



Representation form: Consultation on the Main Modifications to the emerging Local Plan

This form should be used to make representations on the Main Modifications to the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 to the Local Plan Inspector. The Main Modifications Schedule, online response form and all required supporting documentation can be accessed via the Examination website at www.efdclocalplan.org. Please complete and return representations by Thursday 23rd September 2021 at 5pm.

Please note, the content of your representation including your name will be published online and included in public reports and documents.

It is important that you refer to the [guidance notes](#) on the Examination website before completing this form.

The quickest and easiest way to make representations is via the online response form at www.efdclocalplan.org.

If you need to use this downloadable version of the form please email any representations to MMCons@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Or post to: MM Consultation 2021, Planning Policy, Epping Forest District Council, Civic Offices, 323 High Street, Epping, Essex, CM16 4BZ

By 5pm on Thursday 23rd September 2021

This form is in two parts:

Part A – Your Details

Part B – Your representation(s) on the Main Modifications and/or supporting documents. Please fill in a separate Part B for each representation you wish to make.

The Main Modifications Schedule and supporting documents to the Main Modifications can be accessed online at www.efdclocalplan.org. The supporting documents to the Main Modifications are listed below. Representations concerning their content will be accepted to the extent that they are relevant to inform your comments on the Main Modifications. However, you should avoid lengthy comments on the evidence/background documents themselves.

- A. Council's response to Actions outlined in Inspector's post examination hearing advice (Examination document reference number ED98), July 2021 (ED133)
- B. Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum, June 2021 (June 2021) (ED128/ EB210)

- C. 2021 Habitats Regulations Assessment, June 2021 (ED129A-B/EB211A-B)
- D. Epping Forest Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy, December 2020 (ED126/ EB212)
- E. EFDC response to Inspector's Post Hearing Action 5 and supplementary questions of 16 June 2021, July 2021 (ED127)
- F. Epping Forest District Council Green Infrastructure Strategy (ED124A-G/ EB159A-G)
- G. Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Latton Priory Access Strategy Assessment Report, July 2020 (ED121A-C/EB1420A-C)
- H. Revised Appendix 2 to the Epping Forest District Council Open Space Strategy (EB703), July 2021 (ED125/EB703A)
- I. IDP: Part B Infrastructure Delivery Schedule 2020 Update (ED117/EB1118)
- J. EFDC Consolidated and Updated Viability Evidence 2020 (ED116/ EB1117) Consolidated
- K. Statement of Common Ground Addendum East of Harlow, September 2020 (ED122A-B)
- L. South Epping Masterplan Area Capacity Analysis (Sites EPP.R1 and EPP.R2), March 2020 (ED120/ EB1421)
- M. In addition to the above there are a number of Examination Documents, which include Homework Notes produced by the Council as a result of actions identified by the Inspector at the hearing sessions as well correspondence between the Council and the Inspector following hearings. These Examination Documents can all be accessed on the [Local Plan website](#).

Please only attach documents essential to support your representation. You do not need to attach representations you have made at previous stages.

Part A – Your Details

1. Are you making this representation as? (Please tick as appropriate)

- a) Resident or Member of the General Public or
- b) Statutory Consultee, Local Authority or Town and Parish Council or
- c) Landowner or
- d) Agent

Other organisation (please specify)

On behalf of the Landowners of ONG.R1 (Eales-White, Johnson, Kerr, Kerr, and McKinney)

2. Personal Details

3. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Mrs"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Lois"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Partridge"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Sworders"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>
E-mail Address	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>

Part B – Your representation on the Main Modifications and/or supporting documents

If you wish to make more than one representation, please complete a separate [Part B form](#) for each representation

4. Which **Main Modification number and/or supporting document** does your representation relate to? (Each Main Modification within the Schedule has a reference number. This can be found in the first column i.e. MM1, MM2 and each Supporting Document has a reference number beginning with ED).

Any representation on a supporting document should clearly state (in question 6) which paragraphs of the document it relates to and, as far as possible, your comments should be linked to specific Main Modifications. You should avoid lengthy comments on the supporting documents themselves.

MM no.

Supporting document reference

5. Do you consider this **Main Modification and/or supporting document**:
(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

6. Please give details of why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** is not legally compliant or is unsound. 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.

MM161:

We note the change in status of Appendix 6 from supporting text to policy. Whilst we welcome this clarity, the concerns we voiced through hearing statements and sessions remain and are made more acute by the confirmation that the text in Appendix 6 is to have policy status.

We do not consider that all of the information in respect of the West Ongar Concept Framework Area is justified. We are concerned that some of the detail is desirable, as opposed to essential and is based on high-level assumptions and preferences, which are not justified by robust evidence. As a consequence, it lacks clarity and does not direct applicants how to satisfy the policy or provide decision makers with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal. It would be more appropriate for Appendix 6 to contain essential policy requirements only, with the matters of detail being more appropriately determined through the Concept Framework and planning application processes.

Cont...

We are specifically concerned with the section under **On-site Constraints** relating to site access. Both the original drafting and proposed modifications refer to “*potential access constraints*” with no explanation of what these are or how they should be addressed, leaving the applicant with no clear indication of how to satisfy the policy.

Whilst some detail is now proposed to explain that the Council’s concerns stem from proximity to the Four Wantz roundabout and rat-running, no evidence or explanation has been provided as to why this leads to a requirement for a single point of access and a preference for this to be from the High Street. The landowners own evidence demonstrates that a single access point is not the most appropriate strategy to overcome with these concerns.

An illustrative masterplan was prepared and submitted by the promoters of sites ONG.R1 and ONG.R2 alongside hearing statements which demonstrated how rat-running can easily be avoided by simply ensuring that the two access points do not physically connect for vehicular traffic, with the site being entirely permeable for pedestrian and cycle movements.

Similarly, in regard to safe access to the highway network, current guidance advises in favour of two access points for new residential development of this scale (as demonstrated via a Highways Impact Statement submitted with Regulation 19 representations for site ONG. R1).

At the Matter 15 hearing session, the Council committed to review text in Appendix 6, to add clarity and suggested “*access arrangements need to be properly and adequately considered and addressed as part of any planning proposal being brought forward.*” This is an amendment that we would have supported but it has not been made.

In order for the Local Plan to be justified, and based on the most appropriate strategy, based on proportionate evidence in accordance with NPPF 2012 paragraph 182, we suggest that the section under **On-site Constraints** be amended from the original text as follows:

~~“The sites have potential site access constraints. Vehicular access must ensure safe access to the sites from the highway network, and remove the opportunity for rat-running be limited to a single access point for the two sites. The access arrangements are to be Council’s preference is for vehicular access to the Area to be from the High Street subject to properly and adequately considered and addressed as part of the Concept Framework Plan and planning application process, and any planning applications identifying an acceptable solution in relation to the Tree Preservation Order trees which are located along the eastern edge of site ONG.R2. Should this not be possible, opportunities to provide vehicular access to the Area from Epping Road (A414) and the High Street should be explored, including through the potential to upgrade the existing access points.”~~

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** 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.

In order for the Local Plan to be justified, and based on the most appropriate strategy, based on proportionate evidence in accordance with NPPF 2012 paragraph 182, we suggest that the section under **On-site Constraints** be amended from the original text as follows:

~~“The sites have potential site access constraints. Vehicular access must ensure safe access to the sites from the highway network, and remove the opportunity for rat-running be limited to a single access point for the two sites. The access arrangements are to be Council’s preference is for vehicular access to the Area to be from the High Street subject to properly and adequately considered and addressed as part of the Concept Framework Plan and planning application process, and any planning applications identifying an acceptable solution in relation to the Tree Preservation Order trees which are located along the eastern edge of site ONG.R2. Should this not be possible, opportunities to provide vehicular access to the Area from Epping Road (A414) and the High Street should be explored, including through the potential to upgrade the existing access points.”~~

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

8. Have you attached any documents with this representation which specifically relate to an MM or supporting document?

Yes

No

Signature:



Date

23 Sep 21