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	Neil	
Last Name	Forbes	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address	[redacted]	[redacted]
Post Code	[redacted]	[redacted]
Telephone Number	[redacted]	[redacted]
E-mail Address	[redacted]	[redacted]

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which Main Modification number and/or supporting document of the Local Plan does your representation relate to?

MM no: 21

Supporting document reference:

Do you consider this Main Modification and/or supporting document of the Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

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

Please give details of why you consider the Main Modification and/or supporting document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

I object to the Change of Green belt status and use for housing of the land show in the documents as SP4.3 / SP5.3
The context of the wider area of Harlow, the surrounding villages, Sawbridgeworth and Bishops Storford means the
needs are spread across three local area authorities. All three of the district councils have seen large areas of housing
added in the last decade with 1000,s of new homes added in the last 5 years and the local plans for all three councils
show new land already allocated for many 1000s more. In total in excess of 25,000 new homes are planned and yet to
be built. It is therefore unproven as to the need for yet more green belt land to be lost to housing. Nor is it reasonable
to lose precious green belt land to other forms of development use (such as a new hospital) than is absolutely
necessary. 1,000's of homes are already allocated directly adjacent to the south in the Harlow Local Plan providing all
housing that could possibly be needed in this area and already damaging the historic value of the village of Churchgate
Street. The possibility of a new Hospital may be a valuable asset to the area but the plan does not then include the land
that would be released by closing the current PAH stated as over 500 homes.
There is long established policy by EFDC to retain green belt land as green breaks between urbans areas and especially
to preserve the definition of our historic villages. Development of this land (and the land to the south as proposed by
HDC) would effectively not only mean the complete loss of Churchgate street as a village it would effectively join it to
Sheering. The value of our historic villages must not be lost for future generations to understand the landscape in which
they live. The villages of Great Parndon, Latton, Tye Green, Staple Tye, Little Parndon, and

Netteswell have all but been
lost forever. A significant green belt space must be retained to protect the historic nature of Sheering as a separate
village.
The loss of natural habitat and valuable countryside is also of real importance. This land has significant natural beauty
and wildlife habitats with water courses from the surrounding higher ground draining into Pincey Brook where the
lower lying ground is a flood plain. Many species of wildlife from Voles, Stotes, newts and ground nesting birds; to Deer
and badgers; birds of prey including, Buzzards, kestrels and Red Kites can regularly be seen here. Development of the
land will damage the delicate ecosystems that support this wildlife. The land is a flood plain and any development will
exacerbate flooding to a damaging level. The Buzzards and Red Kites have already moved north over sheering where
they were not seen before which is highly likely due to the loss of their habitat from to the development of the M11 J7a
link road.
I proposed that part of the land in question could be used for some development under specific conditions.
1. The Land north of the J7a link road MUST be retained as Breen Belt to protect the separation of the historic Village of
Sheering and the delicate natural habit of the flood plain and surrounding fields and woodlands.
2. The land south of the new J7a link road should ONLY be used in conjunction with the new Hospital and NOT for any
other purpose without consultation and should be given the status as an area of special restraint.

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Main Modification and/or supporting document 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 Submission Version of 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 planned changes will effectively remove the green belt status of sheering and be a precursor to further revisions / changes to planning to create additional unneeded residential dwelling. There is currently a shortfall in the infrastructure ie schools /doctors / dentists etc. and this planned change will exacerbate these shortages

The planned changes will destroy wildlife and the village community and the B183 is already over congested and in the center of the village by the Cock pub is a time bomb waiting to happen where there will be a serious accident or fatality due to the traffic congestion every Monday - Friday created by parents dropping children off to the school , the one track entry to the village hall and the car yard (which Jacks yard was never intended for)

Signature: Neil Forbes Date:
05/09/2021