

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Landowner

	Personal Details	Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	Jeremy	
Last Name	Roos	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
AddressRedacted.....	
Post Code		
Telephone NumberRedacted.....	
E-mail AddressRedacted.....	

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which part of the Pre Submission Epping Forest District Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph:

Policy: None of the above

Policies Map:

Site Reference: HONG.E1

Settlement: High Ongar

Do you consider this part of the Pre Submission Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Positively prepared,Effective,Justified,Consistent with national policy

Complies with the duty to co-operate? No

Please give details either 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; or of why the Submission Version of the Local Plan is legally compliant, is sound or complies with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. Please use this box to set out your comments.

The 5000 or so representations made regarding the draft plan were only stored and made available in alphabetical order only. Therefore anyone wanting to read/research or check if any other persons had made any comments on the same issue were not able to. Reading all 5000 representations is not a reasonable or fair option. If an elected member wanted to test the resistance of issues to a particular build site there is no way of checking. A simple index on each site would have been easy to compile. Therefore this hardly makes representations readily available for anyone to see and clearly deliberately works against the duty to co-operate. I do not see how the Inspector will be able to see this. This is a practical and simple issue the Council has deliberately decided to avoid doing in order to prevent resistance to full and proper disclosure.

In particular, my representation to the draft plan 2798 (19 pages) was recorded by EFDC in data format and took out all the photograph, mas, legal documents included in my representation. Therefore anyone reviewing this representation would not know that these documents were in my representation. If they did not know they were there, how could they ask for them as the help text suggests.

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Pre Submission 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 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 Inspect could extend the review time to allow full and honest and open disclosure or allow representations to be made to him/her in person.

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral part of the oral examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

As above

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

Yes

Signature: jeremy roos Date: 29/01/2018