

Representation by W G Lee of GREENHUNT for Land West of Luxford Place, Lower Sheering

Policy SP2 plans for the delivery of 11,400 homes in the period 2011 to 2033.

This is short of the level of growth identified as being the OAN (12,573).

Furthermore recently an Inspector for the East Herts Local Plan (within the same HMA) suggests that a 14% uplift to the OAN is required to respond to out-migration trends from London. If a 14% uplift were applied to the OAN the need would be 14,333.

I have concerns about the bulk of this growth being allocated to Harlow or its north extension in the sense that it may not be deliverable within the first 5-10 years of the plan, due to constraints or contingency on large infrastructure improvements which causes deferral of delivery. By contrast smaller sites tend to come forward earlier and so can make a meaningful effect upon delivery rates in a plan.

I have attached my client's previous representation by AMEC for information.

The Site Selection Methodology Arup June 2017 states that sites of below 6 or 0.2ha would be included for assessment under the SLAA 2012 methodology. (see paras 4.6 and 4.7).

This contrasts with the later PPG guidance for HELAAs of 2014 that assessments should consider all sites capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings and of 0.25ha or greater in size.

The Report on Site Selection Dec v2 Issue of Arup in section 2.26, third bullet, indeed acknowledges sites were reviewed against the same June 2017 methodology. Thereby the logic would be that sites of under 6 houses would be assessed, as long as they exceeded 0.2ha in size

Confusingly then in Table 2.3, first line, it transpires that 109 sites have been discounted on the grounds they are of sub 0.2ha and less than 6 houses. What I think the Council may have done is exclude all sites of less than 6 houses, even if they were above 0.2ha in size: that must please be broken out and clarified to the Inspector. It may be that a considerable number of small plots have been discounted on this basis, which together otherwise could make a meaningful contribution to the overall supply. That would include this site of about 0.3ha and 5 houses.

I am most concerned when reviewing the Arup Dec paper that the Appendix that gave the reasons for rejection of each site was not available, or if so it is only just becoming so, too late in the consultation period for sufficient transparency and process.

The rationale for ignoring small and 5 and under sites may be that they are presumed to come forward under windfall, but that presumption will very likely not deliver the same number of houses as represented. That is because without the allocation in the plan many or most are likely to remain in Green Belt, and so the Council will likely dismiss applications on that crucial ground, as it is doubtful they will qualify under the draft policies in DM4 section C, as they may arguably be neither technical infill or previously developed.

If the Council is despite my arguments above be found not to have been illogical, and has in effect a 6 house minimum 'cut off', then my client offers 6 houses, still not being over development of land at 30 houses per ha.

My client has argued before why this plot in the Green Belt is not strategically material to its purposes, it being part of a mere small 'finger' in to an existing developed area. The land to the east

is a 2000s development on previous land within the Green Belt. There are houses north, and a boatyard in commercial use and riverboat moorings to the west.

The triangular site that is re-represented reflects exactly the Flood Zone 1 low risk area. However we attach the Environment Agency Plan that provides more linear detail than the broad zoning plans in reflecting the defended flood outlines. The green dot on this plan shows the site of the new house for which permission was granted in 2017 under EPF/0828/17, this falling within Flood Zone 2, but low risk being beyond the defended lines.

I attach a plan showing the Council's Land Registry ownership, being the public open space to the west of our client's field. It excludes the owned but shared accesses to the north that therefore in practice would not have houses on them. If that area is not used by actual built form, then it can be made up by using part of the Flood Zone Area 2 west of the dotted line: in practice this is also a low risk flood area, and could form the road access and or garden areas at least. The Council has allocated sites elsewhere under the sequential test that use Flood Zone 2 areas. This site however substantially will still have its built form within a flood free area.