

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	paul	
Last Name	vann	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
AddressRedacted.....Redacted.....	
Post CodeRedacted.....	
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: Yes

Site Reference: None of the above

Settlement: Thornwood

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

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.

inadequate infrastructure- erosion of village life-lack of study on impact to wild life-inadequate school capacity-unbearable traffic volumes increasing further-access to Thornwood common site unclear-plans of Thornwood are inaccurate, road names are incorrect (Brookfield/Brookside) resulting in confusion-this proposal has already been turned down , the potential for road traffic collisions a prominent concern.

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 proposal for Thornwood common is unviable, as has been demonstrated previously.Redacted.....
.....Redacted..... the land adjoining Brookfield (not Brookside) has been the subject of a previous identical proposal which was proven unsound.Redacted.....
.....Redacted.....

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 oral examination

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

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

Yes

Signature: paul vann Date: 25/01/2018