

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

| | | | | |
|----------------|------|------|-----------|------|
| Stakeholder ID | 1531 | Name | Michael R | Ward |
|----------------|------|------|-----------|------|

| | |
|--------|-------|
| Method | Email |
|--------|-------|

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 25/11/2016 |
|------|------------|

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Letter or Email Response:

To Epping Forest District Council It would seem to me that the District Council proposed Plan only focusses on one factor for Loughton namely "where can we squeeze some 1200 homes" and ignores existing problems in the area together with what further difficulties these new homes will bring about. Several schools seem to be stretched to the limit causing, even small children, to be transported daily over unnecessarily long distances. Medical facilities in the area appear to be finding it difficult to cope and local public transport is not good and seems set to deteriorate. An aged utility supply network has frequent breakdowns causing extensive traffic chaos quite apart from the temporary loss of services. Additional demand brought about by extensive housing developments will only exacerbate these problems. Local history will demonstrate how a lack of forward thinking has seen a number of our schools being closed and the land being sold off for housing developments and then within a few years new schools have had to be built and or extensions provided for remaining buildings and the situation goes on at considerable expense and inconvenience. On street parking is becoming a major problem for both overnight and with commuters in the day time. In some streets at night access for emergency vehicles is certainly restricted and it is a constant cause of rows between neighbours over various forms of obstruction. The council should be looking at facilities for more parking not less. In Loughton both stations really need multi storey car parks which could be largely self-financing. This rather than multi storey housing with a smaller car park below. Provision ought to be provided for garages to be built for sale or hire in areas where there are no garages available with existing housing. Where new housing is going ahead more emphasis should be placed with planning applications for adequate off street parking rather than minimal provision as seen in some recent developments. Taking a more general view of the situation one has seen how London has spread out over the years and specifically how high density housing has expanded outwards. Do we really want to encourage this any further? It would be much better for the government to financially encourage a movement of homeseekers to other areas of the country making sure that there are good employment prospects available. This would also then help to curb the spiralling cost of housing in London and its surrounds and which only benefits a few. The designers of the LCC Debden estate did a good job in balancing an excellent spread of green spaces amongst the houses (even if they did not allow for the spread of the motor car). Surely we should not be spoiling this amenity which enhances the whole area. I would ask all councillors to think again about these proposals and to resist pressure from a higher authority who should have a master plan to bring about a more constructive distribution of activity throughout the country. Areas which have been devastated by the loss of mining, shipbuilding and steel etc still need more encouragement for employment opportunities and in turn this could relieve housing pressures in London and the South.

...REDACTED...

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

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Stakeholder ID | 1531 |
|----------------|------|

| | |
|------|-----------|
| Name | Michael R |
|------|-----------|

| | |
|------|--|
| Ward | |
|------|--|

