

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

Stakeholder ID	4284	Name	John & Pauline pierce
----------------	------	------	-----------------------

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

Date	10/12/2016
------	------------

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](mailto:ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

### Letter or Email Response:

Objection to Draft Local Plan and to this Public Consultation, which we contend is deeply flawed. We support the Loughton Residents Association's comments on the Draft Local Plan (DLP). We comment as follows:

1. Your Questionnaire does not allow for constructive feedback. It is a "leading document" designed to justify a predetermined closed option position. As in UK Courts of Law there are very good reasons why this approach is prohibited; it distorts the facts and outcome, it is not fit for purpose.
2. Your restricted options plan to destroy our present infrastructure whilst at the same time fail to adhere to the NPPF and Government Statutory Requirements to provide a clear "Infrastructure Delivery Plan" with details of costings, viability, locations, etc. for at least the first five years. This makes the whole DLP untenable and the Public Consultation worthless.
3. Dealing with your "Guide" to the DLP "What does the Local Plan Mean":
  - "Homes in sustainable locations we have chosen" - How did you choose these locations? They involve destroying the very facility priority you claim the evidence-based studies were based upon. These locations are unsustainable without a provable and evidenced-based Infrastructure Delivery Plan, i.e. where are the schools and NHS surgeries etc to be incorporated?
  - "Identifies our own leisure requirements" It does not. The situation regarding the library is unclear. How can 304 dwellings and the long-promised sports centre possibly fit onto Lucton's field within the bounds of the stated objectives and Government Guidelines.
  - "Protects and Enhances our Natural Environment". The lack of outline proposals indicates the opposite is true. Rather than protecting and enhancing the basis of this DLP is to turn Loughton into an urban concrete jungle which will destroy our natural environment, e.g. the pollution levels in the natural landscape bowl of Loughton will rocket.
  - "Identifies the Infrastructure we Need". Identifies means we know about what is planned and how it is to be delivered. You have spent two years evidence gathering and one of those two years on issues and options consultation, yet you have failed to provide even the basic evidential framework and planned strategy enabling EFDC to consult and inform the Public on the basis upon which you will achieve the stated objectives.
4. How have the number of dwellings per site been arrived at? For example Traps Hill library and car park 44 dwellings. This indicates an outline knowledge of what is being proposed, however there is no framework or outline plan for this, or for any of the other sites. This is illogical, and given Traps Hill's topography, we fail to see how this could ever be achieved within the stated objectives and Government Guidelines.
5. Our present Schools are full to capacity our roads are gridlocked, parking is impossible, land earmarked for educational and NHS use has recently been sold off for housing, you will create a multitude of future problems for EFDC, ECC, other agencies and the Public if this DLP were to be adopted. There is no strategic pathway to achieving the stated objectives. This option would be grossly and disproportionately unfair to the inhabitants of Loughton and its surrounds when a solution is achievable in "Garden Village" format elsewhere. The only winner would be the developers, whose greed will destroy our environment and heritage.
6. Roding Garden Village - comprehensive redevelopment of Woolston

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

Stakeholder ID	4284	Name	John & Pauline pierce
----------------	------	------	-----------------------

Manor Golf Club. • All options for consideration should have been furnished at the Public Consultation stage of the Local Plan; only then can fair judgement be made. Loughton Town Council became aware of the option shortly before their meeting on 29th November 2016. A “breaking news” article was posted on “EverythingEppingForest.com” website on 7th December and we became aware of this possible option on 8th December. • This option should be assessed and considered very seriously as it would offer significant benefits for EFDC, ECC, care agencies, the NHS, schools and all local residents. It would provide: • 600 homes incorporating 200+ starter homes, • a care home, dementia facility, retirement village, • school, • community hall, • GP surgery, • 200+ jobs with new community facilities and shops, • Retention of the country park and existing leisure facilities. • The private hospital mentioned would, we are informed, cater for NHS and private patients, relieving pressure on the NHS. Councillor John Philip has promised to assess this new option. However this sustainable option has not been circulated and is still unknown to the majority of the public (many of whom are not on the internet) who may wish to support or otherwise comment on it. The present Public Consultation will not be valid unless sufficient time is given for the Public to respond to this new option. We wish to comment further. However it would be inappropriate for us to do, so given that our comments will be in the public domain, before we are able to verify some of the information we have only recently received. We request that you extend this Public Consultation period by 28 days in order that the Public and we have an opportunity to respond properly. We also request that you inform us of the exact date you first became aware of this Roding Garden Village option.

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

Stakeholder ID 4284

Name John & Pauline pierce