

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME,
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

NE WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY (WHEN CONSIDERED) AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DHA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.
- THE ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT SITE HAS

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- NOT BEEN MADE WITH ENOUGH DETAIL.
- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
  - THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
  - SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
  - CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

NEWISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

[Redacted Signature] DTA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:

\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No

b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective

Justified  Consistent with national policy

c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PPDAS CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings



9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

WE WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY (WHEN CONSIDERED) AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DHA PLANNING

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  **OHONGAR** Policies Map

Site Reference  **RWSR62  
RF** Settlement  **OHONGAR**

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

NEWISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination. (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DHA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTO  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE NPPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PTO'S CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

NEWISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DHA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:

\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No

b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective

Justified  Consistent with national policy

c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & BELOW.

NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE THE SUBMITTED LETTER OF REPRESENTATION.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE.
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES AND IS OUT OF DATE. THE PLAN MUST BE BASED ON UP TO DATE INFORMATION
- CHIGWELL IS A SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENT. THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS MUST FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY.
- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME & NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SITE SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED ON DISTANCE AND EASE OF ACCESS TO SERVICES. SUCH ASSESSMENTS SHOULD INVOLVE A MATRIX OF MEASURES SUCH AS DISTANCE, SAFETY & UTILITY OF ROUTE, RANGE OF ACCESS TO SERVICES, FACILITIES & EMPLOYMENT.
- MY CLIENTS SITE SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS AN ALLOCATION (SR 0435)
- THE ARUP REPORTS SHOULD BE DISREGARDED OR THE PROCESS REVISITED AND CORRECTED BASED ON OBJECTIVE INFORMATION.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

WE WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN UNDER THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DIA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PDMS CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

NEWISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

  
DHA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018

JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B – If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan;  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER \$PTO  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.
- LARGE SCALE RELEASES SHOULD BE REVIEWED ONCE SUSTAINABLY LOCATED SITES ON THE EDGE OF SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENTS HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY CONSIDERED FOR THEIR EXTENT OF LANDSCAPE IMPACT.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

[Redacted] OF  
DFA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018



JOHN COLLINS.  
DHA PLANNING.

Part B - If necessary please complete a separate Part B form for each representation

4. To which part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan does this representation relate?  
(Please specify where appropriate)

Paragraph  Policy  Policies Map

Site Reference  Settlement

COOPERSALE, FYFIELD  
HIGH ONGAR,  
LOWER SHEERING  
MORRETON, SHEERING  
& STAPLEFORD ABBOTTS.

5. Do you consider this part of the Submission Version of the Local Plan:  
\*Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms

- a) Is Legally compliant Yes  No
- b) Sound Yes  No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail\*

Positively prepared  Effective   
Justified  Consistent with national policy

- c) Complies with the duty to co-operate Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Submission Version of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER & PTD  
(NB: THE FOLLOWING MUST BE READ ALONGSIDE  
THE ATTACHED LETTER.

- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE BROUGHT UP TO DATE
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD FOLLOW THE HAPF
- THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO THE PLAN CONTAINS INACCURACIES WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- THE MECHANISM FOR SITE SELECTION NEEDS TO BE REVISITED SO THAT IT IS BASED ON GENUINE AND OBJECTIVE SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.
- THE EVIDENCE BASE MUST BE PROPORTIONATE TO THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF GREEN BELT POLICY.
- SITE SELECTION SHOULD INCLUDE LVIA AT SITE LEVEL FOR BOTH DAY TIME AND NIGHT TIME.
- CRITERIA FOR SELECTION SHOULD BE BASED NOT ONLY DISTANCE TO FACILITIES BUT THE SAFETY AND UTILITY OF ROUTES. I.E. IF THERE IS NO PAVEMENT & NO STREET LIGHT THE SHOULD PERFORM POORLY.
- LARGE SCALE RELEASES SHOULD BE REVIEWED ONCE SUSTAINABLY LOCATED SITES ON THE EDGE OF SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENTS HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY CONSIDERED FOR THEIR EXTENT OF LANDSCAPE IMPACT.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearings

Yes, I wish to participate at the hearings

9. If you wish to participate at the hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

WE WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEARINGS SO THAT THE INSPECTOR CAN FULLY UNDERSTAND OUR SUBMISSIONS AND CONCERNS IN RESPECT OF THE:

- FAILURE OF THE COUNCIL TO PROPERLY CONSIDER REPRESENTATIONS
- THE REASONS WHY THE EVIDENCE BASE IS NOT CONSIDERED PROPORTIONATE
- THE REASONS WHY WE CONSIDER THE SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY CHOSEN MEANS THE PLAN DOES NOT REPRESENT THE MOST APPROPRIATE STRATEGY WHEN CONSIDERED AGAINST REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO FOLLOW THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.
- FAILURE OF THE PLAN TO BE BASED ON AN UP TO DATE EVIDENCE BASE.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

10. Please let us know if you wish to be notified when the Epping Forest District Local Plan is submitted for independent examination (Please tick)

Yes  No

11. Have you attached any documents with this representation?

Yes  No

Signature:

[REDACTED] OF  
DMA PLANNING.

Date:

26/01/2018