

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

Stakeholder ID	4443	Name	graham` wiskin
----------------	------	------	-------------------

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:

In response to your requests for feedback on the EFDC Local Plan I comment as follows:- The vision projected does not fit with the planned activity. Infilling every available space in Loughton will destroy the amenity for all current residents and create chaos and disruption whilst building work is ongoing. EFDC have no control to provide the required infrastructure to support the 11000+ homes projected so it is frankly irresponsible to plan any development without guarantees that the required infrastructure will be put in place. The logical conclusion is that certain towns are practically full and EFDC need to face the music and accept that new towns/villages need to be purpose built. The council need to revisit the option of new villages/towns and not plough on regardless with the infill option. If some green belt somewhere has to be sacrificed then so be it. Face the music as the country did post 1945 and build new towns. The plan fails to provide infrastructure as EFDC have no control over the provision of schools, medical or highways. Thus the plan is fundamentally flawed. EFDC is a strong commuter area and will always be so. Proposing build on major car parks (Underground, town centre, leisure centre etc) is ludicrous as it will create chaos, degrade facilities and threaten the town centres' commerce. Cars are not going to go away and creating high rise parking will be ugly and unsightly as the developers will not go underground as it is too costly. Again, it is irresponsible of EFDC to even consider this. EFDC need to accept that some of our towns are full up now and the infrastructure is already overstretched (Central Line, doctors etc.) EFDC have allowed areas to be misused in terms of development. For example the new Langston Road site will have warehouses and retail car parks, which from an employment perspective will employ few people. Those sites could have been much better used for housing as that seems to be the priority. The high streets have empty shops so encourage the shops back there by readjusting the exorbitant rates. I object to most of the planned infilling in Loughton. Especially :- Traps Hill Leisure centre - it is used for the town and the leisure centre and library - any development will be the end of the Leisure centre and the library, both of which I and many use regularly and their loss would be detrimental to my amenity. LUL car parks - I and many others use the Central line and often park there - development will cause chaos and overspill and the system is used beyond capacity now. Borders Lane old school and college fields. The should remain earmarked for educational use and not for more housing. Where are the children in the 1900+ new homes predicted going to be schooled? The schools are at breaking point now with the current population. I accept that some development is required but this must be in keeping with the current townscape. Any high rise developments beyond the 2-3 storey structures, which characterise Loughton, will be unacceptable and destroy the current look and feel of Loughton. Any plans for housing need infrastructure changes and improvements for which there is no commitment to provide as it is beyond the control of EFDC and may be reneged upon. Therefore any plan dependent on vague promises from other bodies is fatally flawed. In conclusion, this plan does feel like our plan, it appears to be EFDCs plan, who are meant to represent us, not them.

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

Stakeholder ID	4443	Name	graham` wiskin
----------------	------	------	-------------------

