, regardless of a minor planting defect.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** Where is the key to detail of the maps?	Para 4.14	Maps now have legible and correct keys.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** The best is not necessarily the most expensive. Hire on proven record and experience. Include 'plan B' if it goes wrong.	Para 4.17	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages (see Appendix 1)?** The only people to gain from this appears to be developers	Para 4.21	The Council does not consider that this is the case. Developers will be required to provide for a range of GI provision and contribute to its lon-term maintenance.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Dead tree carving would be possible anywhere. The theme must reflect the location.	Para 3.16	Comment noted. The Strategy reflects this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Downstream of Dobb's weir could be a good spot to create a shallow stream off river for youngsters to playing before it re-joins the navigation.	Para 3.38	Further consideration will be given to this helpful suggestion.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** None unless they are ancient woodland away from population areas		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** No - Epping Forest is unique. The history, ecology is second to none. To relieve pressure on the forest - it must be expanded if people continue to breed at an uncontrolled rate and demand to use it to escape the modern world. More land must be return to the forest - Woodside place is an example of a lost opportunity.		Comment noted. See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Waters	Survey response	06-Jul-20	Found the document extremely difficult to read as it is dripping in jargon. Is it too much to ask to write these surveys in plain English and drop the Americanisms?	Further Comments	The Strategy has been amended to seek to address these concerns.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Add the Long Shaws in Debden Loughton side of the M11- ancient woodland. Small areas of green space in housing estates. School playing fields. Suggest a list of all.	Section2	Links to the detailed parish by parish assessment of assets have been included. The Strategy recognises the constribution that small spaces can make. The projects now proposed in Part 4 would support enhanced access to 'The Shaws'.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - Assumes that all would be improved- some fine as they are, some to be improved, and some to be left or made natural areas. More emphasis on the Green Arc and green corridors for wildlife .	Vision & Objectives	The Vision and Objectives and guidance provided within the Strategy reflect these comments.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** Yes but not suitable for all sites	Multi-functional Approach	The GI Strategy makes it clear that this is the case.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects [project pages] could happen?** Wildflower verges on parts of Roding fields Extend cycle routes from Loughton to Chigwell, Buckhurst Hill and into Greater London - using green routes when possible.	Appendix 1	Further consideration will be given to these helpful suggestions as part of individual projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Sign posted and walking routes		Comment noted.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Caroline Pond	Survey response	07-Jul-20	Not enough on Climate Change in the document. Need ways of reducing car usage, especially traffic pollution at junctions, busy roads. and new development. Not just trees and cycle routes. Not building on designated urban open space. Especially the field site at Loughton College and other spaces in Loughton.	Further Comments	These are matters for the emerging Local Plan rather than the GI Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	"Further development will increase harm to the Epping and implemented." Insert full stop after "SAC". Forest SAC if a suitable range of mitigation measures are not identified	Para 2.3	As SAC is an acronym rather than an abbreviation a full stop would be incorrect.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	It's all very well raising the questions, which are pretty obvious and generalised: what about providing some answers?	Para 2.4	The Strategy identifies the ways that these questions will be answered.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	This analysis is neither helpful nor meaningful, especially given the uniqueness of Epping Forest; is it aiming to provide cover for further development? Who says that the "minimum" is in fact acceptable? Why is it apparently wrong to be 18 times over some arbitrary minimum, when we have a truly exceptional situation?	Para 2.6	This is a statement of fact.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	So make a commitment that the "significant physical barriers" will be removed by specific dates, instead of dealing in generalised observations.	Para 2.12	This relates to strategic road and rail infrastructure and therefore it is not possible to remove them.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	"Consequently identifying opportunities to address parts of the walking and cycling network in particular which are fragmented or incomplete provides the opportunity to negotiate with landowners to secure real improvements to the value of the network." seen as a paragraph of little value	Para 2.13	This statement identifies approaches that should be taken and 'negotiate' has been changed to 'work'.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	So what will be done?	Para 2.17	The Strategy identifies ways of responding to the climate crisis.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	2.41 & 2.42 Too generalised ad open to interpretation. Suggest identifying specific locations in the district where these objectives will be applied.	Vision & Objectives	This level of specificity is not appropriate for what are high-level objectives. However, they have been amended to make it clearer as to how they will be achieved.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - No striking aim or vision in the document, very little brings confidence that EFDC is truly serious. Suggest a commitment to no more development in the Green Belt, or no further development within x miles of the Epping Forest boundaries. The impression is that EFDC is just through the motions, to satisfy the requirement to produce a strategy.	Vision & Objectives	The Council considers that the Vison and Objectives and the Strategy itself provide a positive framework for enhancing and increasing the provision of Green and Blue Infrastructure in the District. The restriction of development is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Underlying thread suggests that being average, or meeting the minimum requirement, is good enough, and an acceptable target. EFDC should be aiming much higher: why can it not be aiming - and desirable - to be in the upper quartile (for example) of performance on key metrics?	Vision & Objectives	These are nationally accepted standards based on thorough research and are used by many local authorities as being appropriate to identify the quantity and quality of Green Infrastructure needed to support local communities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** The document lacks bite and incisiveness. No eye-catching initiative or serious commitment. EFDC come across as devoid of innovative, radical thinking, reliant on largely consultant-style verbiage.	Vision & Objectives	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	P101: "…… projects that should be brought forward….. ". Why not "will be brought forward"?	Appendix 4	These sites were identified by residents in response to the Epping Forest Visitor Survey and the Council was seeking views on their appropriateness for enhancement.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	Paras 1.7, 1.9, etc.: "Potential enhancements and matters to be considered:" Shows no commitment.	Appendix 4	This reflects the site-specific characteristics that any scheme would need to respond to. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	A small number of easy and obvious nominations. EFDC tried very hard for a long time to implement major development on Jessel Green - which tests the credibility of the list. Suggest a provision of new green sites, outside the Masterplan areas, not just "enhancements"?	Appendix 4	Jessel Green was included as it had been suggested by residents as an alternative space to Epping Forest in response to the Epping Forest Visitors Survey 2019.

Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	Page 58 - "… types of projects that could be delivered …" shows no commitment.	Appendix 1	The Strategy identifies a range of projects but makes it clear that the Council is keen for local communities to identify where these projects could take place.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	A very short list, of rather easy potential wins, which ducks some of the fundamental issues such as traffic, pollution, public transport, commuting - demanding objectives are required.	Appendix 1	The Strategy identifies a range of projects but makes it clear that the Council is keen for local communities to identify where these projects could take place.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	The treatment of SANG is weak - seen only as a mitigation of the adverse effects of the Masterplan developments. This is not good enough, when it is already recognised that there are significant pressures caused by today's population levels.	Appendix 3	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	There is a fundamental conflict between the housing developments envisaged in the Local Plan and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Further Comments	These are not matters for the GI Strategy but rather the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	The document should specify what powers EFDC has, and how it intends to use them, as well as how it will use its position to obtain concrete results. It should also list concrete measures of future success.	Further Comments	Where appropriate this is set out in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	To be credible, the document needs to have an Action Plan, focused on major issues, with specific, quantified commitments, and with timetable and deadlines.	Further Comments	The Strategy has been amended to include further information on implementation where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	A drastic shortening and sharpening of the entire document required.	Further Comments	The Strategy has been amended to respond to comments such as this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	G & E King	Survey response	28-Jun-20	Introduce accountability into the document.	Further Comments	The Strategy identifies who will deliver Green Infrastructure enhancements and new provision where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - do not agree that people should be discouraged from using the forest.	Vision & Objectives	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Suggest following good example of housing scheme where every new house had an apple tree planted.	Further Comments	The Strategy supports new tree planting in appropriate locations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	As many street trees as can be afforded with yearly maintenance.	Further Comments	The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Only 'Natural' sculptures in natural areas. Some sculptures are made so children CAN climb on them.	Further Comments	The Strategy makes it clear that the design of Art in the Landscape should be appropriate to its context and designed to maximise opportunities to attracct visitors.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Seating should be considered - this can be a problem in some areas as youngsters can congregate and cause a nuisance.	Further Comments	It is important that seating is provided but this should be in appropriate locations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Do not think people should be discouraged to visit Epping Forest by means of charging for car parking - people should be encouraged to walk instead.	Further Comments	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	The buffer lands between Theydon and Epping would need a lot more of interest for families to visit.	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Concerned about dog exercising in small areas where children might play.	Further Comments	The Strategy does not propose this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	Found survey difficult to take in all at once.	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mrs Turner	Survey response	04-Jul-20	The document was a bit repetitive and concerned it seemed wholly about keeping people away from Epping Forest.	Further Comments	The Strategy has been reviewed to reflect these comments.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Emma Wilson	Survey response	09-Jul-20	Suggest introducing speeding restrictions to discourage motorists and bikers speeding and polluting the air with fumes and noise. Also raise awareness about littering and wildlife protection.	Further Comments	The behaviour of road users is not a matter for the GI Strategy. The Council will consider opportunities to raise awareness of the matters raised.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Insufficient detail on proposals for walking and cycling in the Epping area	Section 2	The Strategy contains a number of proposals, some of which are intended to be developed following suggestions from local communities, as well as requirements for development proposals to provide new and enhanced Green Infrastructure. In addition Essex County Council's Epping Forest District Cycle Action Plan identifies specific schemes, including for Epping.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** Yes but lacks firm proposals	Vision & Objectives	This is not the purpose of the Vision and Objectives. The Strategy itself contains a number of proposals, some of which are intended to be developed following suggestions from local communities, as well as requirements for development proposals to provide new and enhanced Green Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Lacks firm proposals in Epping area	Appendix 1	Specific projects will be identified based on suggestions from local communities.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Better linkage to the town with defined walking and cycling routes, with consideration of safety from traffic and pollution.		The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Site adjacent to Stonards playing fields		See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	More real maps with defined routes would help	Further Comments	Clearer mapping has been provided throughout the strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	John Manning	Survey response	13-Jul-20	The objectives will never be achieved until there is better objectives for Forest users, the Conservators and EFDC.	Further comments	The Council is working with the Conservators of Epping Forest in this regard.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Cllr Jaymey McIvor	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The strategy recognises a lack of facilities for local children and young people. North Weald, in particular does not have its fair share of facilities. The current local plan does not provide an adequate level of quality sports facilities for the people of North Weald.	Appendix 1	This is a matter for the Masterplanning being undertaken for the strategic sites in North Weald in accordance with the site specific requirements set out in the emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Cllr Jaymey McIvor	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Locations which have simple and quick access without the need to travel through congested areas. Locations that are near to my home. The ability to time visits with other activities such as sports or shopping.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Cllr Jaymey McIvor	Survey response	14-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Yes, the redundant North Weald Golf Course.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Michael Calder	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Blunts Farm, Abridge Road, Theydon Bois		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Lord	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** Could use rewilding more - see http://wildeast.co.uk		The Strategy supports rewilding in appropriate locations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Lord	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Better info and cycling access		The Strategy supports this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Lord	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Is Curtis Mill Green included/protected?		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Lord	Survey response	15-Jul-20	I disagree with (p105): 'The important ecological interest features (the reason why it is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest in particular) would not affected by increased recreational use' - surely this can't be right??	Further Comments	The ecological features within the site which have led to its designation as an SSSI would not be impacted as a result of the management regime applied.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Verges in Orchards and expect across the district. Need for wildlife meadow creation, more added for joined up corridors, turn some roads one way to widen or develop wildlife corridors. Consider wilding in amongst hard to imagine areas, e.g. town centres	Section 2	The Strategy encourages such approaches.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - Need to widen vision to think outside box and create a much more green and blue outcome	Vision & Objectives	The Vision and Objectives focus on positive Green and Blue infrastructure outcomes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - More can be done to stop road use dominating the green assets and in fact putting the brakes on the use of roads to fly through the assets creating harm		Comment noted. However, this may not always be achieveable in relation to the current highway network. Policies in the Council's emerging Local Plan support the objective of reducing car use.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Better use of verges, newly created sites and road narrowing with better speed management and development of green corridors. More ponds better fed with rain water would also help	Appendix 1	The Strategy supports such approaches.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** All verges in Epping, a green centre piece in town centre and villages and a pond in the 'greens' end of Epping and Stonards		Comment noted. The Strategy supports making better use of verges for Green Infrastructure purposes and the Council will take into consideration the other helpful suggestions in developing future projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Gary Marshall	Survey response	15-Jul-20	We have to take back some of the space allocated to town and village road and associated parking and services infrastructure	Further Comments	Comment noted. However this may not always be achieveable from a highway capacity perspective.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	One of the main needs in your overall strategy is connectivity – both from a biodiversity perspective and encouraging further use of the network. Later in the document the point is made regarding encouraging people to go for recreation in other areas apart from the Forest, but unless these are made more accessible and connect to the wider network, this will not happen.	Vision & Objectives	The Strategy supports this objective.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Your overall vision for Green Infrastructure should contain an undertaking to make it more connected which will encourage better use of currently under-used facilities.	Vision & Objectives	The Vision sets out that by 2033 a well-connected Green and Blue Infrastructure network will have been created.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Disappointed to note this section only considers walkers and cyclists. It is imperative that the GIS caters for ALL vulnerable user groups, including equestrians. What we would like to see, in common with other user groups such as the Disabled Ramblers, is a cohesive Strategy that aims to provide a network of off-road safe routes for ALL user groups.	Para 2.31	Reference to equestrians has now been included in the relevant parts of the Strategy where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	When considering public access along waterways, it is important also not to forget other user groups such as equestrians as there are opportunities here for further access. Cyclists already use the towpaths – which incidentally were originally created for horses – but currently equestrians are not allowed to use them.	Para 2.22	The use of towpaths for equestrian use is determined by the landowner, which in this instance is the River and Canal Trust. The Council will make the Trust aware of this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Mentions visitor attractions that appear to be currently under used; important to consider whether further access for equestrians is possible in these open spaces, especially if cyclists are considered. It is unfair to consider only certain user groups within a Strategy such as this.	Para 2.37/8	See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Accessibility is missing from this Vision. It is all very well creating high quality spaces etc if they are only accessible to certain groups; the omission at the top level of the Strategy appears to set the scene for the remainder of the document and this omission should be addressed.	Vision & Objectives	The Vision has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Mention of horse riders noted but the need to improve connectivity of the network is significant.	Para 3.46	Comment noted. See also response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Welcome the intention to improve the accessibility for all users; however, further down the paragraph it states '…it is also important not to ignore the opportunities that the identification of 'Quietways' for cyclists can provide…' Why are equestrians being forgotten here? Cyclists and equestrians have similar needs when using the road network and it is extremely disappointing that this Strategy appears to discriminate against equestrians. This should be addressed.	Para 3.48	See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Design in relation to Strategic Site Allocations: it is vitally important that a fully-accessible cohesive network be the aim when considering design and development; we note in para 4.18 in the final bullet point that this is mentioned, but feel that the overall strategy should have far more emphasis on connectivity and accessibility of the movement network and biodiversity.	Section 4	The Strategy supports these objectives and has been amended at appropriate points where this has not been clear.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Latton Priory: opportunities to enhance the network and establish further accessible green links, notably a new east/west route linking bridleway 201_49 to byway 190_12, together with a link running northwards which will connect the new development with the wider settlement - a route could run in parallel with the Harlow side of the ditch as this land is in the control of the developer as we understand this was to be a green wedge.	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** North Weald: bridleway 201_19 runs through the site, and it needs to be preserved in a semi-rural state rather than tarmacked and urbanised. Opportunity for this to be part of a linear park, and links established southwards to the extensive network at Hastingwood and Toot Hill. The proposed Country Park to the north east of the site would give an excellent opportunity to extend the access for all users; for example, a perimeter track around the site linking in with the existing bridleway would be a useful enhancement.	Appendix 1	The Strategy has been amended to reflect this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Accessibility for ALL non-motorised users, including equestrians		See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.2 sets out the basic guidance for spaces within masterplans and we would add that the default when considering access should be that they are open to ALL user groups – walkers, cyclists, equestrians and the disabled. There will be situations where this may not be practicable, but this should be the last resort rather than the norm.	Appendix 3	See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.12 lists the ideal provisions of green spaces and equestrians have been forgotten again.	Appendix 3	See response to Comment 811.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	Paragraph 1.21 – equestrians omitted again.	Appendix 3	See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	This section sets out potential sites where better use of the open spaces can be made. Request the provision of equestrian access is included, as yet again walking and cycling is mentioned but equestrians are forgotten.	Appendix 4	See response to Comment 811.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Sue Dobson	Survey response	15-Jul-20	All through the document there appears to be several instances of incorrect grammar/spelling which have not been picked up through proof reading, which should be addressed, namely the use of the word 'complimentary' in many places when 'complementary' should be used. This is unfortunate as it does give a very unprofessional impression of the document and the Council.	Further Comments	It is unfortunate that this happened. The Council has sought to ensure that such issues are not replicated in the final Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carl Ginn	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - The objectives refer to protecting, enhancing and improving access to existing green and blue infrastructure, but there is limited reference to provision of new spaces. Securing and delivering new recreational and amenity spaces for local people should be a key consideration for the council when allocating land for housing. Existing community assets are underfunded at present levels of demand, and increases in housing and population requires new spaces	Vision & Objectives	The Objectives include reference to the provision of new Green Infrastructure. In addition the Strategy makes it clear that new provision is required as part of new development proposals and this will be achieved through the application of the policies of the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carl Ginn	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** Agree that the strategy should allow for enhancements to existing spaces and provision of new spaces, but disagree with the balance in the strategy. The strategy relies too heavily on improvement to existing spaces and there is not enough emphasis on provision of new spaces	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that new provision is required as part of new development proposals and this will be achieved through the application of the policies of the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carl Ginn	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** No - I visit many of the areas listed on page 78 of the strategy (areas labelled A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and A9.) These are adjacent to Epping Forest, and in most cases visits to this area form the start of walks into Epping Forest itself. These are existing green spaces with public access. They do not represent additional provision, nor are they separate destinations; indeed walks are often linked to Epping Forest with wayfinding signage		Comment noted. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carl Ginn	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** The former North Weald Golf Club site if approved will provide additional recreational facilities for local sports clubs		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Carl Ginn	Survey response	15-Jul-20	The current strategy does not include new SANG provision for North Weald, despite the village being part of the strategic allocation. The North Weald masterplan should be extended to include the former North Weald Golf Club to address the shortfall in recreational provision in the village given the proposed increases in housing for the area	Further Comments	Part 3 of the Strategy identifies the need for a SANG at North Weald Bassett. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Melissa Pepper	Survey response	15-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Large open spaces, natural habitat, a designated area for children's play equipment - but mostly open spaces to walk in. It is difficult to see how this could be achieved given the ambitions in terms of housing density.		This approach is supported by the principles to be applied to SANG in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Melissa Pepper	Survey response	15-Jul-20	EFDC need to seriously consider returning to their initial site assessment to review whether other sites pose fewer challenges and more options for greener and more sustainable development compared to the current South Epping site.	Further Comments	This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Gossan	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - don't readily see that the themes cater for provision of sporting facilities within the social sphere. As chairman of the largest Youth Football club in the area, I would like to see this addressed		Sports provision is addressed through the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Gossan	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** As a council you must consider the impact of meeting the central government housing plan on the local sports clubs and organisations. You should only consider building projects which contribute to the ecosystem and meet all the requirements dictated by the Themes	Appendix 1	Sports provision is addressed through the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy. New development will be required to contribute towards enhancements to Green Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Chris Gossan	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Trails and pathways; nature walks and features		This approach is supported by the principles to be applied to SANG in the Strategy.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Some of the assets are not singled out for proper detailed analysis. Technically they are mentioned but in too broad terms.	Section 2	Links to the Council's evidence base which provides more detailed analysis on a parish by parish basis have now been added to the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - The strategy must go hand in hand with a transport plan. On page 86 there is a lot about proximity to Waltham Cross but no mention of a bus to get to the Gunpowder Mills. Similarly on Page 97 there is a lot about SANGS but again no mention of how to get to them without the use of a car.	Vision & Objectives	This is not a matter for the Strategy but rather is addressed through the policies in the Council's emerging Local Plan including site specific requirements.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - I don't think that enough emphasis is being placed on the role and relevance of art within the district. There are many famous artists who have lived in the district and by art I include, actors, poets, musicians and sculptors. There is no mention that the first performance of Midsummer Night's Dream was, most likely, at Copped Hall. There is a very easy hook into a visitor attraction during the summer.		The Strategy recognises the important role of art and is not specific in relation to the genre for schemes in order to provide flexibility in relation to the local context.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Needs to be a sensitive hand guiding the process. The approach seems to be to hand it over to an expert and suffer the consequences of remote and generic decision making.	Appendix 1	The Council will be leading on the delivery of these projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Copped Hall being the site of the first performance of Midsummer's Night Dream. High Beech where Alfred, Lord Tennyson lived for a while. The Iron age encampment. The hollow that was rumoured to be Dick Turpin's hideout.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** They need to be as un-managed as possible. There is a terrible problem with these questions in that they are too specific and designed to be easily discounted. The main problem with the SANGS is that there is no possibility to get to any of them without a car. There is talk of parking charges but this will not help. To encourage car use will end up using valuable green land for parking. An electric shuttle bus from Loughton and Theydon Bois stations would encourage use of the forest and similarly a bus service to any and all SANGS would be a great boon.		The design principles for SANG included in the Strategy support this approach. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** Yes - If artworks are allowed to flourish. It depends on the final project. The document shows many pictures from around the globe of successful planting ideas but many are from cities. The feeling will be very different with houses more spread out and people having gardens. Wild flower planting needs special care as it may introduce invasive or competitive species to the existing flora.		Comments noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Any spare snippets of land near roads are worth consideration, maybe not as visitor attractions but as places that could enhance living in the district		The important role that smaller spaces can play is included in Part 2 of the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Some of the proposals, such as land around Copped Hall are privately owned and therefore it is difficult to see how use can be made of them. There will be many hoops to go through.	Further comments	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	There is no mention of transport other than cars and parking charges in the forest. Charging for parking in the forest is directly against the notion of the people's forest, however if an alternative is employed then it could be acceptable but that will mean dog friendly buses	Further comments	Wider transport considerations are not a matter for the Strategy but rather are addressed through the Council's emerging Local Plan policies, including site specific requirements. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	How robustly will the rights of way be defended? Especially if paths are moved by developers, with or without notification	Further comments	Public Rights of Way are legally protected and overseen by Essex County Council.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	water quality suffers with run off from over fertilised fields. Better practice from farming would quickly improve the water quality. Where is that mentioned in the document?	Further comments	This is set out in Part 2 of the Strategy (The Water Environment).
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Is there a map of sites to be included in the Green Arc, if the arc is to be continuous then surely these sites need to be identified and then avoided by planning?	Further comments	This level of detail has not yet been developed by the Green Arc Partnership.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Page 35 lifting canopies strikes me as a bad idea - the scrub that lines the roads performs a vital role in collecting a lot of the pollutants that fall from vehicles. Not just particulates form fossil fuels but also tyre degradation and brake linings.	Para 3.12	Lifting canopies can have benefits to both the health of trees and the ecology surrounding them. The Strategy makes it clear that such an approach will not be appropriate in all cases.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The picture shows trees that have, in the past, been pollarded. Now that they are no longer so treated they are in a pretty bad way, you can see lots of water ingress in the limbs.	Page 35	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	A lot of wordage about good design but how is this to be assessed? Again the answer seems to be to parcel it out to a remote and unconnected panel. I fear this will waste a lot of money.	Further comments	Development proposals, including the Green Infrastructure component, will be assessed by Council officers. Critical friend advice from the Council's Quality Review Panel will assist in that assessment and is in line with good practice.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Can the money raised from 106 agreement really cover the cost of these projects? There will be insufficient funds for half of this.		A range of funding sources have been identified. The costs of Green Infrastructure provision have been considered as part of the Local Plan viability work.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	A picture of Berlin, very nice and very good design is evident. However that is from a place that is used to much more communal space and inter generational renting, with low rent and secured tenancies, can this be translated to much more separate housing, owner occupied with their own gardens?	Page 55	The picture is intended to illustrate what can be achieved within developments through good design to give developers an understanding of the approaches that the Council will be expecting them to take in delivering Green Infrastructure within schemes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	How will this be funded? 106 money again? The best solution would be education and volunteering, but with authority to act, so effectively an unpaid official role. There is no mention of how this is to be achieved in the document.	Stewardship	Further information on potential stewardship approaches has now been included in the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Consulting team - Who decides who? This might be better put to a competitive tender that is open to residents to see and maybe vote for?	Stewardship	This will be a matter for consideration at the detailed planning application stage and will be determined by the approach to stewardship that is proposed at the time.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Opening canopies and relaxing verge cutting - contradictory ideas at play here. Relaxing verge cutting will also increase the prevalence of hidden litter and more visible litter.	Further Comments	Both approaches have been successfully implemented in other parts of the country.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Tree planting - in general this is best left to trees. Some areas should be left open and see what nature does with them.	Further Comments	Comment noted. This is part of the intention for the promotion of adopting a re-wilding approach on some sites.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Mentions the proximity of Waltham Cross to the Gunpowder Mllls but there is no mention of public transport. One is pointless without the other.	Page 86	The matter of public transport in this and other parts of the District are not a matter for the GI Strategy but rather for the Council's emerging Local Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	A general point is one of accessibility, how can less-abled people access the forest?	Further Comments	Comment noted. This is a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	More talk of parking charges. And as a mention, the introduction of red lines in High Beech was done without notifying the Verderers. There is little or no mention of the verderers in the document or the possible impact on the rights of commoners.	Page 100	These are matters for the Conservators of Epping Forest. See also the overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No discussion about the possible different rules surrounding the buffer lands bought by the CoL. Does EFDC have more say over their usage?	Further Comments	The use of the buffer lands is ultimately a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The Gunpowder Mills can easily be improved to become a "great walk" Linders field is, in part, in the the local plan for large houses, or at least it will be spoilt by housing in Powell Rd.	Page 106	Gunpowder Mills lies within the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) area and the opportunities associated with it are set out in the LVRPA adopted Area 6 Strategy. The Strategy has been amended to reflect this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Theydon Bois picnic areas? On the green that is owned by CoL? Has this been agreed already?	Page 106	This suggestion was put forward by a resident in response to questions raised as part of the Epping Forest Visitor Survey in 2019.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Simon Heap	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document is a good start but overly wordy and repetitious. Not well enough advertised. The council do not have the correct people in place to oversee the scientific needs of this plan nor the artistic sensibilities that will be required. Spending a lot of money on consultants is not always a good idea.	Further Comments	The Strategy has been amended to improve its readability and reduce repetition.
Draft v2 - June 2020	James Willis	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Ease of access		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Could have included Luxborough lake on the border of Chigwell and Buckhurst hill. This is a large lake and has great potential as a green and blue infrastructure area linking up the two urban centres.	Section 2	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - we need to be careful about the types of tree we plant, and in terms of the green Ark some areas should be left to wild themselves. Also linking green areas together in a development needs to be handled sensitively and the creation of wildlife corridors such as tunnels under roads for animals like hedgehogs or Bridges between trees going over roads for animals like squirrels.		The Strategy makes it clear that the multi-functional approach will not be approriate in all cases.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Wildflower verges - needs to be handled very carefully. Too many grass verges are parked over and we need to ensure ways of protecting the area otherwise it will just be counter-productive. A better way of using wildflowers would be in selected areas of our existing green spaces such Roding Valley recreation ground. Tree planting - need to make sure that the trees are sensitive to the areas they are going into and are good at taking up CO2 as some trees are better than others and further investigation into this needs to happen I think. A goal of not increasing the maintenance budget should be removed. Whilst it's a nice idea it may be unrealistic and we should deal with each project within the bigger projects on their own merits and not beat ourselves up if the maintenance project on one project goes up because we didn't see certain things happening.	Appendix 1	Comments noted and the suggestions are helpful. These will be considered as part of the development of the approach to individual projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Grass verges of Loughton Way and hearts of land around the back of the allotments in lower Queens Road and behind Hornbeam close or Hornbeam Road and the green on Cascade Road in Buckhurst hill as well as the Roding Valley Recreation ground. There are also a number of green islands in certain former council estates which might lend themselves to having a small area of wildflowers, depending on the size of them.		The Council will consider these helpful suggestions in identifying potential projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Good access and a combination of human and natural world use		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Whilst Roding Valley recreation ground is already a great resource it could benefit from some rewilding projects such as those ones already carried out but extended. Also Luxborough lake is a site which would be used very much by the public if the opportunity arose. It has great potential for green and blue infrastructure enhancements and would link up Chigwell and Buckhurst hill. It was once open to the public but is now in private hands. Certainly are an approach needs to be made by the council in the first instance to see if we can work with the owner.		See overarching SANG response. Roding Valley Playing Fields has now been included as an Infrastructure Enhancement Project.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Steven Neville	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document is reasonable but in need of improvement. There needs to be more joined up thinking in terms of the spaces allocated and the way in which we travel there. This part of the strategy needs to be beefed up because how we travel across the	Further Comments	The Strategy emphasises the need to improve connectivity between places and this is set out in the guidance provided.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No reference to a specific timeline for implementation of the various projects.		A timeline has now been included for relevant projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Monitoring is required to ensure that the delivery is as expected.		The Strategy has been amended to include further information on the approach to monitoring.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	There will be significant costs for the successful delivery of such an ambitious programme and attention must be paid to clearer funding sources.		The Strategy identifies a range of funding opportunties.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Too much centred on the main areas of population to the west of the district. There is a need to think about provision right across district, especially the settlement of Ongar and the surrounding villages.		This reflects the location of development proposed in the Council's emerging Local Plan, as pasrt of the purpose of developing the Strategy is to support the implementation of the Plan's policies in relation to the provision of Green Infrastructure.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Food production on farmland must be given greater emphasis and allotments celebrated and enhanced. Studies have shown that allotments are key locations for biodiversity. More should be included to encourage folk to grow their own food.		This is not the purpose of the Strategy. The Strategy recognises the important role that allotments play.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	A key finding from the response of people to lockdown as a result of the pandemic is a greater appreciation of their own immediate green spaces within walking distance of home. This must now be factored into any designs for all the new proposed developments within the district and existing green spaces within the urban footprints of each settlement must be protected from any hint of infilling.		The Strategy reflects this approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Suggest encouraging additional planting schemes in all properties, both private and council owned.		The GI Strategy seeks to encourage such an approach.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Considerable concerns that it is suggested that den building is an acceptable activity in Epping Forest. The fallen logs in the northern woodlands of the Forest provide homes to many Great Crested Newts which hide beneath them during the day, venturing out after dark in search of food. As protected species it is an offence to disturb the habitat of such animals. I would recommend that this suggestion is removed in relation to the Forest. Too many dens are left in place and present a fire hazard which can damage these ancient green monuments. Ideally, den making should be an activity in other locations with a greater degree of on-site supervision.		The Strategy makes it clear that this is a District wide opportunity and that it will only acceptable where is does not impact on the ecological health of a site.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Specific concerns about the deliverability of a sufficient number of SANGs to meet the needs of the amount of proposed development not just in the Epping Forest area, but the high numbers of new residents with adjacent boroughs too. If the calculations are correct there is a massive shortfall in the amount of land required to protect the SAC of Epping Forest from overuse.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Needs to be a clear understanding of the true value of the uniqueness of Epping Forest and the damage caused to its various fragile ecosystems by increasing visitor numbers. Soil compaction is just one facet of the damage and disruption to the behaviour of deer or breeding bird species is another. There needs to be some serious research carried out to evaluate the carrying capacity of existing green spaces being used for recreational activities. The various parcels of Bufferland to the Forest provide green corridors linking the Forest to the surrounding countryside enabling wildlife and humans to enjoy the wonderful landscapes of the area and appreciate some really tranquil sites on the edge of London.		The Council has been working with Natural England and the Conservators of Epping Forest in order to develop the most appropriate approaches for supporting the ecological health of the Epping Forest. Both Natural Engalnd and the Conservators were consulted on the draft Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	To ensure good way-finding requires ongoing funding and sign up to paths many of which cross agricultural land. Sadly, not all users are respectful of the countryside.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	There are a considerable number of books and other published guides to the different walking routes in the district. Why is there no reference to the West Essex Ramblers, other organisations such as the many health and well-being groups, the local Horse Riding Groups all of whom are well acquainted with the various routes?		Relevant users groups will be engaged in the design of individual projects where appropriate.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Many local verges have specific wildflowers and there should not be any sowing of wildflower seeds of dubious origin to supplement the existing flora. Stop mowing and allow for natural seeding and monitor the situation. Assess where verge mowing is essential for road safety and discourage homeowners from scalping the grass outside their own property. Liaison with botanical recorders for details of special verges and ensure that these are properly signed.		Comment noted. These are matters which will need to be considered as part of site specific proposals.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Think carefully about tree planting – it must be the right tree in right place and what after care is envisaged and what is the end point.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Community Art projects can help local people gain a greater appreciation of their green spaces but have to be managed in a sensitive way so as not to detract from the natural feel of such places but provide opportunities to explore the visual and acoustic potential of such locations.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Public art could feature within certain selected green spaces but all residents should be reminded of their existence. Perhaps somewhere could be earmarked for a new public park which over time could become an additional visitor attraction?		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Easy parking, close to home, seats and well maintained paths, views, a variety of habitats including some mature trees, dog free areas.		Comment noted. The SANG guidance in the Strategy reflects a number of these attributes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** To create a SANG the land needs to be close to existing or proposed development sites. This rules out many location as car usage has to be discouraged to reduce carbon footprints. Unless a significant number of landowners are prepared to put forward productive agricultural sites for such uses it will be impossible to comment as to where there should be any additional sites. Any possible sites close to existing urban areas is likely to be highly valued and unless the Local Authority exercises its compulsory purchase rights this presents the Council with an impossible situation as it will be unable to meet its obligations in providing adequate green space provision to protect the SAC of Epping Forest from further damage.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patricia Moxey	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Light pollution does impact right across the area - with loss of tranquillity for humans and of course various forms of wildlife which are sensitive to artificial light after dark. Any new built development will increase the carbon footprint and make it harder for the council to meet its targets in its Climate Change Declaration.	Further comments	This is not a matter for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Andrew Lloyd-Skinner	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The Country Park proposed as part of the current planning application (EPF/1492/18) for the former North Weald Golf Club		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Andrew Lloyd-Skinner	Survey response	16-Jul-20	As the main objective is to avoid impact on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (along with providing multi functional SANG), it is clear that some of the sites allocated in the Draft Local Plan will not allow the Council to achieve these objectives due to their location, infrastructure and potential for housing capacity. A rethink of allocated sites is clearly an urgent requirement. It appears that the GI strategy has not been applied in the site selection process for the draft Local Plan.	Further comments	See overarching SANG response.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - People walking dogs do not readily mix with mountain bikers who don't really fit with families having a picnic who may not want noisy children playing nearby.	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that such spaces will need to be designed to ensure that different activities can co-exist safely.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** No - do not wish to visit a poor copy of a small country park when the forest is next door. The forest was given for the recreational use of the people, not a haven for stag beetles. Pay a large premium to live within easy access of the forest.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document should have been much shorter and easier to digest	Further comments	Changes have been made to the GI Strategy in order to address this.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Pictures cut and pasted from around the globe	Further comments	The use of images from elesewhere are intended to demonstrate what could be achieved and can be useful to help explain the approach that the Council is proposing.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	No funding identified above section 106 - ongoing maintenance and day-to-day security not considered	Further comments	The costs of on-going maintenance is taken into account in the calculation of Section 106 contributions.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	How do you propose to have vehicular access to say Copped Hall grounds without putting additional traffic through the forest?	Further comments	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	What guarantee is there that the SANGS will all be built and correctly maintained?	Further comments	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Will the building of the SANGS precede restricting access to the forest or will you continue the process that has been started with the red route and restricting car parking before getting planning consent and funding for the SANGS?	Further comments	See overarching SANG response. Restricting access to the Epping Forest is a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest and is determined by Acts of Parliament.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Greening of the vehicle fleet that will be accelerated by the encroaching ULEZ ignored - with the ban on hydrocarbon fuelled vehicles fast approaching	Further comments	Commment noted. The Council has adopted an Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy to respond to air quality issues.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Why are there no EV charging points in any of the refurbished forest car parks?	Further comments	This is a matter for the Conservators of Epping Forest.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The strategy document seems to be a rushed, difficult to take seriously with lots of "maybe we can"	Further comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Maps missing from pages 84 and 89,	Further comments	Mapping has now been added.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Where is the diversity survey page?	Further comments	There were optional Diversity and Inclusion questions included within the survey.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Patrick Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Was the document proof read?	Further comments	Yes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the Vision and objectives within the draft Strategy?** No - Proposed work at vast expense carried out to divert the residents of Epping Forest District away from the Forest, but LB Waltham Forest is throwing up blocks of flats all over their borough with no green space provision, so the Forest will still be full of visitors, vehicles, dogs, pollution etc, just from a different area.	Vision & Objectives	The Council as a 'competent authority' under the Habitats Regulations is required to ensure that development within the District does not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Epping Forest SAC. The London Borough of Waltham Forest is also a competent authority under the Habitats Regulations.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** No - It might work in some areas but not all	Multi-functional Approach	The GI Strategy has been amended to make it clear that a multi-functional approach may not be appropriate in all instances.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you think we have identified the right themes?** I don't think the Art in the Landscape idea is worth pursuing.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Free, plentiful parking		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	The document is overlong, full of jargon, not user friendly for a lay person. It needed serious proofreading and editing, (complimentary/complementary, principal/principle, numerous instances.) Page 33, 3.7 first sentence; page 53, 4.12 first sentence, to name a couple of examples, are garbled).	Further Comments	Comment noted. The structure of the GI Strategy has been reviewed to make it more user-friendly and wording has been reviewed where appropriate to improve its readability.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Maps missing from pages 84 and 89 gives the impression of a document being rushed out to meet a deadline and does not inspire confidence in the overall strategy.	Further Comments	Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	There are some sweeping, unqualified statements such as "not cutting roadside verges can help to encourage safer driver behaviour" (?), and various unsubstantiated assumptions such as the proposed appropriation of land currently used for arable farming and that the City of London Corporation would be happy to turn Copped Hall grounds into a park.	Further Comments	Reduced cutting regimes can be beneficial in encouraging safer driver behaviour at junctions based on experiences elsehwere. See also overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Mary Gill	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Over-reliance on funding from Section 106 money. Maybe the Council has other ideas for this money and in any case, once all the 11,400 homes are built there will not be so much of it flowing into the coffers to pay for maintenance of SANG.	Further Comments	Section 106 funding for the provision and long-term maintenance of GI has been taken into account in the Viability Assessment of the emerging Local Plan as part of a package of infrastructure that is required to be funded by new development and the approach is considered to be appropriate.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Urban and semi-urban amenity green space such as Jessel Green and Hillyfields in Loughton (albeit there is a photo); public access land such as Nazeingwood Common and the Woodland Trust land at Theydon Bois; forest ponds and lakes; allotments, cemeteries and churchyards. Some of these categories are listed in Section 1 and then omitted from section 2	Section 2	Links to the Council's evidence base which provides more detailed analysis on a parish by parish basis have now been added to the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you agree with the multi-functional approach?** Largely agree but, particularly when considering enhancement to existing green and blue infrastructure, it may be that one function (e.g. conservation) should take priority	Multi-functional Approach	The Strategy makes it clear that this approach will not be appropriate in all instances.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - interesting and important ideas which deserve support but it would be wrong to suggest they cohere into clear themes in this section. The seem to be organised partly by approach and partly by type of greenspace with little clear prioritisation		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Movement And Wayfinding: the maintenance regimes are especially important here. Many PROWs are not very accessible for much of the year because of overgrown vegetation. This is not really addressed in the How do we get there section which is all about design and construction and doesn't deal with the revenue consequences	Appendix 1	Comment noted. The matter of maintenance will be raised with Essex County Council.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Tree Planting - A Call For Sites: Doesn't address the scale of land likely to be required for a truly impactful intervention. Should particularly look for opportunities to link up isolated patches of woodland e.g. along the M11 from Theydon Bois Woodland Trust Wood, through ECC's Debden woods and into the Roding Valley	Appendix 1	The Council's proposed approach is to encourage tree planting in all appropriate locations regardless of the size of the site. The projects identified in Part 4 of the Strategy support the opportunities identfied in this comment.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** -M11 and Roding Valley corridor -Treetops Meadow -> Lower Swaines Recreation Ground - Swaines Green -> Loveloacks Field -> Meadow Road allotments and adjacent land at Epping -Western Avenue, Centre Avenue, Centre Drive greens at Epping -Amenity greenspace at Stewards Green Road, Epping -Piazza in front of shops, Coopersale -A414 grass verges	Appendix 1	The Council will consider these helpful suggestions in identifying potential projects.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Attractive all year round, Large scale spaces - able to walk / run for several miles with minimal road crossings and urban settings		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement? Please state here.** SANG should predominantly be delivered on new sites, especially at or adjacent to the masterplan sites, not simply divert people to already existing sites		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jon Whitehouse	Survey response	16-Jul-20	Proposals for Copped Hall don't mention need to take account of and protect setting of Registered Park, listed building and conservation area status. There are also access issues. Charging for forest car parks risks diverting parking into more sensitive parts of the forest and roadside	Further comments	See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jason Pottle	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Think the plans for north Weald golf course should be looked at as they plan to provide at lot of recreational space for local clubs and outside use also	Appendix 1	These projects are small scale proposals intended to be implementable in suitable locations across the District
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jason Pottle	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** North Weald golf course		These projects are small scale proposals intended to be implementable in suitable locations across the District.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Jason Pottle	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Open spaces fishing lakes sports fields		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Stacey Smith	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** The proposed provision for green infrastructure is unclear and the council don't appear to be able to demonstrate that what they are proposing is deliverable. The proposed provision for children and young people in north weals is woefully inadequate and lacking in variety and quality. There is a clear link between anti social behaviour and lack of suitable provision for young people and the council should be conscious of their responsibility in this area.	Appendix 1	The GI Strategy has been amended to make it clearer that there are a number of components which collectively achieve the provision of enhancement of GI across the District. The matter of GI provision in relation to North Weald is linked to the North Weald Masterplan Area.

Draft v2 - June 2020	Stacey Smith	Survey response	16-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** North weald park, the proposed development for the old north weals golf course on Rayley lane offers a once in a generation opportunity to provide fantastic community facilities for children, young people and adults.		See overarching SANG response.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Harry Dunn	Survey response	20-Jul-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - The old North Weald Golf Course (disused) is a beautiful area, dotted with ponds and -- presumably natural -- wildflowers. Since falling into disuse, it has become meadowland. It has several public footpaths criss-crossing it, and is a true Public Good -- walking distance from North Weald. It should be protected and enhanced.	Section 2	The purpose of the Section is to provide an analysis of the different types of Green Infrastructure assets rather than identifying all locations which accord with these attributes.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Harry Dunn	Survey response	20-Jul-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Natural beauty. Ability to spot wildlife.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Harry Dunn	Survey response	20-Jul-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement? Please state here.** North Weald Golf Course		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Moreton Bobbingworth & Lavers Parish Council	Survey response	24-Jul-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** No - cannot find any reference to putting in electric charging points for vehicles in the villages and at various points in the forest. This is essential		The provision of electric vehicle charging points is not a matter for the Strategy but will be considered as part of the Climate Action Plan.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Moreton Bobbingworth & Lavers Parish Council	Survey response	24-Jul-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** Charging point at all village halls		See response above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alexa Kotonou	Survey response	19-Aug-20	**Do you have any comments on the District-wide projects identified in the Project Pages?** Not enough detail: no map of plan given for south Epping in any detail, important farmland & hedgerows for wildlife.	Appendix 1	The Landscape-Led approach requires development proposals to undertake this type of analysis. This level of specificity is not appropriate for the Strategy.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alexa Kotonou	Survey response	19-Aug-20	**Do you know of any specific locations where you think these projects could happen?** The cultivated farmland between Brook Rd, M25 tunnel footpath at Gardners Farm and beyond, where the footpath runs right to Theydon Bois Tube Station. With important habitat for the endangered Sky Lark as well as other wildlife, fauna and flora.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alexa Kotonou	Survey response	19-Aug-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Wildlife preservation. Clearly marked footpaths.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alexa Kotonou	Survey response	19-Aug-20	**Do you know of any additional sites that you would like to see as a Site for Enhancement?** Stewards Green Lane		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Alexa Kotonou	Survey response	19-Aug-20	The document isn't clear whether the residential proposals were now abolished in favour of a Green infrastructure strategy in South Epping!? I hope they are. Preserve wildlife.	Further comments	Part of the purpose of the GI Strategy is to ensure that GI is designed in to new development rather than to preclude development.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Luke Moxham	Survey response	04-Oct-20	**Do you agree that we have included all of the GI assets within the District and assessed them correctly in Section 2?** No - Green Roofs are only mentioned contextually within Section 1. Further detail required on the different types of green/brown roofs, especially on biodiverse roofs.	Section 2	Comment noted. Links to resources in relation to best practice have now been provided. Sustainability guidance will also provide information
Draft v2 - June 2020	Luke Moxham	Survey response	04-Oct-20	**Do you think that we have identified the right themes?** I agree, however, more emphasis is required on green roofs.		See response above.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Luke Moxham	Survey response	04-Oct-20	**What features would encourage you to visit these new or enhanced spaces instead of the Epping Forest?** Accessible green roof/gardens and buildings featuring living walls with a variety of plants species. These create excellent social points for the district.		Comment noted.
Draft v2 - June 2020	Luke Moxham	Survey response	04-Oct-20	**If you do live near [the sites shown as a 'Strategic Allocation' or a 'Site for Enhancement'] would you be likely to visit any of these sites instead of the Epping Forest?** Yes - all of them		Comment noted.