

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	C		
Last Name	Wybrew		
Job Title (where relevant)			
Organisation (where relevant)			
Address			
Post Code			
Telephone Number			
E-mail Address			

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: A. Council's response to Actions outlined in Inspector's post examination hearing advice (Examination document reference number ED98), July 2021 (ED133)

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.

It is noted that the LP seeks to deregister the green belt East of Harlow (MP SP4.3). This raises obvious concerns that if development is permitted in this area that the character and identity of the Sheering will be compromised and effectively rendered as an adjunct to an urbanised Harlow. It is submitted that if housing is required then there are other locations within the District where this could be achieved without eroding the individuality and character of existing historic villages. In the context of Harlow and its environs this allocation in the LP places additional pressure on local roads and resources which are not provided for in the LP particularly in respect of the impact further east of Sheering.

In the Council's response to the Inspector (ED133) it is stated that "the extent of development will be agreed during the masterplanning process. This will include agreement on the position of a build to line to appropriately safeguard the settlement edge of Sheering." It is submitted that to deregister the green belt to the extent proposed is not warranted to achieve the East of Harlow masterplan and compromises the stated intention to protect the identity of Sheering. The East of Harlow masterplan merely raises the possibility of a new hospital on land north of Pincey Brook and only as far as Sheering Hall. It states that this land will be used for no other purpose. Yet the District Council is seeking to deregister the full wedge of land in Sp4.3. The Council has not justified why this is necessary and to do so would defeat the self-vowed aim to protect the settlement line of Sheering by making the area vulnerable to future changes in Central Govt policy. The LP proposal to deregister the Green Belt in SP4.3 goes far beyond what is envisaged or is necessary to achieve the East of Harlow Masterplan.

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 deregistering of the green belt should only be to the extent justified by the East of Harlow Masterplan which more accurately reflects the needs of the area than the Epping LP.

Signature: C Wybrew Date:
18/08/2021