

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

Stakeholder ID	4364	Name	Vivienne and Richard	Garrick
----------------	------	------	----------------------	---------

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

Date	11/12/2016
------	------------

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 We are both members of the Loughton Residents Association (“LRA”) and have read and fully concur with and support the views and representations made to you by **....Redacted....** on behalf of the 1,000 or so households that comprise the LRA. We should like to add/emphasise one or two general points. Shortly after and, no doubt, largely as a consequence of the Second World War, Loughton expanded significantly by the development of the housing estate in Debden. It is obvious that, at the time, those responsible for the design and implementation of that development went to great pains and took considerable care to ensure the inclusion of appropriate open space as an important factor in providing a healthy lifestyle for those new to the area and, perhaps more importantly, their children. Over the years since then, Loughton has already become too crowded. According to the last census, in 2011 the population of Loughton was 31,000. It is not unreasonable to assume that the addition of 1,190 new homes will mean an increase of more than 16% in that population - ie the addition of 1,190 new families to the area must mean the addition of something in the order of: a) 2,500 adults; b) 2,500 children: and c) 2,500 additional cars. Particularly against the background of the significant loss of amenities that will be suffered by those who presently live in but will no longer be able to enjoy the open spaces lost to this development, it is not totally clear to us what specific plans the District Council has in place for the consequences of this growth of 5,000 people. These consequences include but are but are by no means limited to: a)the continuing, essential and increasing need for adequate open recreational space and facilities for both adults and children as well as, of course, their pets; b)adequate schooling at infants, primary and secondary levels no doubt to include the replacement of those schools that have been demolished in recent years and redeveloped as residential dwellings; c)Healthcare provision; d)Emergency services - fire, police, ambulance etc especially against the background of plans to remove one of Loughton’s two Fire Appliances; e)Transport - tube, rail and buses for local travel as well as commuting - services that are already stretched and include an aged and potentially dangerous fleet of buses (we are aware of at least one instance where one of these ancient buses has caught fire whilst in service with passengers evacuated to the forest for safety); f)an increase in already heavy traffic levels in the town? g)domestic parking at the proposed development sites as well as for local shopping, commuter and other parking; h)the protection of existing residents’ legal ‘Right to Light’ which must be at risk if anything other than two storey development were to be allowed; and i)the preservation of Loughton’s presently open and silvestrian character. It is also unclear how the proposed developments, necessary infrastructure, services and facilities are to be funded. Similarly, to what extent will those suffering loss of amenity and/or who are otherwise disadvantaged be financially compensated so as to avoid the District Council and, therefore, local residents being involved in the unnecessary time and, more importantly, expense of litigation and consequential pecuniary awards? Inter alia, it is for

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

Stakeholder ID 4364

Name Vivienne and RichardGarrick

these reasons that we are unable to support the District Council's proposals as they are presently framed. We look forward to a full and considered reply to this email in due course but, in the meantime, we should appreciate your acknowledgement of its receipt. From: Vivienne and Richard Garrick both of