

LAND AT WELHAM GREEN

WELHAM GREEN PROMOTERS

GREEN BELT REPRESENTATION ON THE WELWYN HATFIELD GREEN BELT
STUDY, STAGE 3

ON BEHALF OF POTTERELLS FARM, ID: 1047643

SEPTEMBER 2018



TERENCE
ROURKE

LAND AT WELHAM GREEN
WELHAM GREEN PROMOTERS
 GREEN BELT REPRESENTATION ON THE WELWYN HATFIELD GREEN BELT
 STUDY, STAGE 3



ON BEHALF OF POTTERELLS FARM, ID: 1047643
 SEPTEMBER 2018

Issue / revision	Prepared by	Neil Edmonds
Reference	Signature	247201C
This document is issued for <input type="checkbox"/> Information <input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Comment <input type="checkbox"/> Submission	Date	
	Checked by	Richard Burton
Comments	Signature	
	Date	
	Authorised by	Richard Burton
	Signature	
	Date	
	Please return by	

LONDON
 7 Heddon Street
 London
 W1B 4BD

BOURNEMOUTH
 Everdene House
 Deansleigh Road
 Bournemouth
 BH7 7DU

TELEPHONE
 020 3664 6755

www.tortld.co.uk

© Terence O'Rourke Ltd 2018. All rights reserved.
 No part of this document may be reproduced in any form or stored in a
 retrieval system without the prior written consent of the copyright holder.

All figures (unless otherwise stated) © Terence O'Rourke Ltd 2018.
 Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the
 Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown
 Copyright Terence O'Rourke Ltd Licence number 100019980.

Terence O'Rourke Ltd Reg.
 No.1935454 Registered office
 Everdene House Deansleigh
 Road Bournemouth Dorset
 BH7 7DU Registered in England
 and Wales VAT No.905095727

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This representation has been prepared on behalf of Potterells Farm Partnership and reviews the assessment of Parcel P64 in the Welwyn Hatfield Green Belt Study Stage 3, August 2018 prepared by LUC.
- 1.2 Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council submitted its draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in May 2017 and its Examination is currently underway. At the end of the Stage 2 hearing session in October 2017, the Inspector identified a need for further work in order to expand the findings of the Council's Green Belt review evidence.
- 1.3 The Stage 3 Green Belt study was prepared to address the Inspector's comments. The Inspector's comments that have a direct bearing on Potterells Farm are:
- The Stage 1 Green Belt Review was too strategic and therefore its assessment on the extent of potential harm on the purposes of the Green Belt, caused by development within the large parcels was at too large a scale and dismissed smaller individual potential development sites adjacent to the urban areas. In other words, it was not at a finer scale required to effectively assess the Green Belt
 - The Stage 2 Green Belt Review was at a finer grain but did not examine all the potential development sites adjacent to the urban areas
 - The Stage 2 Green Belt Review also assessed openness but considered landscape character when assessing openness when it should only have been concerned about the absence of built development and other dominant urban influences
 - It did not assess the extent to which the Green Belt would be harmed by the loss of a parcel in part, in its entirety or in combination with other parcels in order to assess essential areas of Green Belt to be retained.

2.0 General comments on methodology

- 2.1 Given the fact that the Inspector specifically requested that the Stage 3 report needed to assess the Green Belt at a finer grain, it is confusing as to why LUC have decided to create new parcels that are far larger than those used in the Stage 2 report. Furthermore, the Inspector asked that those areas adjacent to urban areas that had been omitted from the Stage 2 should be assessed.
- 2.2 However, rather than assessing only the areas that were omitted in Stage 2, LUC have instead included previously assessed parcels within their new larger parcels. Therefore, Potterells Farm, formerly located within WeG15 of the Stage 2 report is now within Parcel P64 which includes former WeG1, WeG2, WeG3, WeG15 and the Station Road allotments as well an area south of WeG15 that was formerly omitted from the Stage 2 report.
- 2.3 This means that parcels that had already been assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt within Stage 2 are now reassessed in Stage 3. To make matters more confusing, the methodology for the Stage 3 assessment of the Green Belt purposes differs from that used in the Stage 2 report. Therefore, the assessed

contributions to the Green Belt for some purposes now have differing results. Stages 1 and 2 follow a similar methodology whereas Stage 3 does not, meaning there are inconsistencies across the Green Belt assessment as a whole.

- 2.4 Following the Inspector’s comments LUC have provided an assessment of harm. Their definition of harm is set out at paragraphs 3.80-3.90 of the LUC Final Report.
- 2.5 Three factors are stated as informing the assessment of Green Belt harm:
 - The contribution to Green Belt purposes
 - The loss of openness and the implications on the integrity of the wider Green Belt
 - The consistency and strength of the Green Belt boundary

3.0 Review of the Stage 3 assessment of Parcel 64

3.1 Given the suitability of the site as evidenced by the assessment comments on page 291 of the LUC report there appears to be an obvious disconnect between the assessment of the Green Belt purposes and the assessment of harm which is scored as Moderate-High. We can only assume this is due to the subjective definition of harm as set out on page 32 of the LUC report.

3.2 The assessment of harm from Parcel P64 being released from Green Belt as a whole (P291 LUC) states:

“The parcel is largely open and rural in character and its release would lead to encroachment on the countryside and impact on the integrity of the wider Green Belt to the west and south. However, the parcel is contained on two sides by the existing urban edge and woodland to the south would create a clear southern boundary.”

3.3 It is necessary to understand why this parcel has been assessed as having a potential Moderate–High harmful effect, despite the supportive comments regarding its contribution to the purposes of Green Belt in relation to its suitability to be released. In order to achieve this, we need to look at the three factors that LUC used to define harm and review each in turn. For ease we have reproduced the assessment information by LUC for Parcel P64 which is indicated on figure 1.

Contribution to Green Belt Purposes

3.4 Firstly, we need to understand if there are any differences in the assessment of the Green Belt purposes between the Stage 2 assessment of WeG15 and Stage 3 Parcel P64. The table below provides the assessment of the Green Belt purposes for the Stage 2 and Stage 3 Green Belt assessments.

Table 1.1

Contribution to Green Belt Purposes		
Purpose	Stage 2	Stage 3
Purpose 1: Sprawl	Limited or no contribution	Limited or no contribution
Purpose 2: Merging of Settlements	Partial contribution	Partial contribution

Purpose 3: Safeguarding the Countryside	Partial contribution	Significant contribution
Purpose 4: Historic Towns	Limited or no contribution	Limited or no contribution
Purpose 5: Urban regeneration	Not assessed	Significant contribution
Local Purpose: Settlement Pattern	Partial contribution	Partial contribution

3.5 As per our previous representation on the Stage 2 Green Belt assessment for WeG15, dated July 2017, we have no comments on the assessment of this parcel.

3.6 Our comments on the Stage 3 assessment are provided in table 1.2 below:

Table 1.2

Contribution to Green Belt Purposes	
Purpose	Comments
Purpose 1: Sprawl	We agree the parcel is sufficiently separated or distant from a large built-up area for there to be a limited or no contribution to the purpose of sprawl.
Purpose 2: Merging of Settlements	The parcel sits within a 4.5km gap between Hatfield in the north west and Potters Bar to the south east. As with the Stage 2 Green Belt review the parcel is assessed as having a partial contribution to this purpose. However, there are areas of ancient woodland to the north west and woodland blocks to the south east that mean this parcel shares elements of the criteria that would see it having a limited contribution. We therefore suggest that Parcel P64 fall within the very lower end of having a partial contribution .
Purpose 3: Safeguarding the Countryside	We do not agree with the assessment of Parcel P64 as contributing to this purpose significantly. The criterion for significant contribution states the parcel must contain the characteristics of open countryside relating strongly to the wider countryside, have a sense of separation from the settlement and lack urbanising development. To state in the assessment of the parcel that it lacks urbanising development is untrue. It is enclosed on two boundaries by settlement, which are visible to the north and east of the parcel. It also contains a large vehicle repair shop. We consider it more closely relates to the criterion for partial contribution which states: " <i>Land that contains the characteristics of open countryside and has limited urbanising development...</i> " We therefore consider the grading should be reduced to partial contribution .
Purpose 4: Historic Towns	It is agreed that this should be limited or no contribution
Purpose 5: Urban regeneration	The significant contribution is common to all parcels and we have no issue with this grading, but there is no reason why this should be significant. Instead it should be graded as not applicable .
Local Purpose: Settlement Pattern	We have no comment in regards the grading of this purpose as having a partial contribution .

The loss of openness and the implications on the integrity of the wider Green Belt

- 3.7 All undeveloped Green Belt land, if developed, will result in the loss of openness to some extent. The issue will be whether the land removed will impact on the integrity of the wider Green Belt.
- 3.8 As described in the LUC Final Report on page 18-19, openness can be defined as having both a spatial aspect and a visual aspect. With regards WeG15 and its visual aspect, it is visually enclosed to the north and east by the existing urban edge of Welham Green and by a hedgerow to the west.
- 3.9 As stated in the assessment of harm for Parcel P64, in which WeG15 is located: *“woodland to the south would create a clear southern boundary.”* The land south of WeG15 is also in the ownership control of the Potterells Farm Partnership and as such is proposed as providing strategic green infrastructure. The existing riparian woodland running along Mimmshall Brook that forms this southern boundary will be enhanced and new structural woodland belts are proposed to supplement the existing western hedge and fill any gaps as well as mark the line of development in line with the existing development along Station Road.
- 3.10 With regards the spatial aspect of WeG15 the existing development and car repair workshop affect, to a limited degree, the extent to which this parcel is considered open, and creates a shared relationship to both the settlement of Welham Green and the wider countryside.
- 3.11 We therefore conclude that through these strategic green infrastructure proposals, development of WeG15 and its loss of openness would not impact on the integrity of the wider Green Belt.
- 3.12 This is supported by LUC’s findings on page 62 of their final report. Here they state that none of the parcels around Welham Green form essential Green Belt.

The consistency and strength of the Green Belt boundary

- 3.13 As set out in paragraph 3.9 above, using the woodland belt along the southern boundary of Parcel P64 along with strategic green infrastructure enhancement proposals to this existing woodland belt and the western hedgerow boundary, the boundaries would provide recognisable and defensible boundaries in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that would be robust to any future challenge.
- 3.14 Taking all these above factors into account and considering them with the other parcels around Welham Green we consider that the assessment of harm for Parcel P64 should be lowered from Moderate – High to **Low – Moderate, and certainty no higher than Moderate.**

LUC Harm scenario assessments

- 3.15 The LUC Final Report on 292 and 293 provides a series of scenarios looking at the harm of removing Parcel P64 as a whole from the Green Belt and then a variety of scenarios looking at the impact when using varying combinations of the Stage 2 land parcels. We have reproduced some of these scenarios on figure 2.

- 3.16 As can be seen, scenario P64e assesses the harm using WeG1, WeG2, WeG3 and the allotments. The comments provided for scenario P64e on page 292 state:

“The cumulative impact of the release of these sites would be similar to the release of the parcel as whole as it would lead to encroachment onto the open countryside.”

- 3.17 As we have stated in the above factors considered for Parcel P64 as a whole, we consider that with the strategic green infrastructure enhancement proposals to this existing woodland belt in the south and along the western hedgerow boundary, that the assessment of harm should be lowered from Moderate – High to **Low – Moderate, and certainty no higher than Moderate.**

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 We have concerns over the robustness of the LUC report.
- Most confusingly they have not followed the Inspector’s comments to make their Green Belt assessment at a finer grain, and have in fact created parcels larger than those used in Stage 2
 - They have not simply assessed the areas of Green Belt adjacent to the urban areas that were omitted from Stage 2, as per the Inspector’s comments, but included parcels previously assessed within Stage 2
 - They have used different assessment criteria to assess the purposes of Green Belt, which makes sensible comparison very difficult
 - The subjective nature of the review of harm makes a transparent assessment impossible, leaving the reader with no ability to cross check the findings
 - The Green Belt assessment of purposes and harm are often inconsistent with each other.
- 4.2 All the above leads to confusion in terms of the assessment. We consider that the Green Belt assessment of purpose 3; Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment should be assessed as **partial** rather than significant.
- 4.3 The assessment of harm as Moderate – High we consider should be assessed as **no more than Moderate.**