

## **Paragon North Weald Ltd**

### **Local Plan representations – Matter 4 Issue 4**

*Land owned by Mr J Foulds, Carswell, Rye Hill, Harlow, Essex CM18 7JG  
& Ms R Gemmill, 2 Bilsden Farm Cottages, Epping Road, Ongar, Essex  
CM5 0DF*

**Participant reference: 19LAD0122**

**Peter Brett Associates**

January 2019

## MATTER 4: THE SPATIAL STRATEGY/ DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT

### Issue 4: Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release?

- 1.1 There is a clear need to adjust the Green Belt boundary here – for both housing and employment. In responding to Matter 3 we noted that, in our opinion the need for additional employment land had been under-estimated, and we consider the Market Signal uplift to housing applied to be inadequate and out of alignment with the most recent (sound) Essex examples.
- 1.2 Here we add two detailed points relating to the proposed Green Belt boundaries in the plan – particularly related to North Weald Bassett, but also more generally.
- 1.3 Issue 4, question 4, makes reference to ‘anomalies’ in the Green Belt boundaries. In this regard we note that the plan is proposing to introduce significant anomalies around our client’s land at North Weald (part of SR-0158B) – coloured pink on the map below.

**Figure 3.1 Map of Paragon North Weald land (shown in pink)**



- 1.4 The Council is proposing to allocate the ‘blue’ land for development (and place it outside the Green Belt. New housing site allocations are proposed a short distance (just a few metres) to the east. But there is no Green Belt justification for the new boundary, retaining SR-0158B within Green Belt.
- 1.5 In part, the new boundary is drawn rather arbitrarily through fields, regardless of defining physical features such as hedge rows in the area. More generally in this

area, given the principle of developing land immediately to the west and east of SR-0158B has been accepted by the Council, this land remains a ‘finger’ of unallocated Green Belt land between two new significant land allocations. This appears to be an anomaly which this plan is now creating.

- 1.6 Part of the reason for this is the unusual and rigid site selection process discussed as part of representations to Matters 3 & 4. Sites dismissed at early stages of the Arup Site’s Selection assessment process have not been revisited following consultation or reassessed to ensure that the proposed land parcels follow common sense or best practice for Green Belt boundaries.
- 1.7 Here the most obvious, common sense and defensible boundary (given the proposed new allocations and subsequent adjustments to the Green Belt), would appear to be along Vicarage Lane – as opposed to through field boundaries or weak hedge lines as currently proposed.
- 1.8 Although a matter for a latter session we note in passing that the Council has previously found this area suitable for development as part of a Masterplan exercise for the area. Given this finding we cannot see why the boundary has been drawn in the way it has and ultimately excluding our clients land<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> EB1003A North Weald Bassett Masterplanning Study (Allies & Morrison Urban Practitioners 2014) Part A

EB1003B North Weald Bassett Masterplanning Study (Allies & Morrison Urban Practitioners 2014) Part B