

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

Stakeholder ID	3494	Name	Chris Shepherd
Method	Letter		
Date	9/12/2016		

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 object to the plan on the following grounds. ...Redacted... says the plan is about keeping Epping Forest a somewhere we want to live, yet it seems to me his words do not match up to his actions. I see that the plan is supposed to address 3 main priorities of Green Space, Encouraging Growth and Community facilities. I detail below how this plan singularly fails to meet any of those priorities. Protecting and enhancing Green space The proposal to remove a village green at Jessel Drive and build on Luctons field along with other smaller greens goes directly against this priority. For most residents of the EFDC area the green space surrounding us is a big part of why we live here. But the proposed increase in housing density in Loughton will make it indistinguishable from most London Boroughs.

Encouraging the growth of local jobs & businesses The plan makes lots of nice noises about "sustainable transport choices" but seems to offer nothing in the way of solutions to the issue. Instead the plan seems to be to cram as much as possible into as small an area as you can and grind the district to a halt with congestion. Already I know people who have left the area due to the time it takes to get out of Loughton in the morning, this plan can only worsen this. How gridlock of the local roads is supposed to encourage growth in local businesses is beyond me. There is no reasonable prospect of easing congestion, providing the much needed new roads, train lines and bus routes are outside the EFDC's control. The Corporation of London would not allow new roads through the Forest, and there are limited opportunities to cross the railway line and river. The Central line is at full capacity now and it can only get worse with the increase in population in the area. Providing facilities for the community Local bus, police and fire services have been cut, in spite of an increase in population. Schools, GP and Dentist, hospital and other services already overloaded and only "sticking plaster" solutions to this seem to be proposed. Summary 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 find myself unable to support this plan. The further increase of housing density in the areas already most populated within the district, will result in a lower quality of life for those already living in those areas. The plan shows a lack of imagination and ambition, instead it simply promises more of the same. A new greenfield village would be a better approach and is the one adopted by councils such as Uttlesford. Of course this would require actual integrated planning of the provision of schools / shops / transport / other facilities (something that is sadly lacking in the current proposals. Yours Sincerely ...Redacted... Developing the opposite side of the road could set a precedent for future development and encroachment into the countryside. Access to the town centre is also distant. Loss of vistas from the road on to Copped Hall.

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

Stakeholder ID	3494	Name	Chris Shepherd
----------------	------	------	----------------