

Committee: Planning Policy Working Group

Agenda Item

Date: 26 November 2015

8

Title: Duty to Cooperate

Author: Andrew Taylor, Assistant Director Planning
and Building Control

Summary

1. This report updates members on the Duty to Cooperate work.

Recommendations

2. To note the report.

Financial Implications

3. None

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	Communication and consultation form the bedrock of cooperating. This paper is published on the website.
Community Safety	The Duty to Cooperate will include all factors.
Equalities	The Duty to Cooperate will include all factors.
Health and Safety	The Duty to Cooperate will include all factors.
Human Rights/Legal Implications	The Duty to Cooperate will include all factors. Failure to comply would result in the Local Plan being found unsound.
Sustainability	The Duty to Cooperate will include all factors.
Ward-specific impacts	Affects all wards equally.
Workforce/Workplace	This will involve Councillors, officers from the Planning Policy Team and others as necessary.

Situation

6. This report seeks to update members on the Duty to Cooperate which forms part of Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. The Duty requires local planning authorities, public bodies and others to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to the planning of sustainable development.

Update

7. The **Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)** was jointly commissioned by East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford Councils as a clear outcome of our Duty to Cooperate discussions and the need for a robust joint evidence base. This was adopted into our evidence base at the last meeting of the Working Group.
8. In addition to the SHMA the four authorities commissioned **Economic Evidence to support the development of the OAHN for West Essex and East Herts**. This was also adopted into our evidence base at the last meeting of the Working Group.
9. The SHMA and Economic Evidence work forms part of the wider cooperation between the four authorities and a number of others including, Brentwood, Broxbourne, LB Redbridge, Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils. This group has collectively become known as the **Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board**.
10. The Coop Board met on 16 March 2015 and received a presentation on the emerging SHMA and a report on the Further Alterations to the London Plan. The minutes of this meeting are attached as **Appendix 1**.
11. The Coop Board then met on 3 June 2015 and discussed the future of the Board. The Board agreed that it was a useful mechanism for cross border working and agreed to continue its work which included funding an officer resource to coordinate work. The Board received a presentation on the emerging Economic Report as well as a verbal update on J7a/J8 of the M11. A report was also provided on the support from ATLAS (Advisory Team for Large Applications) who have been working with the four authorities to help coordinate strategic growth around Harlow. As a result the four authorities are about to appoint an officer to coordinate this work, lead discussions with developers and ensure that developments which cross borders are dealt with strategically. The minutes of this meeting are attached as **Appendix 2**. A more detailed discussion for officers on the potential for growth around Harlow was held jointly with ATLAS on 10 June 2015. This led to the drafting of a job description for the new officer post. This job description is attached at **Appendix 3**.
12. The Coop Board met on 22 September 2015 and received and approved the SHMA and Economic Evidence reports. In addition a paper prepared by the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium was discussed. This focused on the need for strategic thinking for development around Harlow and suggested a number of facilitated workshops for Leaders, Chief Executives and planners to help this process move forward. This approach was agreed although it was

noted how important it was for this process and the process of the various Local Plans to be closely aligned.

13. The Coop Board then met on 26 October 2015 and discussed a proposal from the LSCC for a facilitated group workshop to provide a joined up approach to delivering the identified housing need within the SHMA area. The initial meeting has now been confirmed for 2 December 2015. The Board also received an update on highways work from ECC and an update on the work to focus on the strategic options work in and around Harlow. The Board received two presentations on Local Plan consultations from UDC and Broxbourne. The later presentation focused on a newly published Duty to Cooperate document which also lists a range of potential development sites across the Borough.
14. The Council has continued to actively engage as part of the **Strategic Spatial Planning Officer Liaison Group** (SSPOLG). Cllr Barker and the Assistant Director attended the Wider South East Summit on 19 March which addressed the co-ordination of future housing and infrastructure needs for the wider south east. The discussion papers are attached as **Appendix 4**. Cllr Barker and the Assistant Director also attended the subsequent East of England roundtable held in Cambridge on 4 September 2015. This was part of a series of 5 roundtables in the South East and East of England to consider joint working. The outcome and report from these events will be considered at the next Wider South East Summit on 11 December 2015.
15. In addition to the Councillor meetings officers meet regularly as part of SSPOLG to ensure that the joint working continues and that preparations take place for the Councillor meetings. To aid coordination the East of England representatives have additional meetings to ensure a consistency of approach and message. These have been very helpful in moving forward the agenda. As an example the East of England have proposed, and developed, a Stocktake of the entire strategic evidence base in the Wider South East. This is now being circulated with our partner areas to ensure a clear understanding of the existing evidence base.
16. The Council continues to participate in meetings with **Stansted Airport** and neighbouring authorities. Regular meetings are held to oversee the transport strategy, the delivery of the Sustainable Development Plan, ongoing S106 obligation monitoring and discussions regarding future development at the site.
17. Officers of the **Four Authorities** (East Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire County Council, Essex County Council and Uttlesford) met on 7 September 2015 to discuss our ongoing joint working in relation to Stansted airport. Specifically the discussion focused on the Airports Commission next stages, highways infrastructure and consultations on flight paths.
18. Officers have held a number of meetings with consultee bodies as part of the preparation of the **Areas of Search and Sustainability Appraisal process**. Meetings were held with the National Trust, Historic England and ECC Historic Environment Team on 3 July 2015 and Essex Wildlife Trust, Natural

England and ECC Ecology on 8 July 2015. Notes of these meetings are at **Appendix 5 and 6** respectively.

19. Regular meetings of the **London Stansted Cambridge Consortium** Board (LSCC) have continued (4 March, 12 May and 30 September) to continue the work of delivering cross border sustainable growth and development. Additional officer meetings are held to proceed the Board and also for specific task and finish groups. As a result of this work the Assistant Director has been appointed to the **West Anglia Taskforce – Working Group** to support the work of the Taskforce examining the West Anglia mainline.
20. Officers have met a number of other Local Councils as part of joint working. For example the Director of Public Services and the Assistant Director met with their counterparts from **South Cambridgeshire Council** on 5 March 2015. This was a very helpful meeting to understand the outcome of the joint South Cambridgeshire/Cambridge City Local Plan process and what additional work was being discussed. A further meeting was held on 19 November with a joint Councillor meeting to follow on 24 November 2015.
21. Officers met with **Chelmsford City Council** on 9 April 2015 to discuss both Local Plan processes. A note of this meeting was agreed and is available at **Appendix 7**.
22. Officers met with **Essex County Council** on 20 April 2015 to discuss the Local Plan process now being put in place and to seek detailed support and information. This was followed up with a meeting on 4 June to specifically discuss the provision of education within Uttlesford. ECC agreed to re-supply up to date information on spaces, expected admissions numbers and where existing schools had scope to expand. This information could then be used by Uttlesford as part of its sieve mapping exercise. A meeting with ECC Highways was held on 6 August 2015 which related to the need for external Transport Consultants to advise the Council and to seek the County support and buy in to this process. The notes are at **Appendix 8**. A meeting with the ECC Waste and Minerals Team was held on 9 September 2015 and the notes are at **Appendix 9**.
23. Officers together with Cllr Barker met with **East Hertfordshire Council** on 22 April 2015 to explore in more detail the cross border issues affecting both authorities. Specifically this related to Bishops Stortford due to its relationship with Uttlesford and the Green Belt.
24. Officers met with **Braintree District Council** as observers in a meeting with the Andrewsfield Development consortium. Uttlesford were invited to attend as the site crosses the border and both Councils consider that it is important that the site is assessed on the same basis by both Authorities. A second joint meeting with the promoters of the Boxted Wood scheme was held on 10 June 2015.
25. Officers held a joint meeting with Braintree District Council on 23 July 2015 to discuss the two presentations from developers and to discuss and agree future joint working. This specifically focussed on how to deal with cross border sites and future Local Plan consultations.

26. Officers met with the **Planning Inspectorate and Department of Communities and Local Government**, ATLAS together with Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils and Garden City Developments to discuss how a Local Plan process could incorporate a development based on Garden City Principles. This was a positive meeting with the Planning Inspectorate/DCLG agreeing to put a note together for future reference.
27. Given the importance of **Highway Infrastructure** to the success of the Local Plan the Council has been keen to meet with partners to drive this work forward. Officers attended a meeting on 27 April 2015 and again on 9 September 2015 involving Highways England, Essex County, Hertfordshire County, East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford Councils together with ATLAS in attendance. These meetings focused on the work ECC have been doing on Junction 7A and J8 of the M11. Notes of the latter meeting are at **Appendix 10**. A further meeting on 30 April 2015 of Highways England, ECC, Stansted Airport owners M.A.G and Uttlesford focused on J8 of the M11 and further joint working and sourcing and securing potential funding options.
28. The Council has become part of the **Enterprise A120** group which is a group of Councils including Essex County, Tendring, Colchester and Braintree and Uttlesford Councils designed to support the development of enterprise areas along the A120 route from the Harwich port to Stansted airport. While the Council is not committed to the principle of an Enterprise Zone along this route it has indicated its support to its partner authorities. The growth of economic development is important for the prosperity of our area and the support of these growth corridors will need to be considered as part of the wider Local Plan strategy.

Conclusion

29. Work with other Councils and organisations continues as part of the integrated work of the Planning Policy Team. As part of the development of the revised plan there are some important Duty to Cooperate meetings to be held and decision to be made. Councillors will be aware that some of these decisions will be difficult and involve a significant amount of discussion and negotiation before an outcome can be secured.

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Failure to comply with and demonstrate the Duty to Cooperate	2 – Some Council's have been found lacking in this Duty by Inspectors. Therefore need to ensure that we	3 – Will result in the Local Plan being found unsound. Significant impact on planning policy and	Cooperate closely with current organisations and continue to do this through the plan making process. Identify any gaps in cooperation and work closely with those

	capture as many groups, issues and outcomes as possible to present a full picture of our work.	planning applications.	bodies to rectify situation.
--	--	------------------------	------------------------------

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Appendix 1

Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board

Held at Epping Forest District Council, 16 March 2015

Present:

Cllr Susan Barker (Chairman)	Uttlesford DC
Cllr Jim Metcalf	Broxbourne BC
Cllr Mike Carver	East Herts DC
Cllr Linda Haysey	East Herts DC
Cllr Richard Bassett	EFDC
Cllr Chris Whitbread	EFDC
Cllr Helen Coomb	LB Redbridge
Vicky Forgione	Broxbourne BC
Claire Sime	East Herts DC
Laura Pattison	East Herts DC
Alison Blom-Cooper	Epping Forest DC
Zhanine Oates	Essex CC
David Sprunt	Essex CC
Diane Cooper	Harlow BC
Paul McBride	Harlow BC
Paul Donovan	Herts CC
David Hughes	LB Redbridge
Andrew Taylor	Uttlesford DC
Jonathan Lee	ORS

Apologies:

Cllr Phil Baker	Brentwood BC
Cllr Barry Aspinell	Brentwood BC
Cllr Phil Mynott	Brentwood BC
Cllr Kay Twitchen	Essex CC
Cllr Jon Clempner	Harlow BC
Cllr Anthony Durcan	Harlow BC
Cllr R Thake	Hertfordshire CC

Note of Meeting January 2015

The note of the meeting was agreed.

SHMA update presentation

Jonathan LEE on behalf of ORS provided a presentation on the SHMA work. The presentation is attached as an appendix to these notes. The current work had taken into account the most recent 2012 household figures produced and published by Government. These are the most recent projections and the National Planning Policy Guidance has been updated by Government.

Those present at the Board were able to ask questions of detail and clarification as part of the presentation.

The Board agreed that officers should comment on the draft report, assess the economic projections, seek overview by Counsel, sense check with their own members and agree a final report. Board agreed to meet in late April to receive the report so that each individual Council can adopt into their evidence base in the new municipal year.

Wider South East Summit

The Board noted the meeting on 19 March 2015 and the briefing document that had been circulated.

Next Meeting: 9am Thursday 30 April 2015

Appendix 2

Note of Co-operation for Sustainable Development Member Board

3rd June 2015 – at Harlow District Council

Attendance

Members

Broxbourne BC	Cllr Jim Metcalfe
East Herts DC	Cllr Linda Haysey
Epping Forest DC	Cllr Richard Bassett (Chair for latter part of meeting), Cllr John Philip
Essex CC	Cllr Kay Twitchen
Harlow DC	Cllr Jon Clempner, Cllr Anthony Durcan
Herts CC	Cllr Terry Douris
Uttlesford DC	Cllr Susan Barker (Chair for start of meeting)

Officers/others

Brentwood BC	Phil Drane
Broxbourne BC	Vicky Forgione
East Herts DC	Kevin Steptoe, Claire Sime
Epping Forest DC	Derek Macnab, Alison Blom-Cooper, Sarah King
Essex CC	Hamish Barrell, David Sprunt
Harlow DC	Graeme Bloomer, Dianne Cooper, Paul MacBride
Herts CC	Paul Donovan
Uttlesford DC	Andrew Taylor
Hardisty Jones Associates	Gareth Jones, Stuart Hardisty
Opinion Research Services	Nigel Moore

1. Apologies

Brentwood BC - Cllr Roger McCheyne & Cllr Will Trump
Epping Forest DC – Cllr Chris Whitbread

2. Introductions

3. Minutes of Board on 16th March 2015

Minutes were agreed as circulated.

4. Future of Co-op. Board

Andrew Taylor introduced his paper (as previously circulated), which considers the future of the Co-op. Board.

It recommends the continuation of the Board if Members agree, and suggests that costs for administration including refreshments, room hire, officer time etc. be shared. Andrew explained that since the paper was drafted, officers have discussed the administration costs and would now recommend that these are met only by the four West Essex/East Herts

SHMA authorities on the Board, i.e. East Herts DC, Epping Forest DC, Harlow DC and Uttlesford DC.

It was agreed that the Board was very useful and should continue. The principle of the four 'core' authorities sharing the costs of administration was agreed, and a more detailed proposal will be brought back to the Board on another occasion. Officers from the four SHMA authorities will report back to their individual Councils.

5. Election of Chair for the municipal year

Attendees thanked Cllr Susan Barker for her good work in chairing the Board meetings for the last municipal year.

Cllr Richard Bassett was nominated to be the Chair for this municipal year. All agreed, and Cllr Bassett chaired the remainder of the meeting.

6. Terms of Reference

It was suggested that the words 'at least' under para. 2.4 were deleted, as this implied that the Chair of the Board should be rotated more than annually. This was agreed, the terms will be amended.

7. West Essex/East Herts SHMA & economic work update

a. Economic work for SHMA area – update

Hardisty Jones Associates gave a presentation as to initial findings on the economic study of the West Essex/East Herts SHMA area. There was a general discussion on how commuting impacted jobs growth, and on the impact of Stansted growing in passenger size and in jobs numbers.

b. West Essex/East Herts SHMA – update re: jobs

Opinion Research Services gave a presentation on the likely impact of the above economic work on the West Essex/East Herts SHMA. There was a general discussion as to changes in commuting, unemployment and 'double-jobbing' and how these affected the need for housing in the SHMA area.

It was noted that both these pieces of work were not yet complete so these were only initial findings. Members are asked to send any questions back through their officers. Draft reports for both will be sent out as soon as they are complete, and in due course will be brought to the Co-op. Board.

8. M11 J7A verbal update from David Sprunt

David Sprunt updated the Board on progress with transport modelling for a future junction 7A on the M11. He explained that there would be a public information exercise starting in July, which will update stakeholders and members of the public as to progress with the Junction 7A modelling work, and how the new junction might affect traffic flow. He noted that work on the design of the junction was continuing, and that there would be a formal public consultation starting in January 2016.

Essex CC officers are happy to meet with individual districts/boroughs to brief officers and/or Members on the content of the public information exercise but this would need to be soon, i.e. at the end of June/beginning of July. **Please could any authorities who would like such briefings contact David asap (david.sprunt@essex.gov.uk) with some available dates.**

Essex CC expects building work on junction 7A would start in 2019/20, lasting for about 18 months.

9. ATLAS support work verbal update

Alison Blom-Cooper explained that officers from the four West Essex/East Herts SHMA authorities were due to meet with the Homes and Communities Agency's ATLAS team (the

Advisory Team for Large Applications) next week. ATLAS has been supporting the SHMA authorities' Members and officers in assessing large potential development sites around Harlow. Officers have discussed a possible joint study assessing such sites around Harlow, how these should be evaluated by the four authorities, with the potential for creating a role to help co-ordinate this work across the SHMA area.

10. A.O.B.

Essex CC Waste Plan – Hamish Barrell explained that Essex CC would be running a 'Revised Preferred Approach' consultation starting in July. This will build on previous work as well as changes to government policy, and although many sites will have been consulted on before, some are new. There is a District/Borough Council engagement event on 18th June, to which all Board Councils should have received an invitation.

Concerns were raised by representatives of Epping Forest DC and Harlow DC that Essex CC Waste & Minerals officers had not shared what sites were within their areas, or given details of the proposals. Hamish stated that details of the sites will be published within the consultation. It was noted that a briefing for all Essex County Cllrs had already been held, but that District Councillors would not be aware of sites within their areas until the public consultation began. Some attendees felt that this was not demonstrating compliance with the Duty to Co-operate, and it was not in line with the aims of this Board. Essex County Cllr Kay Twitchen explained that Essex CC was working to a very tight timetable to meet EU regulations, and said that she would relay attendees' concerns to the relevant Essex CC Cabinet Member.

11. Next meeting

The next Board will be arranged for mid-July – date and location to be confirmed.

Appendix 3

Harlow Council Job Description

Job Title:	Principal Planning Officer (Strategic Sites Coordinator)	Post Number:
Grade:	▪ 15	Date: September 2015
Service:	▪ Planning and Building Control	
Location:	▪ Civic Centre	
Responsible to:	▪ Planning and Building Control Manager	

Job Purpose:

To provide planning expertise and guidance to assist in the coordination of strategic planning matters within East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford District Councils (collectively *the Councils*), in accordance with the provisions of the Duty to Cooperate, particularly in respect of major development sites.

- 1.0
 - To coordinate the evaluation of potential strategic development sites around the wider Harlow area.
- 2.0
 - To establish the impact and benefits of alternative growth options in the light of defined objectives and criteria and the potential development sites being promoted by developers.
- 3.0
 - To prepare a report that sets out options that could help to meet the development needs of the Housing Market Area/Functional Economic Market Area in a sustainable manner that is capable of being jointly endorsed by the four Councils.
- 4.0
 - To facilitate engagement with key stakeholders, including the local community, landowners, developers, Members, parish and town councils, and statutory providers to ensure necessary infrastructure can be brought forward in a timely manner.
- 5.0
 - To advise officers, and members (through the existing Cooperation for Sustainable Development Member Board – which comprises Members from the four Councils above, and other adjoining and relevant bodies), on related matters and to have regard to the sensitivity associated with the obligations of the Duty to Cooperate and to attend and make presentations to the Cooperation for Sustainable Development Member Board and Cooperation for Sustainable Development Officer Group as may be appropriate.
- 6.0
 - Undertake other duties as required.
- 7.0
 - To be familiar with and have regard to Harlow Council's Statement of Health and Safety and other relevant protocols.

8.0 To coordinate the evaluation of potential strategic development sites around the wider Harlow area.

- 8.1** To undertake an assessment of the location, nature and scale of potential strategic development sites being promoted by developers and others within or adjoining Harlow against the background of the emerging technical work, including the joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Joint Economic Report (covering the Functional Economic Market Area), and also studies from the individual authorities where appropriate)
- 8.2** To co-ordinate the preparation of a framework and appropriate criteria within which potential development options can be evaluated.
- 8.3** In conjunction with the respective Councils undertake the evaluation and development of appropriate policy approaches and programmes that could secure the delivery of strategic growth sites, including the requisite infrastructure requirements.

9.0 To establish the impact and benefits of alternative growth options in light of defined objectives and criteria and the potential development sites being promoted by developers.

- 9.1** Review existing socio-economic and environmental conditions across the wider Harlow area using existing evidence base studies and other relevant material as may be appropriate.
- 9.2** Determine the level of infrastructure provision required across the area in order to ensure major new developments secure the wider corporate aims of the Councils and identify and evaluate different approaches how such provision could be delivered, including liaison with statutory bodies.
- 9.3** Consider alternative strategy and policy options and consider their implications and consequences on the areas affected and recommend an approach that best meets the long term development needs of the Councils.

10.0 To prepare a report that sets out options that could help to meet the development needs of the Housing Market Area/Functional Economic Market Area in a sustainable manner that is capable of being jointly endorsed by the four Councils.

- 10.1** Undertake appropriate research and information gathering at national, regional and local levels on a variety of relevant topics to inform the assessment of strategic development options.
- 10.2** Analyse complex technical information, identify trends and present information, using a range of IT packages, to support the evaluation of strategic development proposals in the area.

10.3 To prepare a report that sets out recommendations based on the outcome of the research, describing issues, explaining their implications and alternative solutions to inform discussions of the existing Co-operation for Sustainable Development Boards and officer groups and subsequent decisions made by the respective Councils.

10.4 The report must be capable of forming part of the evidence base assembled by the four Councils in their emerging Local Plans, and set out how the overall process, accords with the obligations of the Duty to Cooperate on strategic planning matters.

11.0 **To facilitate engagement with key stakeholders, including the local community, landowners Members, town and parish councils and statutory providers to ensure necessary infrastructure can be brought forward in a timely manner.**

11.1 Liaise with relevant bodies including adjoining districts, Essex County Council, Hertfordshire County Council, Government Agencies and statutory bodies to exchange information and views, and to consult, discuss and work in partnership with them to deliver the objectives of the Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board.

11.2 Attend internal and external meetings as required, including Cooperation for Sustainable Development Member Board, Cooperation for Sustainable Development Officer technical Groups and other committee, panel and working groups, including making presentations at such meetings, as may be required.

11.3

To evolve a clear understanding of the infrastructure capacity, future requirements and implications relating to the development of strategic sites in and around the Harlow area, and report relevant findings to the Board and officer technical groups.

12.0 **To advise officers and members on related planning matters and to have regard to the sensitivity associated with the obligations of the Duty to Cooperate and to attend and make presentations to the Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board and Cooperation for Sustainable Development Officer Group as may be appropriate**

12.1 Whilst based primarily at Harlow Council, to provide members of the Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board and relevant officers of the respective Councils identified above, with advice and guidance on strategic matters relating to the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

12.2 Where necessary, prepare evidence and appear as the Councils' professional planning witness at planning inquiries, to give evidence and respond to cross-examination.

12.3 Assist in the appointment and management of external consultants as may be appropriate.

13.0 Undertake other duties as required.

13.1 All employees should show a commitment to safeguarding children, young people and vulnerable adults.

13.2 To undertake other duties commensurate with the grade, skills, knowledge and experience of the post holder.

14.0 To be familiar with and have regard to Harlow Council's Statement of Health and Safety and other relevant protocols.

14.1 Harlow Council is committed to the provision of high quality health and safety standards. In order to achieve this all staff employed by the Council has the following specific responsibilities, which are consistent with the requirements of the Health & Safety at Work etc. Act 1974.

- 14.2**
- To take reasonable care for the health and safety of yourself and of other persons who may be affected by what you do or fail to do
 - To co-operate with Harlow Council in order to enable statutory requirements to be implemented
 - Not to intentionally interfere with or misuse anything provided in the interests of health and safety.

Appendix 4

Appendix 5

Uttlesford Local Plan - Meeting Notes

Topic: Historic Environment

Uttlesford District Council Offices

10am Friday 3rd July 2015

Attendees

Ben Cowell – National Trust, Regional Director
Ade Clarke – National Trust, General Manager
Richard Havis – Historic Environment Team
Tom Gilbert Wooldridge – Historic England

Uttlesford District Council

Hannah Hayden – Planning Officer
Sarah Nicholas – Senior Planning Officer
Martin Paine – Planning Policy Team Leader
Andrew Taylor – Assistant Director Planning and Building Control

Notes of the meeting (action points highlighted)

1. **English Heritage** now English Heritage now split into two, with Historic England the new public body sponsored by Department for Culture, Media and Sport performing regulatory functions in relation to planning. English Heritage now run as a charity, with a license to manage over 400 historic properties (including Audley End).
2. **Uttlesford Local Plan:** withdrawn in January following Inspector's report in December 2014. Restarting the process with high level approach to ensure that alternative options are considered to enable a properly justified plan. Starting with consideration of wide range of options for testing including a number of new settlement options, not limited to sites submitted by landowners and developers.
3. **Input to Local Plan process:** Options consultation planned for autumn 2015. Options for high-level comment, not preferred sites. Anticipate further detailed input from stakeholders including historic environment early in 2016 to consider Preferred Options. Iterative nature of plan preparation with increasing detail as initial options are gradually narrowed down and confidence increases in Preferred options.
4. **GIS mapped data inputs to Local Plan process:** UDC currently have listed buildings, conservation areas, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, protected lanes, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, assets of community value.
5. **Approach to 'constraints' and use of mapped data:** Agreed that at this stage mapped data should be considered as a starting point for consideration

rather than 'constraints', because this would depend on site-specific factors which are not known at this stage.

6. **Unmapped evidence/data:** includes qualitative information not mapped but nevertheless should be taken into account. For example the Historic Settlement Character Assessment (2007). Views especially of churches important but not mapped. It was agreed that consideration of these wider factors would be undertaken to inform the development of the Preferred Options in 2016, but not possible to go into this level of detail at this early Options stage.
7. **Hatfield Forest:** Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve (NNR) managed by National Trust. Difficult balance between access and conservation, with soil erosion and woodland edge habitat degradation due to increased visitor pressure. Concern that without intervention Natural England could downgrade SSSI status to unfavourable.
8. **Historic Airfields:** agreed that these would be considered in more detail later in 2016 as part of work on the Preferred Options. Aircraft hangers sometimes considered to be historic assets.

Appendix 6

Uttlesford Local Plan - Meeting Notes

Topic: Natural Environment

Uttlesford District Council Offices

2pm Wednesday 8th July 2015

Attendees

Annie Gordon – Essex Wildlife Trust
Gemma Holmes – Place Services (Ecology team)
Emma Simmonds – Place Services (Ecology team)
Gordon Wyatt – Natural England

Uttlesford District Council

Hannah Hayden – Planning Officer
Sarah Nicholas – Senior Planning Officer
Martin Paine – Planning Policy Team Leader

Notes of meeting

9. **Uttlesford Local Plan:** withdrawn in January following Inspector's report in December 2014. Restarting the process with high level approach to ensure that alternative options are considered to enable a properly justified plan. Starting with consideration of wide range of options for testing including a number of new settlement options, not limited to sites submitted by landowners and developers.
10. **Input to Local Plan process:** Options consultation planned for autumn 2014. Options for high-level comment not preferred sites. Anticipate further detailed input from stakeholders including historic environment early in 2016 to consider Preferred Options. Iterative nature of plan preparation with increasing detail as initial options are gradually narrowed down and confidence increases in preferred options.
11. **GIS mapped data inputs to Local Plan process:** UDC currently have mapped SSSI, National Nature Reserves, local wildlife sites, ancient woodlands and important woodlands.

The following additional data was suggested ...

- Living Landscapes
 - Accessible Natural Greenspace
 - Special Verges
 - Historic Lanes
 - Wildlife Sites Alert map
- Maps should also show SSSI which fall in adjoining districts but adjoin the District boundary. **Action:** EWT to supply GIS data on Living Landscapes and

Accessible Natural Greenspace; ECC to supply up to date GIS layer on special verges

12. **Approach to 'constraints' and use of mapped data:** Raising the issues discussed and the meeting about the Historic Environment it was similarly agreed that at this stage mapped data should be considered as a starting point for consideration rather than 'constraints' divided into absolute, medium and low, because this would depend on site-specific factors which are not known at this stage.
13. **Buffer zones to SSSI:** It was agreed that the buffer zones suggested by Natural England do not take into account context and impacts and do not need to be shown at this stage. However, more detailed consideration of specific impact pathways and potential mitigation measures would be needed as potential locations for development begin to emerge.
14. **Air Quality Issues on the Natural Environment:** These generally arise from the airport (from aircraft and vehicles) and roads. Concerns are generally raised if a road is within 200m of a SSSI, although in practice this can reduce to 50m depending on the size and amount of traffic on a road.
15. **Water Quality and the Natural Environment.** The Council's existing Water Cycle Study would be an important source of information on this.
16. **Local Wildlife Sites:** Local wildlife sites in Uttlesford are generally small and evenly spread across the district. They are therefore the key reserve of biodiversity in the District. If wildlife linkages and corridors can be improved and/or created between Local Wildlife Sites this would enhance the biodiversity of the District.
17. **Hatfield Forest:** Similar concerns about damage to the forest from visitors accessing from Flich Way were raised as at the meeting on the Historic Environment. The idea of safeguarding land around the Forest as future public open space to relieve the pressure on the historic forest was suggested.
18. **European Designated Sites.** Habitats Regulations Scoping Report (2012) indicated that there would be no discernible impact of development in Uttlesford on European designated sites such as Ramsar, Special Areas of Conservation or Special Protection Areas. Such areas on the Essex coast would be unlikely to be impacted, and Epping Forest and the Lea Valley sites are too far away. A new scoping report will be prepared to support the new Local Plan.
19. **Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.** Council will consult on scoping report including environmental criteria to be used to assess potential development locations in the emerging plan. Statutory consultees include Environment Agency and Natural England. Essex Wildlife Trust to be added to list of consultees. Place Services are the Council's consultants on SA.

Appendix 7

Duty to Co-operate Meeting

Initial Uttlesford District Council Meeting –9 April 2015 at 2pm, Uttlesford District Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden

MEETING NOTES

Summary of Actions Agreed at this Meeting

Action 1 – It was agreed by all that Minutes of this, and all future meetings will be agreed by attendees and kept by Chelmsford City Council (CCC) and Uttlesford District Council (UDC) and published as appropriate as an audit.

Action 2 – Agree that UDC and CCC should liaise with one another in relation to SFRA work.

Action 3 – A further meeting should be set up once UDC have draft options ready for consultation. It is suggested that this is likely to be September 2015.

Action 4 – It was agreed that further Duty to Co-operate meetings would be set up as and when needed.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Attendees:

(JMP) Jeremy Potter – Senior Planning Policy Officer, Chelmsford City Council

(LJP) Laura Percy – Planning Policy Officer, Chelmsford City Council

(AT) Andrew Taylor – Assistant Director Planning and Building Control, Uttlesford District Council

(SN) Sarah Nicholas – Senior Planning Officer, Uttlesford District Council

2. Purpose of the meeting and the Duty to Co-operate

2.1 JMP set out what the Duty to Co-operate is and the need to engage with others. The purpose of these meetings is to set out where Chelmsford City Council (CCC) are and where we are going in terms of the new Local Plan, and to identify any strategic cross boundary issues between CCC and Uttlesford District Council (UDC).

Action 1 – It was agreed by all that Minutes of this, and all future meetings will be agreed by attendees and kept by Chelmsford City Council (CCC) and Uttlesford District Council (UDC) and published as appropriate as an audit.

3. Existing plans, emerging Local Plan and Evidence Base (Presentation)

3.1 JMP set out the existing adopted plan covering the period to 2021 and the progress which has been made on this. He advised that CCC has adopted an

interim housing target of 800 dwellings per annum ahead of adoption of the new Local Plan.

3.2 JMP set out the need for a new plan to cover issues such as Objectively Assessed Needs (AON), 5 year land supply and infrastructure requirements. An OAN paper is currently being carried out by Peter Brett Associates for Chelmsford, Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils.

3.3 JMP stated that approximately 3500 homes allocated in the existing plan will roll into the new plan period, i.e. post 2021. Approximately 2000 of these already have planning permission.

3.4 JMP advised that CCC are currently testing housing scenarios based on the EPOA Edge Analytics Greater Essex Demographic Projections.

3.5 JMP stated that the new plan will consist of at least two stages of formal consultation in addition to the discussions which will take place as part of the Duty to Co-operate.

3.6 JMP set out that key constraints for CCC would be flood plains, Green Wedges, the Green Belt, and key landscapes.

3.7 JMP advised that the NE Chelmsford Bypass was safeguarded in the current CCC Plan and it was the intention of CCC and ECC that this should come forward in the future.

3.8 JMP stated that the strategic highway and rail networks will be an important factor in determining where growth can be accommodated.

3.9 JMP asked if UDC had any proposals for development close to its border with Chelmsford City Council.

3.10 AT advised that a planning application had recently been refused for 700-800 homes to the north of Fitch Green, but nothing was planned for the south of these Villages.

4. Uttlesford District Council – Initial thoughts, priorities, needs, implications etc.

4.1 AT advised that UDC are currently out with a Call for Sites following their Examination. UDC will shortly have a joint SHMA drafted which will give an overall housing number for the housing market area, as well as breaking down a number for each authority. It is envisaged that UDC would be in a position to have further discussions with CCC in Summer 2015 once they have established numbers and are considering different spatial strategies for their new Plan. This will also involve reviewing draft allocations from the withdrawn submission plan which do not have planning permission..

4.2 A consultation for UDC is planned for Autumn 2015. This will include housing numbers the results from the Call for Sites and different distribution strategies.

4.3 AT advised that in addition to UDC housing requirement it will need to ensure that the full housing need for the SHMA area is being delivered by the partner Councils and consider any request to assist with meeting housing requirements from other Councils.

4.4 JMP asked if there was likely to be any potential for development along the A120. If there is to be any such development consideration should be given as to how traffic would feed down towards CCC. If any significant development is proposed CCC would welcome how this may assist with the NE Chelmsford Bypass.

4.5 JMP asked if there was anything UDC would be looking to, or have concerns with, within CCC's new Local Plan.

4.6 AT advised that UDC had no major strategic cross boundary issues. The main issue to consider would be CCC's views on any new settlements along the A120.

4.7 JMP requested that CCC are contacted and consideration be given to joint working on UDC SFRA.

Action 2 – Agree that UDC and CCC should liaise with one another in relation to SFRA work.

5. Future liaison and working arrangements

5.1 AT suggested it would be useful to meet again once UDC had their options ready for consultation (likely to be Summer 2015).

Action 3 – A further meeting should be set up once UDC have draft options ready for consultation. It is suggested that this is likely to be July/August 2015.

5.2 JMP raised the issue as required by the DtC that UDC and CCC should consider a joint strategy. All agreed that this was probably unlikely to be required as there were no major strategic issues which needed to be considered collectively. Both authorities' plans were pretty much aligned so it was considered that this was a better approach and that the Duty to Co-operate would be the forum to liaise with one another on any issues which occur.

5.3 JMP set out that CCC had carried out a Call for Sites in December 2014.

6. Duty to Co-operate Strategy

6.1 JMP introduced the document. SN confirmed that Uttlesford had been consulted on the document and had no issues with it.

7. The Next Steps - Action 4 – It was agreed that further Duty to Co-operate meetings would be set up as and when needed.

Appendix 8

Uttlesford Local Plan - Meeting Notes

Topic: Transport Assessment

Essex County Council Offices

2pm Thursday, 6th August 2015

Attendees

Essex County Council

Katherine Wilkinson – Strategic Development Engineer

David Sprunt – Principal Transport Strategy and Engagement Officer

Matt Bradley – Strategic Development Manager

Uttlesford District Council

Martin Paine – Planning Policy Team Leader

Jeremy Pine - Planning Policy / Development Management Liaison Officer

Notes of meeting

20. **Uttlesford Local Plan:** Withdrawn in January following Inspector's report in December 2014. Restarting the process with a high level approach to ensure that alternative options are considered to enable a properly justified plan. Starting with consideration of a wide range of options for testing including a number of new settlement options, not limited to sites submitted by landowners and developers. "Areas of Search" were presented to the Planning Policy Working Group on 27th July, and it is likely that these may flush out other candidate sites from landowners.
21. **Options:** A main problem for UDC will be site delivery in the first 5 years of the new plan, although there are some extant planning permissions that will help. The Planning Inspectorate likes to see a mix of sites to avoid the "eggs in one basket" danger. UDC may need to be proactive and contact landowners. It was noted that the joined appeals decision re Elsenham and West of Dunmow was overdue, probably because of the Inspectorate's high workload. UDC's assessment work needs to test and explore to come up with evidence if sites are either to go forward for further assessment or are to be rejected. UDC is already working with Garden City Developments on assessment of the 10 most major sites identified in the Call for Sites process.
22. **M11 Junction 8:** Lack of mitigation was identified as a major snagging issue in the Inspector's report. ECC is still looking at design and mitigation, and is undertaking trip reassignment on the VISUM model which may buy another year or two of capacity. Whatever, J8 is still likely to fail in 2025, and the mitigation required would be beyond what a Local Plan could be expected to

deliver. As Manchester Airports Group (M.A.G) are also looking as J8 design and mitigation for airport expansion purposes (in particular a northbound slip), it would be appropriate to meet with them to compare work streams and ensure there is no duplication of work. M.A.G's work will need to be included in the VISUM model. ECC is happy to meet with M.A.G and UDC.

23. **Appointment of a Transport Consultant:** UDC members are keen that the Council appoints a transport consultant to assist it in the Local Plan Transport Assessment process. The appointed consultant could help to give an overview, identify any "showstoppers" and carry out sustainability assessment. A tender document is currently being drawn up in consultation with the Council's Procurement Manager. Castle Point DC prepared a similar brief, which UDC might like to look at. ECC is willing to comment on the content of the final brief, and to be involved in interviewing the candidate consultants. ECC warned that a wide brief could become very expensive – commissioning design work and modelling could cost anything up to £100k or more and could take a considerable period of time. UDC's aim of having a consultant appointed by October was over-ambitious – commencement by Christmas was more realistic. ECC would be willing to attend meetings with UDC's consultants, but dates need to be put into diaries as early as possible. These meetings could be useful if they help to flush out constraints.

Appendix 9

Joint Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan (RWLP): Revised Preferred Approach

Meeting: 9th September, 10:00 – 12:00, Saffron Walden, Room 7
UDC

Present

Hamish Barrell – Principal Planner Essex County Council

Gemma Bright – Minerals and Waste Planning Officer Essex County Council

Sarah Nicholas – Senior Planning Officer Uttlesford District Council

Plan Update

Consultation responses

Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (ECC & SBC) received approx. 1000 comments from approx. 500 representations across the suite of consultation documents. Specifically (172 comments - the most individual comments on an individual site) Elsenham, (28) Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) at the Crumps farm complex, (1) Dunmow Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW), (1+) Armigers. We are analysing these, the results of which will be described in 'outcomes reports' which will feed in to RWLP Pre-sub document.

Timetable towards Pre Submission Plan

ECC & SBC Minerals & Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) states Regulation 19 would be December 2015, but more likely to be Spring 2016 Uttlesford (UTT) Issues and Options consultation in Oct 2015 (includes Areas of Search). Strategic Housing Market Availability Assessment (SHMAA) to be sent to the working group at the end of Sept, together with the Issues and Options consultation documents. Draft Plan to be produced in 2016.

UTT has new members including 9 new members representing 'Residents for Uttlesford' A Team Leader has been appointed to the Planning Policy Team.

Sites

Context at County level

Looks to accommodate sites in terms of our projected need, based on 2x call for sites.

Noted the predominant volume need is inert waste management. Sieving methodology explained

District specific issues- responses

Crumps Farm, L(n)3/W23

UTT would like confirmation this is the most efficient use of the preferred/existing MLP sites are being used for waste management
Crumps wasn't selected during this stage, but this may change once we analyse and action (if appropriate) responses.

ACTION ECC: Check the current on site operations and report back to UTT

ACTION: Could ECC investigate using the existing processing area be used rather than putting aggregate recycling on the new sites?

Little Bullocks, L(n)7R

UTT would like confirmation this is the most efficient use of the preferred/existing Minerals Local Plan (MLP) sites are being used for waste management

UTT notes access may be an issue on this site re crossing the Flich Way & access to Strategic route hierarchy

The sites MLP were able to be delivered to low level (no significant imports of waste to achieve restoration. However, we've needed to reassess our needs based on what's come forward from site promoters and Ln7R was one of those sites.

Access has been fully assessed as per the methodology (via the current site access), with specialists highways comments feeding directly in to the site selection process.

Little Bullocks, L(n)8R

UTT requests ECC ensures Duty to Cooperate (DtC) is undertaken with other Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) re availability of other landfill capacity for SNRHW & that there are no other suitable sites within Essex

Consider cumulative impacts of SNRHW alongside inert waste management

UTT noted access is an issue on this site re crossing the Flich Way & access to Strategic route hierarchy

ECC confirmed past & on-going DtC with other WPAs about availability for similar waste management facilities beyond the plan area is scheduled to be carried out (by end of Sept 15)

ECC confirmed No other landfill sites have been submitted within Essex as capable of accepting SNRHW. Since closure of Roxwell, we are managing very little of our own hazardous waste, either stable non-reactive hazardous waste (e.g. Asbestos) or other types hazardous waste, which presents problems to us in terms of net self-sufficiency. There has been no active investigation of potential voids that could accommodate SNRHW, but it should be noted that the London clay at Little Bullocks would be in principle suitable with minimal additional

engineering to accommodate this waste stream. This may be because it is potentially more viable than other sites due to environmental controls.

Access has been fully assessed as per the methodology (via the current site access), with specialists highways comments feeding directly in to the site selection process.

ECC noted we are having continuing DtC with adjacent and important WPAs who potentially could accommodate our waste.

UTT agrees in principle of using minerals sites for landfill.

ACTION ECC: ENSURE THE ACCESS POINTS ARE NOTED IN PLANS FOR PRE SUB

Elsenham (W8)

Concerns over allocation re:

Local designation in local plan as Historic Park & Garden (Policy ENV9. UTT identified this park **in addition** to those on the national register, policy is considered on a site by site basis at the point of application. Policy wording includes ‘Development proposals likely to harm significant harm historic parks and gardens ...as defined on the proposals map will not be permitted unless the need for development outweighs the historic significance of the site’.

Abuts an area of important woodland (Policy ENV8)

Proximity of Elsenham Hall (GII listed) and church (GI listed)

Existing minerals site (at Elsenham) - cumulative impact, especially on highway impacts?

Existing recycling plant at Loppingdales – can ECC use existing sites rather than this new on?

Golf and leisure club (recreation)

Proximity of hotel in east (De Salis)

Greenfield site

ECC noted it was a non-selected site in 2011, but now required through the revaluation of our needs and the approach nationally where the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) doesn't give as much weight to greenfield protection.

ECC agreed there are new issues for consideration that arose during consultation and confirmed these would be fully fed in to the site assessments review..

Ex-Jam factory, is now part of existing Industrial Estate, including bottled water plant, there is also an extension area to this site ‘Elsenham Meadows

ACTION UTT: To provide details of this potential extension area as specified in the withdrawn UTT plan.

ECC noted if we invited Loppingdales to submit their sites; it may result in 2 suitable sites for allocation & would not be consistent with our overall approach.

ACTION ECC: Discuss with operator if there is potential to accommodate proposed site on existing site area

ACTION ECC: Is the whole of the red line area necessary or could this be accommodated on a smaller portion of the site – location within this large site could be more detrimental in one part than the other.

Agree with non allocation of Widdington (W24) & Armigers Farm (W35 & L(i)8R)

ECC Noted that this may change as part of the review of the site assessment methodology and scores. It was noted road access are an issue with both.

UTT asked why Widdington wasn't considered as site is close to the main road hierarchy.

ACTION ECC: what are the current operations/end dates at Widdington and confirm if it is an increase in capacity or size they are seeking?

ECC noted Newport existing chalk site has been put forward during last consultation for inert recycling & landfilling. UTT informed ECC this had been submitted as a site for housing in the now withdrawn local plan.

Traffic impacts on Newport Village is a concern.

Discussion around Uttlesford Local Plan considerations

Concern raised over adding **waste consultation zones** to Policy Maps.

Would prefer to add these to constraints maps - See agenda item 6

Areas of Search (AoS)

Context at County level

The AoS has identified capacity across Essex to accommodate different facilities however the spatial distribution is not equal.

District specific issues- responses

UTT Disagree with **Ashdon Road Commercial Centre**, (S. Walden) as it has not taken in to account permission (UTT/13/2423/OP) on the site itself. *Suggested the planning permission referenced by ECC, is on the opposite side of the road.*

Action: ECC to check that the PP that we quote are on the site.

The proposed site has PP for a new Builders Merchants store and yard (Ridgeons - own whole site), B1, B2 and B8 uses, A1, A3 and A4 uses, Class C1 hotel (to be located within Area of Search) and up to 167 dwellings (to be located adjacent to Area of Search to the west).

Currently demolishing existing industrial buildings and erecting new

store.

UTT noted that in theory the B use class buildings could be used, but would any be big enough/further enough away from consented housing?

ACTION UTT to suggest some Industrial Estates which may they consider to be more appropriate for waste management for our consideration.

Disagree with **Start Hill (Gt Halingbury)** as it has not taken in to account permission (UTT/14/0138/FUL) on the site itself.

ECC Suggests no amendments to the Areas of Search are proposed as a result of this consultation rep comment.

Discussion around Uttlesford Local Plan considerations

UTT noted potential opportunity near the Recycling Centre for Household Waste (RCHW) in Saffron Walden. ECC to check the existing permissions.

Noted UTT losing a number of industrial Estate allocations to housing

UTT noted there may be additional employment use space as part of an UTT permission behind Gt Dunmow LACW site. ECC to Check.

It was noted in the future there is potential to relax restrictions around the airport to allow non-airport related development although deliverability of waste facilities given ownership is doubtful. Also this may not be in line with our timescales.

District Specific Issues

Gt Dunmow WDA transfer & PA3 – Site allocations LACW

Concern that the policy as written would provide for intensification of site, beyond development permitted. Further evidence needs to be provided. *ECC Response noted the site has been assessed through the site assessment process.*

UTT agree with Vision, ECC Response, noted

Agrees with Strategic objectives, **BUT not net self sufficiency** re Hazardous waste, if DtC reveals there are suitable sites outside the Plan area. See *ECC response to Little Bullocks, L(n)8R*

District specific issues- responses – *None raised.*

AMR Discussion/Data Collection

ECC noted that UTT has a chalk (minerals safeguarding area) MSA and some (minerals consultation areas) MCAs surrounding existing sites. ECC requested that UTT assist in us collecting non-mineral related development within these areas, between 01/04/14 and 31/03/15, for which the Minerals Planning Authority would have been consulted (Monitoring indicator 9). An email would be sent within the next 2 weeks confirming the scope of the

request and a form to be filled in. It was noted ECC would be grateful if the form could be filled in by UTT officers, in a potentially short deadline (2-3 weeks) if at all possible.

The future method of collection that would be most efficient to both authorities was discussed. It was noted by UTT that should it be an annual request this would be undertaken by the policy team, whilst on a case by case basis would be a DM/admin task. ACTION UTT: to consider further which method would be most appropriate and ECC will endeavour to accommodate this request.

Safeguarding- Consultation Zones

UTT response, preferring use of a constraints GIS layer, rather than adding this to the policy map was noted.

How will the process work?

ECC noted they are considering this approach (constraints, rather than policy map) may be more appropriate, following the responses received. We are considering this further. It was noted that this method may have the impact that potential developers would not be as aware of these areas and therefore, need to be highlighted by officers during pre-application procedures and at the point of validation to ensure sufficient information is submitted for the WPA to comment.

Discussion- how will this work for districts?

ECC noted this would result in us periodically sending GIS layers to Districts where new sites are permitted, to be considered by DM officers during standard Pre-app/validation procedures.

Alternatives/Improvements? UTT suggested that GIS updates would be most appropriately sent at the point of determination to ensure they are most up to date with Waste consultation Zones

Outcomes/actions and next steps from meeting

Summary of Actions

ACTION ECC: Check the current on site operations at Crumps and report back to UTT. **DEADLINE: 3 weeks**

ACTION: Could ECC investigate using the existing processing area at Crumps be used rather than putting aggregate recycling on the new sites? **DEADLINE: 3 weeks**

ACTION ECC: Ensure the access points are noted in plans for pre-sub
DEADLINE: Publication of Pre-sub

ACTION UTT: To provide details of this potential extension area as specified in the withdrawn UTT plan. **DEADLINE: 2 weeks**

ACTION ECC: Discuss with operator of Elsenham if there is potential to

accommodate proposed site on existing site area. **DEADLINE: 2 weeks**

ACTION ECC: Is the whole of the red line area for Elsenham necessary or could this be accommodated on a smaller portion of the site – location within this large site could be more detrimental in one part than the other.

DEADLINE: 2 weeks

ACTION ECC: what are the current operations/end dates at Widdington and confirm if it is an increase in capacity or size they are seeking? **DEADLINE: 2 weeks**

Action: ECC to check that the PP that we quote is on the Ashdon AoS.

DEADLINE: 3 weeks

ACTION UTT to suggest some Industrial Estates which may they consider to be more appropriate for waste management for our consideration.

DEADLINE: 2 weeks

Is a further meeting required?

UTT requested that another meeting is held if the results of the outcomes report do not look to address/modify the outcomes of the Revise Preferred Approach towards Pre-submission- therefore as and when needed.

Would be useful to have a meeting either just before or once pre-sub is published to help with understanding of the document.

Appendix 10

Notes from the East Herts & West Essex

Planning Policy Development Group

9th September 2015

Introductions

Paul MacBride (PM) – Harlow DC
Amanda Thorn (AT) – Epping Forest DC
Alison Blom-Cooper (ABC) – Epping Forest DC
Jeremy Pine (JP) - Uttlesford DC
Sarah King (SK) – Epping Forest DC
Steve Smith (SS) – Aecom
Rob Smith (RS) – Atlas
James Farrar (JF)- Atlas
Sophie Leaning (SL) – Harlow DC
David Sprunt (DS) – Essex CC Highways
Mary Young (MY) – Essex CC Highways
Andy Jobling (AJ – Highways England
Kay Mead (KM) – East Herts DC
Sue Jackson (SJ) – Hertfordshire CC Highways
Roger Flowerday (RJ) - Hertfordshire CC Highways

Apologies

Dianne Cooper – Harlow DC
Graeme Bloomer – Harlow DC

Junction 7

DS confirmed that the J7 & 8 study is now complete and will soon be ready for publication. He also confirmed that J7 is at capacity which means that there is need for immediate capacity improvements.

AJ advised that Highways England were examining options for Junction 7 that should be clarified by late 2016, with design options selected by the end of 2017, design finalised by mid-2018, orders in place by 2019 and work due to commence in 2020. These works will address the existing development commitments in Harlow and provide some limited capacity for future growth.

It was confirmed that J7a would still be required to address development requirements by 2017 and definitely beyond 2020.

PM inquired what the position of HE be if premature planning applications were submitted.

AJ advised that in the absence of highway mitigation measures, the HE would object to any scheme that increased congestion or increased the risk of collision.

RS questioned the costing figures that had referenced by the Roads Investment Strategy.

AJ confirmed these were possibly too low and not the final figures. Costs will be refined as options are developed

AJ clarified that the Road Infrastructure Strategy (RIS) aims to better manage existing growth plus take into account predicted growth based on population projections, but that it does not necessarily take into account growth aspirations.

PM questioned this and AJ explained that they initially base their work on committed growth but can't necessarily resolve all additional growth aspirations.

RS questioned whether proposed short-term interventions would go ahead and DS advised they were still to be decided.

SS asked how Highways England would respond to large applications that may come in in the near future.

AJ stated that there is a need to recognise development must work with current infrastructure.

PM highlighted the fact that local authorities and highways organisations are duty bound, through the Duty to Cooperate to assist in delivering the Government's growth agenda, but this is challenging given that transport and planning timelines were not aligned and as officers we need to make the case to Government for this issue to be addressed. He also made the point that it was necessary to differentiate between meeting needs identified through evidence and wider aspirations.

AJ agreed stating that funding certainty had now been extended to a five year cycle so is becoming more in line. He added that there was a chicken and egg situation emerging where transport planners are waiting for Local Plans on which to assess infrastructure requirements and vice versa.

PM also raised an issue with the Essex Waste Plan proposal located in Epping south of Junction 7.

DS agreed to look at the issue of whether this would impede the widening of the slip road on the M11 north towards Junction 7 should this be deemed necessary.

Junction 7A update

DS confirmed that the report and model had recently been sent to Highways England for validation. Following a meeting in October there may be some tweaks to be made, but final validation should happen by the end of October.

DS agreed that copies of this report would be distributed. In terms of the Harlow options for the model, it is currently set to model median growth of around 10,000

dwellings. These tests are focused on testing junction 7A operation but are not necessarily useful for Local Plans as certain developments (e.g. Harlow East) have been removed.

PM stated that the Local Authorities would want to use the model to help them to ascertain the best spatial options. Members want to be informed on longer term growth. These solutions need to be modelled.

MY stated that higher, long-term growth has started to be run and does show pressure points across the road network.

SS questioned whether large-scale improvements may make things worse on the roads in the short term.

AJ responded by explaining that while junction 7 funding is in place, funding for 7a is not. In order to prove 7a is required other solutions, such as smaller-scale network improvements including a link road across J7 between Harlow and Epping will need to be explored, if these are effective then 7a may be delayed or not agreed at all at this point. Smaller-scale improvements may be all that happens in the interim.

DS add that this work would be phased, depending on how successful the capacity improvements to junction 7 were. Whilst Local Plan's need to be in place sites would not be implemented at once which depend on road proposals.

RF asked about whether then we are looking to identify a tipping point for junction 7 before the 7a proposal is taken seriously.

DS advised that the model would help with phasing and putting clear timescales for the 7a need in place.

SS asked whether the Northern bypass was still on the table.

DS stated that yes but that would much longer term, over 15 years. Modelling of this had created a significant increase of traffic on the A414.

MY added that the main issue in Harlow was the volume of traffic moving both in and out and that this doesn't necessarily address this issue.

MY asked for LP sites to be put forward for testing against the model,. It was agreed that the various scenarios for testing would be compiled at the Strategic OAN meeting on Friday 18th September. Testing a scenario takes around 3 weeks in total.

SS agreed that a coordinated response was needed and stated that the ultimate aim has to be to have a memorandum of understanding which works for all authorities from Highways England and the County Council that will aid in getting Local Plans approved.

AJ questioned whether the Planning Inspectorate understood that RIS worked on a five year cycle and that funding further ahead can't be guaranteed.

DS advised that there were other sources of funding including SELEP, developers and ECC.

SS pointed out the LPs need to demonstrate certainty for the first five years but that further on the certainty may decrease and that this will be accepted by an inspector as long as there is a plan B in place.

AJ added that private sector contributions would help to prioritise this scheme competing against other infrastructure improvements.

SS asked how assumptions for other areas were built into the model.

MY stated that background growth for all areas was modelled.

HCC and A414 study

RF explained that HCC had created a A414 model which was designed to help identify traffic hotspots which could then be investigated in more detail.

SJ added that improving junctions on the A414 was not an easy option. The road still had capacity to cover the next five years of growth in Hertfordshire.

RF stated that potential future changes to the A414 could include creating a strategic link to Stansted.

AJ agreed that a recent study had concluded that work was needed on east-west linkages across the country.

DS added that while that not extending the A414 could prove to be a limiting factor for growth to the north of Harlow, an extension could create more problems in Hertford.

AJ asked whether conversations had been had with rail service providers.

RF stated that there did need to be a more integrated approach and commented that Harlow may want to look at plans for Crossrail2, linking it with possible development to the North of the town.

Update on Junction 8

DS stated that junction 8 issues had been covered in the headway study. He added that different element of the proposal could be introduced at different times.

Integrated Transport Strategy

DS explained that the ITS for Harlow report was due to be consulted on soon. It focused on utilising the cycle network and reducing demand for the car.

PM added that it was essential that new developments around Harlow needed to integrate into the existing network.

AJ added that it is hard for new developments to prove that they will have minimal impacts on the roads- there is no guarantee what people will choose to do.

RS questioned how sustainable transport as modelled into the ECC junction 7a model.

Rail transport matters

PM observed that other transport matters need to be considered at future meetings of the Group of which the ITS may form part in order to demonstrate an integrated approach to transport matters.

AOB

None

Date of next meeting

TBC