

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

Stakeholder ID	4526	Name	thomas	jones
----------------	------	------	--------	-------

Method	Email
--------	-------

Date	12/12/2016
------	------------

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:

I wasn't aware of the EFDC leaflet about the district plan until the panel mentioned it at the meeting at Murray Hall in November, as I hadn't received one myself. I spoke with others at the meeting who were also in the same position. I've since had to borrow an EFDC leaflet about the plan from relatives that live locally. I was also not aware of the consultation process in 2012, as I'm sure I would recall a proposal with implications for the green spaces of Debden. I've spoken with many others who were also not aware of the 2012 consultation. As I'm now personally aware of limited public consultation regarding the district plan, I can only conclude that the consultation process has been (and is) fundamentally flawed. On that basis, I must recommend that plans based on evidence from the flawed consultation process be shelved until the process can be properly conducted with the full involvement of the residents of Debden, Loughton and Chigwell. Only then would a proposal be worthy of the description of 'our plan'. On the topic of building a town elsewhere, I understand a councillor vote was taken in 2012, where LRA uniformly voted against the proposal for building in existing housing areas and conservatives uniformly voted for acceptance of the plan. As the conservatives out-numbered the LRA, the proposal was granted. Councillor Phillip had many opportunities to discuss this at the Murray Hall meeting, but failed to do so. Why was this not discussed? It was abundantly clear that many of the attendees (including myself at that time) were not aware of the vote. This is further evidence of a flawed consultation process. In the council meeting regarding the plan and at the Murray Hall meeting, councillor Phillip requested that objections to the plan be based on evidence that would make construction on the green spaces unviable (such as a stream under the proposed site). Most people would reasonably expect the council to have the majority of information regarding land in the borough, including all previous plans. Therefore, very few individuals would be likely to possess the information that councillor Phillip has asked for. Given this, the plan would appear to be a foregone conclusion, with very little room for objection in the parameters required by the EFDC. Personally, I'm not aware of any streams under the green spaces of Debden. However, I can say that I've often returned from places with high urban intensification such as Walthamstow or Leytonstone and realised how depressing it would be to live there, as there are so very few green spaces. In the spring, I always enjoy travelling through Debden as the scenery is so pleasant and over the years, I've come to really appreciate the area I live in and become active in protecting it. If the green spaces of Debden are built over, I really would find it depressing. I have lived in Debden all my life, but I honestly don't know if I would be able to remain in the area if the current proposals are agreed upon, as I would feel very sad about the loss of green spaces. To summarise this point, green spaces are good for my ongoing mental health. I also noted at the Murray Hall meeting that the option of building a town elsewhere to meet the housing demand was rejected, as it would not have the supporting infrastructure. At the same meeting, it was also discussed and acknowledged that the current infrastructure for Debden (in particular the Central line) was already over capacity. Extra housing in Debden would only

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

Stakeholder ID	4526
----------------	------

Name	thomas
------	--------

	jones
--	-------

make the situation much worse. In this respect, I must agree with statements at the Murray Hall meeting that Debden residents would be excessively encumbered by the works proposed in the plan. I'm writing this with the assurance that our correspondence will be listened to and our views will not be treated with the same contempt the EFDC showed to the residents of Debden around the outrageous Winston Churchill saga