

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Dr	
First Name	Andrew	
Last Name	Davis	
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: 2.69, 5.128

Policy: H 4 Traveller site development

Policies Map:

Site Reference: None of the above

Settlement: Roydon

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? Effective

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.

2.69.3 states that additional traveller sites may be considered at "sites with temporary permissions or unauthorised sites that may potentially be suitable for regularisation". Para 5.128 states ". There are no allocations for Traveller Accommodation in Roydon." The elephant in the room is the Roydon Chalet EstateRedacted..... a large number of semi-permanent traveller caravans in a very unsuitable location. The plan must be clear on whether 2.69.3 or 5.128 takes priority. I am sure there are other instances related to traveller sites where disambiguation is needed.

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.

2.69.3 should clarify that such consideration will only be made at existing approved traveller sites, and/or should be clear about the process for post-approval of traveller sites whereRedacted..... development has taken place.

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:

REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: SP 4 Development and Delivery of Garden Communities in the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town

Policies Map:

Site Reference: SP 5.2

Settlement:

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? Effective

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 includes far-reaching commitments to ensure environmental protection within the Water Lane area and to make the area an attractive place to live, but the real test will come as EFDC sets out more detailed planning obligations for developers. The Plan as it stands does not give sufficient information on how existing rural communities will be protected or how the border between the built-up area and the surrounding countryside will be created and sustained as development proceeds. Nor does it comment on the impact 2100 homes will have on traffic through Roydon and other nearby villages, or the impact on health services (GP surgeries are in particularly short supply)

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 plan should recognise that for 2100 homes more infrastructure may be required than just schooling.

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

No

Signature: Andrew Davis Date: 25/01/2018