

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

Stakeholder ID	3356	Name	David Linnell
			LOUGHTON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

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 support the Loughton Residents Association (LRA)'s comments on the draft Local Plan. In particular, 1. The draft fails to respect the Community Choices consultation in that it fails "To protect and enhance green spaces whilst encouraging the growth of local jobs and businesses" because of the proposals to build on Loughton's open spaces 2. The draft fails to carry the Vision & Objectives into the Plan details, because the proposals to build on Loughton's open spaces is in direct conflict with the Vision of residents continuing to enjoy a good quality of life, and that developments should respect the attributes of the different towns and villages. Similarly, the proposals are in direct conflict with Draft Plan Objective B which requires new developments to i) relate positively to its context to create a harmonious whole; ii) make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;" 3. The LRA response gives specific examples of the failure of the draft to carry the Objectives and Priorities through to the Policies: 4. The Consultation document is seriously flawed because it fails to give realistic alternatives but instead appears to have been drafted to guide residents towards the options selected by the Council 5. Significant options have been omitted. In particular, no mention is made of the possibilities of a. A garden village elsewhere in the District b. A greater amount of development on the Harlow border Either or both of these options would significantly reduce the pressure for development elsewhere in the District and their omission calls into question the adequacy of the consultation process 6. Priority 3 ("open space") is inadequately defined and is therefore not fit for the purpose of determining whether or not open space is adequate or not. This is highly significant in relation to the inclusion in the draft of the Debden green spaces. 7. Loughton development site proposals. These fail to respect the character of the town. In particular: a. The proposals for the two Debden green spaces would have a significant unfavourable impact on the quality of life of residents; these areas should instead be designated as District Open Land b. The proposal to build on the Traps Hill car-park would do major harm to the commercial and residential life of the town, as the closure of the car-park during construction would impact heavily on the shops in the High Road, and on access to the Leisure Centre. 8. Infrastructure. Although the Council proposes to create an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, in practice it has no control over the providers of infrastructure such as TfL, the NHS, and schools. In proposing that it will only grant planning permissions where the necessary infrastructure is in place or will be provided in an agreed timescale, it is therefore professing something which in practice it will be unable to deliver, and so fails to meet the NPPF requirement that the Plan be "aspirational but realistic".

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

Stakeholder ID	3356	Name	David Linnell
----------------	------	------	---------------