

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

Stakeholder ID	3495	Name	Maria Shepherd
----------------	------	------	----------------

Method	Letter
--------	--------

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:

Dear Sir/madam, Looking at the new plan I find it difficult to believe that anyone could think this would work, rather than grind the whole district to a standstill, increase air pollution, overload public transport, essential services, drainage and sewage systems, and increase the risk of surface flooding. I object to the plan on the following grounds.

**Infrastructure** The plan does not seem to offer any realistic or practical solutions to any of the infrastructure problems it clearly creates. Congestion in the area is already high; I sit every day in traffic jams from 7.30 am, and again at 4.30pm. School run traffic is also a big issue. The Central line is at full passenger capacity now at peak times. All of these will only get worse with the current building works in progress, and the new retail park, let alone the thousands of more properties being suggested, in the already most densely populated part of the district. Additional road traffic will have a detrimental effect on travel time to hospital services currently out of the district. Local bus, police and fire services have been cut, despite an already increasing population. Schools, GP and Dentist, hospital and other services already overloaded (indeed schools are already aiming to create extra spaces for current projections of increased numbers required). There is no reasonable prospect or certainty of creating more infrastructure services, particularly new roads, trains lines and bus routes, because it is outside the EFDC's control. It is highly unlikely (and right) that the Corporation of London would allow new roads through the Forest, and there are limited opportunities to cross the railway line and river. Increasing capacity on the Central Line is outside the gift of the EFDC, as is the provision of further bus, police or fire services and school places. The main travel option open to residents of any proposed new housing would be to travel by car, increasing congestion and air pollution further, along with increasing the risk of accidents. Water services currently struggle to cope as it is, and again these are outside the remit of the EFDC to improve or increase capacity. Frequent water main leaks cause travel havoc, and there have been incidents of sewage flowing out onto the Roding Meadows Nature reserve after heavy rainfall. Upgraded services are already needed, but don't appear to be forthcoming.

**Green spaces** Another big issue is the loss of open spaces. A main attraction for the EFDC area, I believe, is that it is semi - rural, with lots of green spaces, close enough to London, but not part of it. This plan seems to seek to replicate the worst of more densely populated areas - such as parts of Redbridge and Waltham Forest - both London boroughs, which we are not. The green spaces are one of the main reasons that people chose to move, live, and stay here, and must be preserved. Building over station car parks (which I think the Mayor of London has said can only be used for social housing ?) to create high rise homes, is completely out of character with the area. The proposal to remove a village green (Jessel Drive) - which wasn't even included in the draft plan- along with other smaller greens is a dereliction of duty to those who live there. The housing and surrounding green areas were originally created for the enjoyment of those housed from London into a pleasant environment by the LCC. These greens are used by many, not just on a daily recreational basis, but for community events too in the case of Jessel

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

Stakeholder ID	3495	Name	Maria Shepherd
----------------	------	------	----------------

Green. Increased risk of surface flooding Any loss of green space will increase the risk of surface flooding, especially to housing at a lower level to proposed new homes. I cannot see any evidence of a post draft plan risk assessment or plans to ensure that the risk is not increased any further than it already is. The writers of the SFRA update 2015 - a desk exercise- stated in their report 'EFDC is beginning the preparation of its Local Plan, which will replace the existing Local Plan, and at the time of writing this Level 1 SFRA Update EFDC had not confirmed its potential site allocations for future development within the District. It is therefore not possible to provide a specific assessment of the potential impact of development on flood risk' Examples of problems arising from previous planning decisions You only have to look at the new Sainsburys in Church Hill Loughton when deliveries are in progress, to see the failure of integrated planning for access / egress and space for delivery vehicles. These vehicles block part of the car park entrance, and others waiting on the road outside block visibility to customers trying to leave. The entrance / exit is for some reason shared with the entrance to the petrol station, meaning that cars exiting the car park could easily collide with cars entering the petrol station, especially when visibility is obscured by delivery lorries. A small project which had simple faults identified by local Councillors, but which were not taken into account, and were passed anyway. So much for localism! The access to Loughton station's pick up / drop off point, is another example. It is so unintuitive, and years on people still seem to have problems using that area correctly. It is examples like these that leave me with little faith that the planning process for this draft plan would have fully identified and considered potential problems / detrimental knock on effects, or planned effectively for their solution. Concern regarding the Planning Process I have been informed that currently where the EFDC is the landowner, a proposal of more than 12 dwellings would not have to be presented to the local plans committee, thereby overriding local input and democracy. If so, (and if I am wrong then I am happy to stand corrected), then this is of huge concern, and a massive conflict of interest. In no circumstance should the producer of the plan, being also the owner of the land , be able to pass plans that have huge implications on a community without significant input from that community and its local councillors. Summary For all the above reasons, I cannot support this plan. There comes a point where you simply cannot fit a quart into a pint pot. I believe we are there already, with existing infrastructure problems that can only get worse. I also cannot support plan which seems to seek to further increase the density of housing in the areas already most populated within the district, with the resultant decrease in quality of life for those already living there. Other councils, like Uttlesford seem to have taken a different approach with the creation of new villages (eg Priors Green Village), where schools / shops / transport / other facilities are included within the plans. If the amount of housing proposed is really needed, then a similar new, greenfield village proposal would surely be a better approach? Yours Sincerely ....Redacted....

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