

This specific contribution concerns Epping Forest District Council's collated responses from residents in Loughton. It aims to help the Inspector determine if EFDC has given sufficient consideration to the content of 1077 responses submitted by residents who live in Loughton before selecting sites here for development.

EFDC's Reg 19 DLP Submission is deficient and unsound because they have ignored 1077 residents' responses. Evidence is contained in their responses and a spreadsheet. The plan could be made sound by the removal of two green spaces defined as LOU.R5 - Jessel Green and LOU.R4 - Lucton's Field.

All Reg 18 Consultation responses can be seen on the Council's website at: [www.efdclocalplan.org/draft-local-plan-2016](http://www.efdclocalplan.org/draft-local-plan-2016). Further information from EFDC was obtained on 8 January 2018. It listed 3273 public responses plus 2 headers. Those listed as concerned with Loughton were row numbers 1312 - 2261 = 949 or 28.9948% rounded to 29%.

The Suburb column was blank for row numbers 3 - 118 and 2950 - 3275. So 116 blanks + 325 blanks = 441 blanks and can be expressed as: Blank Suburb rows 441 from a total of 3273 or 13.47% - a significantly high percentage to make the Consultation Responses understanding incomplete and this element of the Reg 18 process unsound.

The blank suburb column was completed where possible after reading the actual Stakeholder response text. The process used was to take each Suburb blank row in turn, note the surname, look up the surname on the councils website, search to the correct Stakeholder ID number, confirm the name, click on View representations, then opened the file or files displayed in the Search Results.

Quite a number of Stakeholders made more than one submission and the councils method ensured that no single Stakeholder could exaggerate their opinion with multiple responses. There were a few blank Survey Forms where it's likely the Stakeholder made a second response by e-mail, perhaps not confident their first on-line attempt was successful. Every response file was opened and studied. The blank Suburb was completed in cases where it was obvious. For example, if a response text mentioned 'Don't build on Jessel Green and Rochford Green' and no other places then the blank was completed with 'Loughton'. Many of the 441 were completed as the submissions allowed and other parts of the district were completed including: Epping, Theydon Bois, Chigwell, Nazeing, Buckhurst Hill, Ongar, North Weald Bassett, Waltham Abbey and Harlow.

The results were saved as file: 'DLP Responses Reg 18 EFDC 040118 MB 130118 Suburb Edit.xls'. It took some time to complete this work and the data was saved at each point so it could be used as evidence in future. Every Suburb column blank response was read to identify the area correctly and many were read 2 or 3 times during the work. Some blanks could not be completed because a specific area is not clear, multiple areas are mentioned or no area. There remain Suburb blanks on row numbers inclusive 3 - 6 and 3251 - 3275 = 29 blanks from a total of 3273 or 0.008%. This percentage is now very low so the data is much more identifiable and representatively listed.

Tables 1 to 4 show more reliable results and a conclusion using the responses in a more complete and sound way.

<b>Table 1</b>							
Actual checked data In order of Settlement - <b>Response</b> Numbers							
Settlement	Row numbers	<b>Responses</b>	<b>% of 3273</b>	Residents	Area square miles	People in 1 square mile	Wikipedia or Census
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>1352 - 2429</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>32.90</b>	<b>31106</b>	<b>5.91</b>	<b>5263</b>	2011
Epping	482 - 1224	742	22.67	11461	2.98	3846	2011
Remainder	N/A	436	13.32	48786	60.08*	*	*
Theydon Bois	2929 - 3125	196	5.99	4062	3.30	1231	2011
Chigwell	264 - 448	184	5.62	12987	6.05	2147	2011
Nazeing	2444 - 2588	144	4.40	4267	*	*	*
Buckhurst Hill	90 - 231	141	4.31	11380	1.40	8129	2011
Ongar	2714 - 2841	127	3.88	6251	3.48	1796	*
North Weald Bas't	2591 - 2710	119	3.64	6039	8.80	686	2001
Waltham Abbey	3149 - 3222	73	2.23	21149	16.37	1292	2011
Harlow	1235 - 1269	34	1.04	*	11.79	7294	*
Total District	N/A	3273	100.00	130300	130.88	996	2016
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Loughton has a significantly higher number and proportion of responses within the district.</b>						

<b>Table 2</b> Actual checked data In order of Settlement - <b>Residents</b> Numbers							
Settlement	Row numbers	Responses	% of 3273	Residents	Area square miles	People in 1 square mile	Wikipedia or Census
Remainder	N/A	436	13.32	48786	60.08*	*	*
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>1352 - 2429</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>32.90</b>	<b>31106</b>	<b>5.91</b>	<b>5263</b>	2011
Waltham Abbey	3149 - 3222	73	2.23	21149	16.37	1292	2011
Chigwell	264 - 448	184	5.62	12987	6.05	2147	2011
Epping	482 - 1224	742	22.67	11461	2.98	3846	2011
Buckhurst Hill	90 - 231	141	4.31	11380	1.40	8129	2011
Ongar	2714 - 2841	127	3.88	6251	3.48	1796	*
North Weald Bas't	2591 - 2710	119	3.64	6039	8.80	686	2001
Nazeing	2444 - 2588	144	4.40	4267	*	*	*
Theydon Bois	2929 - 3125	196	5.99	4062	3.30	1231	2011
Harlow	1235 - 1269	34	1.04	*	11.79	7294	*
Total District	N/A	3273	100.00	130300	130.88	996	2016
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Loughton has a significantly higher number of Council Tax payers within the district.</b>						

<b>Table 3</b> Actual checked data In order of Settlement - <b>Area square miles</b>							
Settlement	Row numbers	Responses	% of 3273	Residents	Area sq. miles	People in 1 square mile	Wikipedia or Census
Remainder	N/A	436	13.32	48786	60.08*	*	*
Waltham Abbey	3149 - 3222	73	2.23	21149	16.37	1292	2011
Harlow	1235 - 1269	34	1.04	*	11.79	7294	*
North Weald Bas't	2591 - 2710	119	3.64	6039	8.80	686	2001
Chigwell	264 - 448	184	5.62	12987	6.05	2147	2011
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>1352 - 2429</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>32.90</b>	<b>31106</b>	<b>5.91</b>	<b>5263</b>	2011
Ongar	2714 - 2841	127	3.88	6251	3.48	1796	*
Theydon Bois	2929 - 3125	196	5.99	4062	3.30	1231	2011
Epping	482 - 1224	742	22.67	11461	2.98	3846	2011
Buckhurst Hill	90 - 231	141	4.31	11380	1.40	8129	2011
Nazeing	2444 - 2588	144	4.40	4267	*	*	*
Total District	N/A	3273	100.00	130300	130.88	996	2016
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Loughton has a very high number of residents living within a fairly small area of the district.</b>						

<b>Table 4</b> Actual checked data In order of Settlement - <b>People living in 1 square mile</b>							
Settlement	Row numbers	Responses	% of 3273	Residents	Area square miles	People in 1 square mile	Wikipedia or Census
Buckhurst Hill	90 - 231	141	4.31	11380	1.40	8129	2011
Harlow	1235 - 1269	34	1.04	*	11.79	7294	*
<b>Loughton</b>	<b>1352 - 2429</b>	<b>1077</b>	<b>32.90</b>	<b>31106</b>	<b>5.91</b>	<b>5263</b>	2011
Epping	482 - 1224	742	22.67	11461	2.98	3846	2011
Chigwell	264 - 448	184	5.62	12987	6.05	2147	2011
Ongar	2714 - 2841	127	3.88	6251	3.48	1796	*
Waltham Abbey	3149 - 3222	73	2.23	21149	16.37	1292	2011
Theydon Bois	2929 - 3125	196	5.99	4062	3.30	1231	2011
North Weald Bas't	2591 - 2710	119	3.64	6039	8.80	686	2001
Nazeing	2444 - 2588	144	4.40	4267	*	*	*
Remainder	N/A	436	13.32	48786	60.08*	*	*
Total District	N/A	3273	100.00	130300	130.88	996	2016
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Loughton has a large population living in a fairly small area and is already densely populated.</b>						

\* Reliable info not readily available.

The conclusion of this work for Reg 19 submission culminates in Tables 1 to 4 and submits that Loughton has taken more than its proportionate share of planned sites for future homes. In recent decades, 19 sites in the town near to LOU.R5 and LOU.R4 have been in-filled and built on so there are now only a few green open areas left for the enjoyment and wellbeing of the increased number of Loughton residents. Tables 3 & 4 show that Loughton is already densely populated. It is also land constrained and therefore it has very little expansion potential left.

Furthermore the allocation of planned sites for future homes defined in the Reg 19 DLP Submission is proof that the Reg 18 Resident Consultation Public response to the Reg 18 Draft was not sound because, as residents rightly claim, their views were ignored and not adequately taken into account. 1077 residents have written sincerely, concisely and their well-documented submissions to Reg 18 say in short: 'please don't build on our last remaining Green Open Spaces which are so critical to our physical, mental health and general wellbeing'.

I would like to appear in person to answer questions from the Inspector about this evidence from residents in Loughton.