

19th February 2019.

Dear Inspector,

Matter 5 - Site Selection Methodology and the Viability of Site Allocations.

Site Selection - Issue 1 - Have the Plan's housing allocations been chosen on the basis of a robust assessment process?

2. How were the conclusions reached about individual sites checked for accuracy and consistency? Were sites visited or were they assessed through a desk-bound process? What has been done to check the assessments in specific cases where their accuracy has been challenged e.g. Site SR-0596 (Reps 19LAD0012).

As the co-owner of Site SR-0596, I would like to state that despite attempts to inform the Council that the site was not and had never been a "large amount of amenity land, including an area which is used as a football pitch", I was unable to convince them of the fact that their consultants had obviously not visited the site to correctly assess it and this was a matter of importance.

The entrance to the site is visible from the Harlow Common road and footpath 11 actually goes through the middle of the site, joining with footpath 58 at the top boundary. So practically all the site can be seen from public roads and footpaths. So I can only conclude that the consultants did only a desk-bound assessment or possibly got the wrong site. This then calls into account all the facts stated in the site assessment for this site. This means that the Plan has not been prepared, scrutinised or checked properly in my view.

Throughout the process of compiling the Plan, I found it very difficult to get facts from officers, such as reasons why my site had dropped out, despite repeated e-mails and I resorted to hand-delivering copies. Meetings and deadlines were promised and missed. At one stage I was told my site had been accepted and was invited to a meeting of developers and County Council representatives, only to be informed in the lobby of the Council chamber that there had been a mistake and my site had not in fact even been assessed yet. As a member of the public trying to put forward a site, my sense of frustration throughout the Plan process was intense. I think transparency went out the window.

The Appendices B and C were published after the Council had voted to go ahead with submitting the Plan and I don't think this was right. The additional consultation given to landowners affected gave me little time to get professional help and put together a proposal, which also had to act as a rebuttal to the wrongly stated facts about my site.

I understand that it is not within your gift to re-assess the site but I understand that you can recommend that the Council give it a proper site assessment. I think the site gives the opportunity to provide a ready-to-go housing scheme whilst snags are ironed out at bigger sites. My sister and I hope that our family's land can provide an exciting opportunity for some sustainable homes.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Gray