

Stakeholder Reference:  
Document Reference:

---

**Part A**

---

**Making representation as Agent on behalf of Landowner or Land Promoter**

	<b>Personal Details</b>	<b>Agent's Details (if applicable)</b>
Title	Ms	
First Name	Frances	Antony
Last Name	Hodge	Wells
Job Title (where relevant)	N/A	N/A
Organisation (where relevant)	N/A	N/A
Address	.....Redacted.....	.....Redacted.....
Post Code	.....Redacted.....	.....Redacted.....
Telephone Number	.....Redacted.....	.....Redacted.....
E-mail Address	.....Redacted.....	.....Redacted.....

---

## Part B

---

### REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph: 5.134 - 8

Policy: P 10 Nazeing

Policies Map: Yes

Site Reference: None of the above

Settlement: Nazeing

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

Legally compliant: Don't Know

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Justified

Complies with the duty to co-operate? Don't Know

**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 Plan is not the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence because:

To great an emphasis has been placed on the four large residential development sites chosen within the Nazeing Settlement Area.

These are: The Nazeing Fencing Centre Ref: Naze R2 and the three sites forming the South Nazeing Concept Framework (to which there has already been considerable local resistance) Ref: Naze R1, R3 & R4.

As a result numerous more modest sites with equal potential for residential development have been disregarded. For example Site Reference SR - 0927 Land North of Maplecroft Lane, Nazeing.

Larger development sites cause greater impact on the local community, infrastructure and Green Belt.

It is not good policy to opt for chunky, high impact developments in a village settlement.

In addition, there is no back-up plan of reserve sites, should any of the pre-selected sites fail to become available for any reason.

**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 Planning Policy Team should revisit and reconsider the site selection process, giving less emphasis to larger scale sites and more credence to smaller infill sites, especially where development would cause less overall harm to the Local Green Belt. Even if this means that there are more sites to deal with overall. As previously stated, there is a need for a back up plan of reserve sites in case one or more of the larger sites fail to deliver.

Epping Forest District Council need to plan for a more measured, low impact, proportionate growth for their village settlements, that will be sustainable over the term of the Local Plan.

**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: Antony E Wells Date: 2018-01-27