

Stakeholder Reference:

Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Agent on behalf of Landowner or Land Promoter

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Ms	
First Name	Wendy	Stephen
Last Name	Catton	Hayhurst
Job Title (where relevant)		Chartered Town Planner
Organisation (where relevant)		Hayhurst Tonw Planning Services Limited
Address	[REDACTED]	1 Thorington Close, Great Notley, Braintree CM77 7XE
Post Code	[REDACTED]	CM77 7XE
Telephone Number	01376553970	01376553970
E-mail Address	stevhayhurst@btconnect.com	stevhayhurst@btconnect.com

Part B

REPRESENTATION

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

Paragraph:

Policy: SP 5 Garden Town Communities

Policies Map: Yes

Site Reference: SP 5.3

Settlement: Harlow

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, 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.

My client owns about 4ha of land situated to the north of Moor Hall Road (see red and blue land on attached site location plan). The land includes an existing dwelling (The Engine House) and there is an existing planning permission to convert/extend part of the former Moor Hall Stables to form a dwelling and to replace another stables building with a new detached dwelling (see planning permission ref: EPF/3249/15).

Immediately adjoining my client's land to the north and west are further sites with planning permission for small scale residential development (see planning permission refs: EPF/2386/15, EPF/0109/17 & EPF/1616/17).

Together with further land to the west (Moor Hall Lodge), which is partly in residential use and partly in commercial use, these landholdings form a rough triangle shape which is excluded from the land identified as being allocated for residential development on Map 2.4. I attach an annotated extract from Map 2.4 showing these landholdings outlined in red.

It is clear that this triangular area of land is partly brownfield and partly greenfield.

My clients note and support the inclusion of this land within the designated "Master Plan Area" shown on Map 2.4, but object to the lack of any development allocation on the land.

They know of no land ownership, infrastructural or planning constraints which would prevent the whole triangle area being developed. Indeed all the landowners are known to be pursuing small scale residential schemes on their individual plots and would welcome the allocation of their land for development (which is already implied by its inclusion within the Master Plan Area).

They object to Map 2.4, as the triangular area of land is covered with a diagonal green dashed hatching, which is not explained in the map legend. Whatever this hatching signifies, it is clearly not an absolute constraint to development as some of the land to the north, within the residential allocation, is similarly hatched. However Map 2.4 is unsound in its current form without any explanation of the effect of that designation. I have already asked the Council to explain the meaning of this but have received an unsatisfactory response.

My client also objects to the lack of clarity on the future intended Green Belt status of the Master Plan Area. On the map legend the Green Belt boundary is indicated as a bluey green line. It appears that this line undelays the Master Plan Area boundary along the north-western boundary of the Master Plan Area (Sheering Road) and along the eastern boundary (M11), but it needs to be stated more clearly that the whole of the Master Plan Area within Epping Forest District is to be removed from the Green Belt, as this is not at all clear from the current map and we could find no definitive statement to that end within the text of the Local Plan documents itself.

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.

In policy SP5, in the table at paragraph A, the potential capacity should be increased above 750 homes to include an allowance for the capacity of the currently unallocated land north of Moor Hall Road.

In policy SP5 there should be a specific reference to the intention to remove the whole of the Master Plan Area from the Green Belt, to overcome the lack of clarity in the plan as currently drafted.

On Map 2.4 the dashed green diagonal hatching should be removed from the land north of Moor Hall Road, or alternatively an explanation of the meaning of the designation should be included in the map legend, once again to overcome the lack of clarity in the plan as currently drafted.

On Map 2.4 the currently unallocated land north of Moor Hall Road should be allocated for residential development or consideration should be given to removing the specific allocated housing site in lieu of future detailed discussions about the layout, distribution and allocation of housing and other necessary land uses across the whole Master Plan Area which are to take place through the Master Plan preparation process. As presently drafted the certainty of a residential allocation which applies in some parts of the master plan area appears premature in advance of the Master Plan preparation process.

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: Stephen Hayhurst Date: 25/01/2018