



Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

Planning Policy Working Group

Date: Wednesday, 22 February 2017
Time: 19:00
Venue: Council Chamber
Address: Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Members: Councillors S Barker, P Davies, A Dean, S Harris, J Lodge, J Loughlin, A Mills, E Oliver, J Parry, H Rolfe (Chairman)

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

- 1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**
To receive any apologies for absence and declarations of interest.
- 2 Minutes of previous meeting** 5 - 12
To consider the minutes of the previous meeting.
- 3 Housing White Paper** 13 - 16
To receive a summary of the Housing White Paper
- 4 Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) update** 17 - 20
To receive an update on the OAHN
- 5 Regulation 18 Consultation Paper** 21 - 24
To receive a briefing note on the Regulation 18 consultation
- 6 Water Cycle Study Outline Update** 25 - 30
To consider an update on the water cycle study outline.

- | | | |
|-----------|--|---------|
| 7 | Local Plan Evidence Base Update
To receive an update on the evidence base studies | 31 - 32 |
| 8 | Action Plan Planning Advisory Service
To consider a report on the Action Plan Planning Advisory Service. | 33 - 36 |
| 9 | Duty to cooperate report
To consider an update on the duty to cooperate. | 37 - 66 |
| 10 | Project Plan: Key Milestones
To consider the Project Plan Key Milestones | 67 - 68 |
| 11 | PPWG Forward Plan
To consider the PPWG Forward Plan. | 69 - 72 |
| 12 | Any other items which the Chairman considers to be urgent
To consider any items which the Chairman considers to be urgent. | |
| 13 | Date of next meeting
The date of the next meeting to be 6 April 2017. | |

MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC

Agendas, reports and minutes for this meeting can be viewed on the Council's website www.uttlesford.gov.uk. For background papers in relation to this meeting please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510369/433.

Members of the public who have registered to do so are permitted to speak at this meeting, to a maximum number of five speakers in relation to each main agenda item. A maximum of 3 minutes is permitted for members of the public to speak. You will need to register with the Democratic Services Officer by 2pm on the day before the meeting. Late requests to speak may not be allowed. You may only speak on the item indicated.

Agenda and Minutes are available in alternative formats and/or languages. For more information please call 01799 510510.

Facilities for people with disabilities

The Council Offices has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate. If you are deaf or have impaired hearing and would like a signer available at a meeting, please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510369 as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

Fire/emergency evacuation procedure

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest designated fire exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by a designated officer. It is vital you follow their instructions.

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510433, 510369 or 510548

Email: Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

General Enquiries

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Telephone: 01799 510510

Fax: 01799 510550

Email: uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Website: www.uttlesford.gov.uk

**PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN on 10 JANUARY 2017 at 7.00pm**

Present: Councillor H Rolfe – Chairman
Councillors S Barker, A Dean, S Harris, J Lodge, J Loughlin, A Mills, E Oliver and J Parry.

Officers in attendance: M Cox (Democratic Services Officer), R Fox (Planning Policy Team Leader), G Glenday (Assistant Director Planning), G Holmes (Planning Policy Officer) and R Harborough (Director of Public Services).

PP30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Davies.

PP31 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2016 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

It was agreed that a list of the actions arising from the meeting would be attached to the minutes. There had been no actions arising from the meeting on the 28 November.

PP32 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Chris Bowden from Troy Consulting presented a report on the Infrastructure Levy (CIL). He explained that the CIL was a fixed levy on new development, which could be spent on infrastructure anywhere in the district and had been intended to largely replace Section 106 as a mechanism for securing contributions from development that would fund new infrastructure. As part of the development of the Local Plan, the Council had to consider whether to put in place a CIL charge or to continue to use just Section 106. This decision was now in the context of a more restrictive legal framework, which only allowed the pooling of up to five Section 106 agreements for any one infrastructure type or item.

This issue had been considered in 2014, when it had been concluded that there was insufficient justification to take forward a CIL charge. This was mainly because Section 106 could deliver the necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the sites. However, the new emerging Local Plan was likely to propose a greater number of larger strategic sites. Also, the council was likely to breach the pooling limits in the near future, which could hinder the use Section 106 to secure contributions for future developments.

It was explained that the strategic sites were likely to pay CIL at a rate of £0/m² due to the high cost of on-site infrastructure provision. However, contributions

from other growth could be used to address these or any other infrastructure needs.

The report concluded that there was likely to be merit in putting a CIL charge in place. There would also need to be work to identify the infrastructure to support the strategic sites and how this could be secured through the Section 106 mechanism. A review of CIL had been carried out by a Government appointed expert panel and Members would need to consider the implications of this as well as any outcomes from the Government White Paper. The next step was to carry out further analysis of the funding and the infrastructure that could be brought forward by each option.

In answer to a question regarding the relationship between CIL and health provision, it was acknowledged that this was a complex area. Long term planning for health was only 3- 5 years compared to the longer period of the plan. It was important to update the infrastructure delivery plan and to improve consultation and engagement with the CCG.

The meeting discussed how the CIL would operate in practise and acknowledged the need to put in place governance and decision making principles to ensure the money was spent appropriately and also to prepare for the likely requirement for additional staff to run an effective CIL system.

The Chairman thanked Mr Bowden for this report. He said there would be a continuing dialogue on this issue with a view to making a decision when the evidence developed later in the process.

PP33

LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE BASE - UPDATE

The Planning Policy Team Leader provided an update on the Local Plan evidence base, which set out the evidence that had been commissioned since the Local Plan pause. He said the status of all the studies was recorded on a master spread sheet and some of these studies might need to be revisited as they had now become out of date.

Nick Buhaenko-Smith spoke to the meeting concerning issues around the proposed site to the west of Braintree. A copy of his statement is attached to these minutes.

The Chairman thanked Mr Buhaenko-Smith for his comments and said these would be addressed as the plan progressed. He stressed the importance of having a clear project plan in place as soon as possible.

A question was asked about the highway testing and modelling for South Cambs and whether there had been a dialogue to understand the main concerns and how these might be mitigated to allow for the development of a strategic site.

Cllr Rolfe said there would be a member/officer meeting with South Cambs later in the week. This discussion was part of the specific work being done since the pause, which also included

- The future housing numbers for the district

- The A120 developments
- Saffron Walden and other alternative models
- Evidence in relation to the Great Chesterford site

The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers would be meeting with south Cambs and Cambridge City to discuss the details of the highway modelling requested by Cambridgeshire County Council on the implications of the potential development on the roads on both sides of the border.

Cllr Dean said there still appeared to be a lot of work to be done before the council was in a position to make a decision on any of the strategic sites. He asked for an assurance that the related meetings would be minuted to provide an audit trail.

In relation to the project plan, officers were looking at the evidence base in the context of the governance arrangements and the resulting timetable would form the basis of the updated Local Development Scheme.

The report was noted.

PP34

ACTION PLAN FOR THE LOCAL PLAN – UPDATE

The working group was advised that the report commissioned from IPE, through the Planning Advisory Service, on the progress of the Local Plan had now been received and officers' had prepared a draft action plan in response. The Scrutiny Committee had requested this report and would therefore consider it at the meeting on 17 January, but it was considered useful to have the views of PPWG at this stage.

The Assistant Director Planning said the recommendations were broadly in line with the work that was already being undertaken. This included considering an additional consultation and updating the Sustainability Appraisal. These issues would be discussed at the member workshop 1st February, as well as considering the 2016 housing figures for the SCHMAA authorities and the upcoming White Paper. The action plan also recommended updates to various studies and work on these was already underway.

In relation to the possible increase in housing numbers, members were informed that the neighbouring authorities Epping Forest and East Herts had submitted their plans based on a figure between the 2012 – 2014 AECOM projections. The Inspector had advised UDC that it should take the 2014 figure (14,100 dwellings) as a starting point and then test this figure.

Cllr Lodge reminded the group that UDC was still working to its existing housing number of 12,500 dwellings. He said the council's project plan was missing more significant work around the new settlements and he was concerned that UDC was falling behind its neighbours in working up plans. He understood that three councils in Essex had set up the overarching vehicle to deliver these sites and he would like assurance that work was going on in the background.

The Director of Public Services said that the reports from Braintree, Tendring and Colchester had deliberately separated the preparation of Local Plans from

the establishment of mechanisms to deliver the new settlements. It was appropriate to say in a local plan that the council was proposing the delivery of a strategic development in accordance with Garden settlement principles but not to select sites on the basis of the type of delivery vehicle, particularly if this was a council owned company. However, he said that credible delivery arrangements would support housing supply, which could be material. He said work was continuing on this policy area. There was the option for UDC to join the North Essex authorities' company structure to deliver garden communities if a proposal came forward in the west of Braintree area that included UDC land.

The Chairman said he recognised that there was a lot of work going on but to ensure visibility he would like the strategic sites to be specifically referenced in the Project Plan. He also requested that the Project Plan be circulated as soon as possible, to include a timetable with both a start and finish date. He expected the next meeting to have a more meaningful discussion on the issues raised.

PP35 **EMPLOYMENT LAND TOPIC PAPER**

The group received a paper which set out the current position on future employment growth in the district. The paper addressed how the need for future employment land had been identified, the current employment land, the future site provision and the next steps.

The findings had been based on a medium growth scenario of Stansted Airport achieving its target of 35mppa. It had been calculated that over the plan period there would be a requirement to provide 16,600sqm office space and 18ha of industrial land.

The report update recommended a total of 23 preferred sites that were potentially suitable. AECOM had been commissioned to undertake a detailed assessment of these sites and produce an addendum report which would also take account of the recently published East of England Forecasting model figures, which could have an impact on the future requirement.

In answer to a member question, it was explained that the growth scenarios, also took into account the East of England base line assumptions, which didn't include projections for Stansted Airport.

The report was noted.

PP36 **UTTLESFORD PLANNING POLICY MEMBER FORUM**

The Chairman put forward a proposal to establish a small member group to meet on a more regular basis to oversee progress of the action plan. It was suggested that this group could comprise group leaders (or their representative) plus the Cabinet member. They would report progress on any issues to their group members. He stressed that this was an advisory role, to consider issues in detail at an early stage before items were considered by PPWG.

Cllr Loughlin said she objected to this proposal as being undemocratic as she had expected all the Local Plan meetings to be public. The Chairman confirmed

that this arrangement was not a substitute for PPWG, but rather a case of operational efficiency and to ensure adherence to the timetable.

Cllr Dean said there hadn't been a clear project plan over the last year and members hadn't been adequately informed about the process. He therefore thought it was a good idea to consider a different approach, particularly given the enormous agenda which couldn't be discussed in detail at a formal meeting.

AGREED to recommend the establishment of a Planning Policy Member Forum.

PP37 REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION

The Chairman explained that the previous Local Plan timetable had not included a draft Local Plan consultation and it was now suggested that a programme be prepared that included a preferred options consultation as part of the Regulation 18 stage. This would give the public and other key stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the relative merits of the spatial strategy and policies, and allow time for any modification to the plan as a result of the comments received.

The previous guillotine of 31 March 2017 had been lifted, which would enable this additional consultation to take place. The DCLG was aware of the councils' programme of work and dialogue with officers was continuing.

Members supported this proposal as an opportunity to re-engage the public with the process.

AGREED to recommend the inclusion of a Regulation 18 draft Local Plan consultation stage in the revised Local Plan timetable (LDS).

The meeting ended at 8.30pm

Action points

PP33 – Local Plan evidence base	To make available the notes from meetings with neighbouring authorities concerning the strategic sites.
PP34 – Action Plan for the Local Plan	To include in the Action Plan reference to the work around new settlement options. To circulate an updated project plan to include both a start and finish date.
PP36 – Planning Policy Member Forum	To forward to Cabinet the recommendation to establish a Planning Policy Member Forum
PP37 - Regulation 18 Consultation	To forward to Cabinet the recommendation to include a Regulation 18 draft Local Plan consultation stage in the revised Local Plan timetable (LDS).

Public Speaker

Mr Buhaenko - Smith

Once again, thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of SERCLE. There are four topics I would like to address this evening.

The first is Garden Villages

Councillors are probably aware of the recent announcement by the government of a new batch of garden villages. You may not be aware that reading through various broad sheet papers both left and right of the political spectrum, both sides have been indicating the government seem to be putting their faith in smaller garden developments. Why?

- They are faster to build and will more likely assist the government in meeting it's housing targets. A 10,000+ house development will take a minimum of 4-5 decades to complete.
- The growing political backlash on what one paper stated as "War on the countryside" with senior Tory MPs and Ministers starting to speak out against building larger "Garden Cities".

Two papers, one being the Telegraph, also indicated that the PM's support for "Garden Cities" is waning and specifically support for the Ebbsfleet development is "quietly being scrapped".

The second topic is Lord Kerslake's report on Braintree District Council's Local Plan

Before I go any further I should state that the Lord Kerslake team that put together the report is very pro-development.

What was the result of their report? Currently all we can go on is the details released by the BDC press office. The press release highlighted the praise for the councils working together. As we all from experience, things can work well together but not the reach the right results. But behind this is the real point of the report i.e. insufficient evidence to support the chosen locations of development sites and the reasons behind the rejected sites. So what's the result - BDC delaying their local plan by up to 4-5months so they can strengthen their evidence.

The third is Land Delivery Vehicles

The third topic concerns the financial data to support the creation of the North Essex "New Town" LDVs. For the West of Braintree, the initial estimate of costs is nearly £900million and this is just for the BDC side of West of Braintree. SERCLE estimates the costs for UDC side would be in the region of £200-300million. These are initial estimates and from evidence of previous major infrastructure projects, that costs will rise. It will definitely not go down!

Allocation of costs is another area that should be a concern to UDC councillors. Using the other "new towns" as a benchmark, the costs for West of Braintree would be split equally between BDC, ECC and UDC. So, we may assume UDC's share of the costs towards the project could rise to £400million. Again, I reiterate these costs are an initial estimate.

But it's not just the projected costs. SERCLE have reviewed the maths and we believe that we've identified mistakes. They maths don't add up.

However, along with projected costs and maths that don't add up, is the alarming statement in the LDV report to BDC councillors:

In my experience from a career in investment banking, a statement like that would raise a red flag. I never came across a sensitivity test scenario that can project decades into the future with that level of confidence.

The last topic I would like to raise is on the subject of evidence on DtC

SERCLE notes that minutes from some DtC meetings are attached to this meeting agenda. That's is encouraging however may I remind the working group of a statement from the minutes of PPWG Nov 26 2015:

"Action: To circulate a timetable of future duty to cooperate meetings to all members of the working group and ensure that the minutes of these meetings were reported as soon as they were available"

SERCLE looks forward to seeing the minutes from UDC's meetings with BDC regarding the West of Braintree.

To summarise my points:

- It seems that government political support is waning for Garden Cities, instead emphasising the promotion of smaller, less politically charged garden communities
- It seems the pro-development, Kerslake report has found the evidence for the North Essex new towns to be "un-sound"
- The report to support the feasibility of the West of Braintree LDV is fraught with risk and the numbers do not add up
- The potential costs to UDC for West of Braintree are upwards of £400million with no guarantee that the ability to recoup the monies within a reasonable time frame? Could that be considered a sound return of investment?
- UDC's evidence for their DtC meetings with BDC is still outstanding

With these points in mind and the many other issues that the council will face, I would assume councillors will wish to discuss the question –

"Should we maintain the risks of development within our control and borders, and then assess feasibility of developing a "garden city" with BDC maybe in the next plan period?"

Committee: Planning Policy Working Group

Agenda Item

Date: 22 February 2017

3

Title: Housing White Paper

Author: Richard Fox, Planning Policy Team Leader **Key decision:**

Summary

1. This Report provides an initial analysis of the Department for Communities and Local Government's ("CLG") Housing White Paper ("HWP"): 'Fixing our Broken Housing Market' which was published on Tuesday 7 February 2017.
2. Publication of the much-anticipated Housing White Paper provides significant statements on government policy and the approach to improving the supply and affordability of housing at a national level.
3. Locally, the potential measures announced within the Housing White Paper will not all have immediate effect and the majority are subject to further consultation. However, publication of the Housing White Paper is a milestone in terms of how local authorities may be required to approach plan-making (and also decision-taking on planning applications) in future years.
4. The summary provided by this report gives an initial assessment and overview of potential implications from the Housing White Paper, particularly in relation to the Uttlesford Local Plan.

Recommendations

- a. PPWG note the publication of the Housing White Paper and the initial assessment of its potential future implications for preparation of the Uttlesford Local Plan
- b. Officers of the Planning Policy Team prepare a response to the CLG Housing White Paper for presentation to Cabinet in March 2017 prior to submission to government

Financial Implications

5. The White Paper proposes that local authorities will be able to increase planning application fees by 20% from July 2017 if they commit to invest the additional fee income in their planning departments. The Government is also minded to allow an increase of a further 20% for those authorities who are delivering homes.
6. Members are advised that any subsequent implications will be the subject of ongoing assessment. Subject to further government consultation and any implementation of measures introduced through the Housing White Paper funding implications may subsequently arise. The outcomes of this for Council funding streams and other sources of infrastructure funding cannot be directly identified at this time.

Background Papers

7. None

Impact

8.

Communication/Consultation	The measures proposed In the White Paper are subject to consultation
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	N/A
Health and Safety	N/A
Human Rights/Legal Implications	N/A
Sustainability	There are proposals relating to climate change, flood risk, noise and onshore wind energy in the White Paper.
Ward-specific impacts	All
Workforce/Workplace	N/A

Situation

9. The Department for Communities and Local Government's ("CLG") Housing White Paper ("HWP"): 'Fixing our Broken Housing Market' was published on Tuesday 7 February 2017. Officers have undertaken an initial analysis of the HWP and its supporting evidence. The Council's assessment of the HWP and its future relevance in the District has also benefitted from the recent meeting between Officers from the Planning Policy Team and advisors at CLG on 15 February 2017.
10. The release of the HWP has been anticipated for some months and the delays to its publication mean that while useful it does not yet provide full certainty on matters relating to the Local Plan. Given the limited time since publication, this review has not yet been able to fully consider the potential implications of the approach outlined in the HWP.
11. Having said this, the HWP clarifies the government's policy direction on a range of housing issues and refers specifically to earlier announcements and Written Ministerial Statements as well as existing policies. Decision-makers (and to some degree those preparing Local Plans) will need to quickly establish the weight they should give the HWP as a material consideration.
12. The government's HWP identifies four broad (but interrelated) themes under which to identify current problems with the housing market and through which

it proposes certain solutions. These can broadly be summarised as follows (with chapter headings from the HWP in parentheses):

- Meeting housing needs, effective strategic planning and making land available for housing (“Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places”)
 - Improving the rates and pace of housing delivery (“Building Homes Faster”)
 - Restructuring the housing market to provide increased supply (“Diversifying Housing Market”)
 - Improving affordability and meeting a wider range of needs (“Helping People Now”)
13. Each of these is relevant to the local context in Uttlesford and it is necessary to consider the HWP as a whole.
14. Strong protection for the Green Belt will be retained. The HWP also emphasises the need for Local Plans to be kept up-to-date, subject to regular review, and able to justify housing targets against objectively assessed need. Exceptional circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt land will only exist where all other reasonable alternatives have been explored.
15. The HWP introduces only a limited range of measures that are intended to have immediate effect in looking to address the issues identified in the housing market. For local authorities this principally relates to a new ‘Housing Delivery Test’ from November 2017.
16. The way in which the ‘Housing Delivery Test’ will apply in Uttlesford is of great importance to the Council. The ‘test’ will be triggered where the number of new homes being built in a given district is below expectations. Introduction of this test does not depend on further consultation. It is a separate assessment to the calculation of Five Year Housing Land Supply and is designed to highlight which the delivery of housing is above or below identified requirements. From November 2017, if no up-to-date Local Plan is in place, the official household projections will form the base for the ‘delivery test’. Authorities that under-perform against the ‘Housing Delivery Test’ will be required to prepare an Action Plan to assist in improving supply.
17. For the Local Plan it is important to note the proposed introduction of a standardised methodology for calculating housing need. Consultation on the Housing White Paper seeks views on what ‘reasonable justification’ may be provided for departing from the standardised methodology. The government also proposes to make it possible for those preparing neighbourhood plans to obtain a figure for housing requirements in their local area directly from the local authority. Greater emphasis on the specific housing needs of older people is also intended to make sure the right type of supply is provided to meet these needs.
18. The HWP reiterates a firm expectation that authorities will continue to cooperate on cross boundary matters and address the strategic priorities for plan-making. Measures are proposed that would require completion of

Statements of Common Ground between authorities that set out how cross-boundary matters will be approached.

19. The HWP encourages Local Plans to bring forward a wide portfolio of sites, including smaller and medium-sized sites, to provide homes to help rural communities thrive, and to bring forward brownfield land. Proposals set out that Local Plans should contain policies to support 'windfall' provision and provide at least 10% of allocations as smaller sites. The HWP also reiterates support for new planned settlements.
20. The government is proposing to broaden the statutory definition of affordable housing as part of measures in the Housing White Paper. This retains a commitment to the delivery of 'Starter Homes', but as part of a broader mix of products including support for affordable private rented tenures.
21. It is important to note that publication of the HWP has not in itself brought about any immediate change to national planning policy, although revision of the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to take place in 2017. The extent of the proposals and scope of the HWP is less than some anticipated which reduces the level of certainty in the details provided at this time.
22. A 'Fixing our broken housing market: consultation' has been launched alongside the HWP and gives all interested parties an opportunity to comment on specific questions related to topics raised in the HWP. This consultation runs until 2 May 2017 and is of significant importance. It is important that Uttlesford District Council submits a detailed response to this consultation.
23. This will be informed by a full and complete assessment of the HWP in terms of its relevance in Uttlesford. A draft of the proposed consultation response will be presented to Cabinet prior to submission in time for the consultation deadline.
24. Based on the broad approach set out in the HWP it is important that the Council's consultation response set out how the specific measures should be implemented so far as they affect the ability to better meet housing needs and support the housing market in Uttlesford.

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
3. That the Council does not meet the Planning Delivery Test.	Possible	3. Significant	Ensure sufficient deliverable sites are allocated in the Local Plan.

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.

Planning Policy Working Group 22 February 2017

OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED FOR UTTLESFORD - UPDATE

Purpose of this Paper

This Paper provides an update on the current position with the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the Local Plan for Uttlesford and sets out the recommended way forward.

Housing White Paper

It was anticipated that specific further guidance would be given in the White Paper about the OAHN for local authorities. In the event no figures have been provided but there will be a consultation in the coming months on a standardised methodology. A separate report on this agenda provides an initial analysis of the Housing White Paper.

Background –The Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN or OAN)

PPWG was briefed on the OAHN position at the meeting on 28 November 2016 when the following context was given:

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:- “To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.”

Strategic housing market areas do not generally fit local authority boundaries neatly. This is because they are based on demographics, travel to work patterns etc. Generally, there is more than one SHMA in each local authority area. The agreed SHMA is that which is the “best fit” for the Council. In Uttlesford’s case it is the West Essex and East Herts SHMA, loosely centred on Harlow. Significant parts of north Uttlesford fall within the Cambridge HMA. However, to assess OAN only one SHMA is used as a basis. The other SHMA authorities are East Herts, Epping Forest and Harlow.

The process for reaching an OAHN figure for the SHMA is extremely complicated. **The starting point is the CLG population projections derived from the Sub National Housing Population Projections produced by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and Government advice in the Planning Practice Guidance is that these figures should form the baseline for calculating projections.**

Household projections published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should provide the starting point estimate of overall housing need.

The household projections are produced by applying projected household representative rates to the population projections published by the Office of National Statistics.

The population projections are then adjusted for local circumstances which include factors such as house price affordability, commuting patterns, economic activity levels, age profiles etc. This adjusted figure is the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the SHMA. This is frequently referred to as the “policy off” figure because the actual housing numbers that can be provided in a local plan may be higher or lower depending on local circumstances. (Please refer to the ORS presentation to PPWG of 27 January 2016 on the committee website for a fuller exposition).

Based on the 2012 population projections for the West Essex and East Herts SHMA this figure was 46,100 from 2011-2033. Taking into account district wide factors, the Uttlesford component of this figure was 12,500 dwellings. This is in the 2015 published SHMA report.

In July 2016 CLG published the new 2014 based population projections which showed an increase in the overall projected numbers. The SHMA authorities have modelled the 2014 projections on a ‘policy off’ basis (ie OAN for a SHMA and local authority areas purely based on population statistics, demographics, household formation rates, migration, market signals etc.). The 2014 projections set the need (2011 – 2033) at 54,600 new homes rather than 46,100 new homes with the 2012 projections. **Uttlesford’s component of the 54,600 figure is 14,100 new homes.**

Distribution of OAN within the SHMA on 2012 Need

The SHMA authorities tested a range of potential distribution options taking into consideration the 2012 need with the support of the consultants, AECOM . Having undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal (September 2016).of the potential options the authorities agreed a preferred strategy of 51,000 new homes (2011- 2033) based on environmental capacity and infrastructure constraints (the “policy on” basis).

The SHMA authorities considered the distribution of 51,000 new homes across the individual authorities and proposed a preferred strategy based on what was considered sound planning reasons as shown in the following table:

	Need identified – 2012 Projections	Preferred Distribution following AECOM study
East Herts	16,400	18,100
Epping Forest	11,300	11,400
Harlow	5,900	9,000
Uttlesford	12,500	12,500
Total	46,100	51,000

The differences in identified need and preferred distribution reflect the focus on Harlow as the preferred growth location. It is proposed that the eventual preferred distribution strategy will be delivered in line with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by all four districts. This has been discussed at the Co-op Member Board.

OAHN within the SHMA on 2014 Need

The SHMA authorities then assessed the OAHN based on 2014 projection figures on a district basis and the current position is set out below.

	Need identified – 2014 Projections	Housing numbers currently under consideration by each District
East Herts	19,400	18,100
Epping Forest	13,300	11,400
Harlow	7,800	9,000
Uttlesford	14,100	14,100
Total	54,600	52,600

East Herts and Epping Forest District Councils have recently concluded consultation exercises on their draft local plans (Regulation 19 and Regulation 18 respectively). Both authorities decided to include the housing figures based on the AECOM distribution strategy rather than the 2014 projections given their more advanced stage in preparing their local plans. It is clear that this approach will be tested through the Examination process.

At the Local Plan Inspector's Advisory Visit to Uttlesford on 1 November 2016 the Inspector, Simon Emerson, focussed on the figure of 12,500 new homes for the district (this figure is based on the agreed spatial distribution strategy for the entire SHMA) . **His informal advice was that the Council should be taking the higher 14,100 new homes figure** derived from 2014 Population Projections as a "policy off" starting point.

The Inspector at the Advisory Visit indicated that the AECOM work will be robustly challenged at the Examination and if it is to be relied on then the local authorities need to be confident that the work can be effectively defended. Michael Bedford QC (our Local Plan Counsel) has also advised that the AECOM work needs to be strengthened to make more explicit how the preferred spatial distribution was derived at. AECOM have been commissioned to explain the continuing relevance of the preferred distribution strategy (51,000 new homes) in the light of the 2014 projections.

Conclusion

In the light of the above it is considered that the most prudent course of action will be to continue to plan to take the 2014 OAHN figure which is 14,100 new homes for Uttlesford as the baseline for the spatial strategy. This will be subject to completion of the evidence base which will include the Sustainability Appraisal.

Richard Fox
Planning Policy Team Leader
17 February 2017

Planning Policy Working Group 22 February 2017

PREPARING FOR THE LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION

1. Purpose of this Note

- 1.1 Work is proceeding apace on the local plan and this Note sets out the next formal stage of the process and the methodology that is being followed in preparing the Plan for members' consideration.

2. Progress to Date

- 2.1 Since the initiation of the 'Pause' in decision making the officers have focussed on testing updated Objectively Assessed Housing Need targets, finalising the local plan evidence base, and pursuing discussions with neighbouring authorities.
- 2.2 Expert independent advice has been given by a Visiting Local Plans Inspector, and also the Planning Advisory Service/ Intelligent Plans and Examinations, which have concluded that the District Council is following a reasonable methodology for the preparation of the local plan. All this expert independent advice is being followed in completing the evidence base and finalising the spatial strategy for the local plan.

3. Key Strategic Issues Being Addressed

- 3.1 A significant opportunity that arises out of the 'Pause' is to test a revised Objectively Assessed Need target of 14,100 new homes up until 2033. This higher housing target requires testing the delivery of up to three new settlement proposals, as well as examining reasonable alternative sites across the district.
- 3.2 The aim is to prepare a preferred local plan spatial strategy for member consideration in June 2017 to allow 'Regulation 18' consultation with the public and stakeholders between late July and the end of August 2017 (under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning [Local Planning] Regulations 2012 the District Council may consult the public and various stakeholders on a draft local plan, or elements of the local plan). This stage of consultation is not compulsory. There are a range of issues that need to be addressed to allow this, however, there are three significant themes that are especially important in this work and these are set out below.

Transport and Traffic Modelling

- 3.3 Existing highway capacity is a significant constraint to development within the district. All of the emerging strategic sites are subject to traffic modelling and, at the time of writing, work is focussed on examining strategic allocation proposals at Saffron Walden and also Great Chesterford. Officers are also looking at the cumulative impact of spatial strategy options as well as the position with individual strategic sites. Officers intend to reach a definitive recommendation on the proposed spatial strategy for the whole district, at least in principle, for a Regulation 18 Draft Plan report in June 2017.

Delivery of New Development

- 3.4 One of the preferred new settlement proposals is at Easton Park where there are proposals for 1,400 new homes to be delivered within the plan period. The key issue here is that part of the site is currently an active aggregate quarry with a mineral processing plant and the quarry has planning permission until 2032. The site promoter contends that the quarry operation will not prejudice the phased development proposal and this view is currently being tested. If this view is accepted, then a Statement of Common Ground will be prepared between the District Council, Essex County Council, as Minerals Authority, and also the landowner. This issue will need to be resolved in principle before June 2017.

Duty to Co-operate

- 3.5 There are two significant issues in relation to the 'Duty to Co-operate' and the emerging Spatial Strategy. The first is in relation to the new settlement proposal for Great Chesterford and the second is the proposed new settlement west of Braintree.
- 3.6 The Great Chesterford site is close to the county boundary and within the Cambridge Sub-region SHMA area. Consequently there is a statutory duty to engage constructively with South Cambridgeshire District Council and also Cambridgeshire County Council. A number of meetings have taken place with officers of both County Councils and South Cambs. The main issue is the completion of traffic modelling work and representatives of the four authorities and also Highways England are collaborating on this work. The transport position, and any other strategic issues, will need to be resolved in principle before June 2017 and it is proposed that a Statement of Common Ground would then be agreed by all the authorities if the allocation is to be pursued.
- 3.7 The position with respect to a new settlement at West Braintree is also linked to the Braintree District Council Local Plan which is expected to be considered by the Full Council of that authority for publication on 5 June 2017. The principal issue is the phasing of development and the apportionment of housing numbers within the plan period of both our plan and the Braintree Local Plan (there is a prospect of a planning application for mineral extraction on part of the site within Braintree). There is a mutual interest for both authorities to agree this phasing before June 2017 and then to sign a Joint Memorandum of Understanding.

4. Next Formal Stage in the Process

- 4.1 The next key stage is for the Council to approve the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan for consultation. It is proposed that this consultation will be based upon a full draft local plan.
- 4.2 The approach that is being taken by officers is based on objectively prepared technical evidence and if, during the next few weeks, it becomes clear that any potential strategic areas/ allocations may not be deliverable within the plan period then alternative proposals will be considered and recommended. The Council does have discretion to consult on part of the Local Plan during the Regulation 18 stage and could opt to focus on the strategic allocations if this was considered preferable.
- 4.3 It is not proposed to adopt a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) at this stage until the issues referred to above have been resolved satisfactorily, this is unlikely to be before late Spring 2017. It is considered important that the revised LDS can be agreed with as much certainty as possible. It should also be noted that the LDS is not

only about local plan preparation but also about all the planning policy documents of the local authority and a later decision date allows the latest information to be included.

- 4.4 The strong officer recommendation is that the Regulation 18 Consultation is carried out on the whole draft Local Plan between July and the end of August 2017 (please see the separate item on this agenda – Project Plan Key Milestones) . The alternative would be to only consult on the strategic elements of the draft plan however this would not allow representations to be made within the context of all of the proposed policies and proposals in the draft plan. A further alternative would be to delay this part of the process which would, in turn, delay submission of the draft Local Plan beyond Spring 2018 with all the substantial risks that would then flow from that position.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 Good progress is being made on preparing the draft Local Plan. Independent experts have stated that the methodology of the Council is reasonable and the Council is following expert advice in relation to preparing the spatial strategy and its supporting evidence base.
- 5.2 It is recommended that this approach set out in this paper is adopted so that the spatial strategy can be finalised in time for member consideration in June and that the formal Regulation 18 Consultation can then take place between July 2017 and the end of August 2017.

Gordon Glenday
Assistant Director Planning
17 February 2017

Committee: Planning Policy Working Group

Agenda Item

Date: 22 February 2017

6

**Title: Uttlesford District Water Cycle Study
Outline Update January 2017**

Author Sarah Nicholas, Senior Planning Officer

Summary

1. A Water Cycle Study (WCS) update has been prepared to provide evidence that development proposed within the emerging Local Plan can be accommodated by the water and wastewater infrastructure, and wider water environment and identify if additional infrastructure may be required as part of the development. A copy of the study is available at www.uttlesford.gov.uk/backgroundstudies

Recommendations

2. That the Working Group note the Water Cycle Study Outline Update January 2017 to support the development of the emerging Local Plan, and its inclusion within the Local Plan evidence base.

Financial Implications

3. Cost of study was met from existing budgets.

Background Papers

4. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The study will be publicly available as part of the evidence base supporting the preparation of the local plan.
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	N/A
Health and Safety	N/A
Human Rights/Legal	N/A

Implications	
Sustainability	The study considers the sustainable use of water and draws conclusions accordingly
Ward-specific impacts	All
Workforce/Workplace	N/A

Situation

6. Uttlesford Council commissioned Arcadis Design and Consultancy to undertake an update to the water cycle study. Arcadis was formally Hyder Consulting UK who undertook the previous Scoping and Outline Strategy Water Cycle Study in 2010 and the Detailed Strategy in 2012.
7. Water Cycle Studies (WCS) need to be informed by a trajectory which sets out the scale, location and estimated timing of development. For the purposes of this Outline WCS it was based on a strategy of
 - New Settlement(s): 2,800 dwellings within plan period.
 - Towns: 1,200 – 1,800 dwellings
 - Key Villages: 200-400 dwellings
 - An assessment of Type A villages was not required by the WCS update due to the small scale of development envisaged.
8. The WCS assessed the four largest new settlement locations (Great Chesterford, Elsenham, West of Great Dunmow and West of Braintree). It assessed sites in the towns and key villages which were identified as being potentially suitable through the SLAA; the purpose being to confirm whether there were water supply and disposal issues which cannot be resolved. The Water Cycle Study is one piece of evidence to assist in the allocation of sites. Because a site has been assessed it does not imply that it will be allocated. A detailed study can be commissioned when the council has decided on its preferred development strategy.

The Water Cycle

9. The water cycle is the process by which water is transported throughout a region. The process commences with some form of precipitation. This is then intercepted by the ground, travels through the catchment area before evaporating to complete the cycle. Abstraction of water from surface water and ground water surfaces interacts with this cycle and reduces the amount of water which is naturally held within aquifers. Similarly the use of paved or built areas reduces the amount of water able to percolate to aquifers and increases surface water runoff, potentially leading to flooding. The wastewater from developments is transported via the sewerage network to water recycling centres where it is treated and discharged back into rivers or groundwater.

Water Supply

10. Affinity Water supply the District with water from a combination of groundwater and surface water abstractions. The study reports that Affinity Water is confident that the potential development sites can be supplied without the need for major infrastructure upgrades that will constrain the scale of development tested. However the Local Plan should contain policies which aim to achieve water efficiency.

Wastewater Treatment and Sewage.

11. Wastewater in the District is collected and treated by Thames Water Utilities in the southwest and Anglian Water Services in the northeast. The study concludes that no significant sewerage capacity issues with any of the sites in the draft development trajectory were identified as potential 'show stoppers'. However many of the sites are likely to require some upgrades to the water recycling centres (sewage works) in order to accommodate the increased flow and should a site be allocated, developers need to work with the water companies as part of the pre-development enquiries as the individual sites enter the normal planning application process.

Water Quality

12. The results of the qualitative water analysis indicate that the proposed development will not lead to a deterioration of Water Framework Directive (WFD) status or will compromise the achievement of WFD Good status in the receiving watercourses. The development in the towns and key villages will not lead to DWF consents being exceeded apart from at Great Easton and Newport. The study recommends that any development within these catchments are phased to allow improvements in the respective Wastewater Recycling Centre (sewage works) to be made. In relation to the impact of the new settlement locations the DWF consent would be exceeded apart from at the Bishop's Stortford Water Catchment. For the new settlement sites the study recommends that consultation is undertaken early in the development process with the Environment Agency and water companies to confirm if a new water recycling centre is required.

Flood Risk Management

13. The study reviews the Uttlesford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the latest Environment Agency flood map and none of the sites lie predominantly within flood plains. Small areas of the new settlement sites are at high risk of flooding. The study recommends that opportunities should be exploited at the master planning stage for multiple benefits in terms of integrated sustainable drainage, green infrastructure, amenity and biodiversity. A high level assessment indicates that the increased flow from each water recycling centre is considered as having a low flood risk.

Conclusions for New Settlements

14. The study concludes that all four sites have a similar level of general constraints and opportunities in relation to water management although the main differentiating constraint to development is considered to be the capacity

of the receiving Wastewater Recycling Centres. It must be recognised that any planned upgrade to the receiving water recycling centres need to take into account future growth of the sites post plan period.

Great Chesterford – Existing flow consents are exceeded due to the new settlement but wastewater capacity could be provided subject to major upgrades to both the treatment processes and associated sewerage networks at the Wastewater Treatment Works. The extent of the required enhancements at Great Chesterford WRC may justify other strategies such as a new WRC or conveyance to Saffron Walden WRC catchment if viable. Anglian Water has concerns regarding the level of growth and should be engaged by the site promoter as early as possible.

Elsenham – Existing flow consents are exceeded due to the new settlement, however wastewater capacity could be provided subject to significant upgrades to Stansted Mountfitchet Wastewater Treatment Works. Thames Water has concerns regarding the level of growth and should be engaged by the site promoter as early as possible.

Little Easton (West of Great Dunmow) – Existing flow consents are not exceeded due to the new settlement however there are process constraints at Bishop’s Stortford Treatment Works. Thames Water has confirmed that upgrades will be expected along with concerns regarding the level of growth and should be engaged by the site promoter as early as possible.

Stebbing (West of Braintree) – Existing flow consents are significantly exceeded at Felsted Wastewater Treatment Works, it is not likely that upgrades can be undertaken to provide wastewater capacity. Following consultation with Anglian Water they have confirmed that a new treatment works would likely be required and that they should be engaged by the site promoter as early as possible.

Risk Analysis

15.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the Local Plan allocates a site which cannot be delivered due to issues relating the water cycle.	Low. This outline study considers all aspects of the water cycle in relation to sites and a detailed study can be commissioned as the development strategy is	The plan may be found unsound if sites are not considered deliverable	To take into account the findings of the outline study and commission a detailed study if appropriate.

	refined.		
--	----------	--	--

- 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.

ITEM 7**Planning Policy Working Group 22 February 2017****Local Plan Evidence Base Update**

Evidence	Brief Written/Commissioned	Timetable for Completion
Whole Plan (including Affordable Housing) Viability Study	Brief finalised. Study Commissioned.	Draft Study Late April 2017. Final Study June 2017
Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)	In process of being updated	March 2017 Completion
Water Cycle Study	Commissioned	Complete
Duty to Cooperate Chronology and Statement of Compliance	Ongoing due to nature of Duty to Cooperate.	On-going
West of Braintree Study (Joint with Braintree District)	In Process	Mid-May 2017 completion
Sustainability Appraisal - Reasonable Alternatives for New Settlement and Other Strategic Sites	Commissioned	Draft in April 2017. Post Member - Developer Meetings in March 2017.
Sustainability Appraisal - Whole Local Plan	Commissioned	Draft in April 2017.
Saffron Walden Eastern Relief Road modelling	Commissioned	Initial work to be complete end February 2017
Highway tests and modelling on various potential scenarios	Commissioned and will follow on from Reasonable Alternatives above.	One months work available end of March 2017
Highway tests and modelling - South Cambs	DtC - to agree what testing is required and reasonable. Agreeing specification by end February 2017. Work to be done.	End April 2017 completion
Essex County Council Highways test Junction 8 modelling	If required	To be reviewed when scenario testing for Easton Park and West of Braintree complete. Mid March 2017 for review.

Update of Employment Land Review	Brief written and in process of commissioning in February 2017.	Draft in early April 2017.
Employment Needs Review (Joint Study with West Essex / East Herts Authorities)	In Process	April 2017 Completion.
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Commissioned	Draft and Final Study May 2017
Habitats Regulation Assessment	To be completed once Draft Plan is produced.	Regulation 19 Stage
Review of Windfall Assumptions	Being undertaken inhouse. Work commenced	March 2017 Completion.
Gypsy and Traveller Assessment	In process.	April 2017 Completion.
Local Development Scheme	Required to be updated.	June 2017 Completion.
Easton Park Minerals Resource Assessment	In Process	Early May 2017 Completion
Local Wildlife Study	In house desk top review of 2007 study	End 2017 Completion

Committee: Planning Policy Working Group

Agenda Item

Date: 22 February 2017

8

Title: Update on Action Plan from Planning
Advisory Service Report

Author: Richard Fox, Planning Policy Team Leader

Item for decision

Summary

1. An Action Plan following a report by the Planning Advisory Service was reported to Scrutiny Committee on 17 January 2017 and 7 February 2017.

Recommendations

2. That the Working Group note progress in implementing the Action Plan following the report by the Planning Advisory Service on the Local Plan Process.

Financial Implications

3. No new financial implications.

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	Further consultation is proposed by the PAS report.
Community Safety	N/A
Equalities	Further work on affordable housing and Travellers is proposed by the PAS report
Health and Safety	N/A
Human Rights/Legal Implications	Further work on affordable housing and Travellers is proposed by the PAS report
Sustainability	Further work on the Sustainability Appraisal is proposed by the PAS report
Ward-specific impacts	All
Workforce/Workplace	N/A

Situation

6. An Action plan has been produced following a Planning Advisory Service review of the Local Plan Process. The action plan below reflects the recommendations of the 17 January 2017 Scrutiny Committee and emboldened updates were reported to Scrutiny Committee on 7 February 2017.

Number	Report finding/action	Proposed response by UDC
1	An additional Preferred Options (Draft Plan) stage and supporting evidence for consultation would reduce risk/inform plan.	<p>The Council will give consideration to a Preferred Options (Regulation 18) document as part of programme for consultation. Updated Local Plan project plan for the above to Feb PPWG. A formal revised LDS for March PPWG/Cabinet.</p> <p>UPDATE: A CLEAR NARRATIVE NOTING THE REGULATION 18 CONSULTATIONS WILL FORM PART OF THE FINAL UPDATED LDS. PRIOR TO THE LDS BEING FORMALISED, HOWEVER, PPWG ON 22 FEB WILL CONSIDER A PROPOSED TIMETABLE FOR LOCAL PLAN INCORPORATING ADDITIONAL REG 18 CONSULTATION STAGE</p>
2	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) needs to include preferred scenarios or weighting process.	<p>A further scoping exercise to be completed mid January on reasonable scenarios. Member workshop to consider outcome of draft scoping work on SA 1 February.</p> <p>Apply a weighting system to SA (assuming preferred options) to PPWG Summer 2017.</p>
3	Uncertainty exists regards the scale of housing and consequently its location, timing, viability, transport, and infrastructure impacts. Staying with 12,500 homes is a serious risk to soundness. It is suggested that UDC use 14,100 homes from latest government projections as a starting point. Method of apportionment in the SHMA that results in UDC provision needs to be clearly explained.	<p>Accept that limiting provision to 12,500 homes is a serious risk to soundness therefore we need to consider proceeding on the basis of testing 14,100 homes. Updated topic papers to be put to PPWG/Cabinet on location, timing, viability, transport, and infrastructure impacts by first quarter 2017.</p> <p>UPDATE: HMA CONSULTANTS TO PRODUCE A CLEAR EXPLANATION FOR SCALE OF HOUSING APPORTIONMENT – WITH CLEAR AND LOGICAL EXPLANATION OF THE CALCULATIONS ON THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT SHOWING WORKINGS</p>

		BEHIND THE HEADLINE FIGURES. DUE IN MARCH.
4	Further government announcement on changes to planning policy in the Housing White Paper expected although outcome unknown. The Council needs to reflect on this when moving forward with the Plan.	To be closely monitored and reviewed as soon as available. UPDATE: OFFICERS WILL PROVIDE A TOPIC PAPER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE RECEIPT OF THE WHITE PAPER LIKELY TO BE PUBLISHED IN FEBRUARY.
5	2014 IDP out of date/requires more recent information. Transport study including Saffron Walden needs to be completed.	While the published Local Plan Viability Study October 2016 included infrastructure requirements of new settlements, the 2014 IDP needs to be updated with timeframe as above e.g. to reflect new evidence and planning considerations coming from the White Paper. Transport study reports will need to be published once complete as above. Both studies will be tested at Examination. UPDATE: OFFICERS WILL PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE IDP'S CONTENTS WITH TIMETABLE SHOWING INDICATIVE DELIVERY OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE ONCE COMPLETED IN MAY.
6	Updates of the Habitats Regulation Assessment, housing viability and employment studies to be done	The housing viability and employment study updates are underway. The target for completion will be dependent on a revised LDS. The HRA will be completed at draft plan stage.
7	Suggests that a topic approach to duty to co-operate would be more helpful than chronology.	To be collated by Troy Planning by March 2017.
8	Desirable to have specific section on Braintree duty-to-cooperate.	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) needs to be in place by Submission stage. UPDATE: TECHNICALLY, THE MOU ISN'T REQUIRED UNTIL THE LOCAL PLAN SUBMISSION DATE. HOWEVER, WE WILL WORK WITH BRAINTREE DC TO AGREE A SIGNED MOU AS SOON AS PRACTICALLY POSSIBLE. AS BRAINTREE IS SCHEDULED TO SUBMIT ITS PLAN IN JULY, THE MOU WOULD NEED TO BE AGREED

		BEFORE THEN.
9	Will need further criterion policy on traveller provision for those considered travellers who do not meet the government definition.	This is currently being considered.

Risk Analysis

7.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the Local Plan Process does not deliver a sound plan.	Low	Failure to deliver a sound plan would have a significant impact	Action Plan sets out a range of measures.

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.

Committee: Planning Policy Working Group

Agenda Item

Date: 22 February 2017

9

Title: Duty to Cooperate

Portfolio Holder: Richard Fox, Planning Policy Team Leader

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. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

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. An assessment of compliance with the Duty will form part of the Examination of the Local Development Framework (LDF) in due course.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in paragraph 178 that 'public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities...(and) the government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities'.

Update

8. The SHMA **Co-op Officers** Group has met on 19 January and 16 February. There was a **Co-op Member Board** meeting on 23 January. A paper recommending two Memoranda of Understanding between the SHMA authorities and other related organisations was considered at Cabinet on 16 February. Specific Duty to Co-operate sessions with **South Cambridgeshire District Council** took place on 11 January and 13 February at officer level. There was a Member discussion with South Cams on 13 January. Two meetings with **Braintree District Council** took place on 20 January and 7 February.
9. In terms of specific issues, officers from **Essex and Cambridgeshire County Councils**, South Cambridgeshire and Uttlesford District Councils discussed the traffic impacts of potential development in Uttlesford on the Cambridgeshire Highways network on 1 February. There was a session on Essex Infrastructure with ECC officers on 3 February and a SHMA workshop on the Functional Economic Market Area on 3 February.
10. Where published and agreed, minutes of the various meetings are appended and there will be a power point presentation at the meeting summarising the main issues covered.

Conclusion

11. 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

12.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Failure to comply with and demonstrate the Duty to Cooperate.	2 – Some Councils have been found lacking in this Duty by Inspectors. Therefore need to ensure that we capture as many groups, issues and outcomes as possible to present a full picture of our work.	3 – Will result in the Local Plan being found unsound. Significant impact on planning policy and planning applications.	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 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.

Agenda - Co-operation for Sustainable Development Member Board Group

6.30pm - Monday 23 January 2017

Committee Rooms 2A & 2B, Civic Centre, Harlow

1. Apologies
2. Draft notes of meeting of 19 December – including review of action points
3. Update on current/recent consultations and Local Plan progress
 - a. East Herts DC
 - b. Epping Forest DC
 - c. Harlow DC
 - d. Uttlesford DC
 - e. Any others?
4. Distribution of affordable housing (paper from Harlow DC)
5. 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town' (scoping paper from ATLAS)
6. Verbal update on Princess Alexandra Hospital relocation feasibility work
7. Verbal update on Memoranda of Understanding
8. Any other cross-boundary/strategic matters
9. A.O.B.
10. Dates of next meetings:
 - o Thursday 27 February 2017 - (6:30pm Harlow DC)
 - o **To be confirmed** Thursday 20 March 2017 - (6:30pm Harlow DC)

**Draft Note - Co-operation for Sustainable Development Member Board
Monday 19 December 2016 – Civic Centre, Harlow**

Attendance

Organisation	Councillors	Officers
ATLAS		James Farrar
East Herts DC	Cllr Linda Haysey (Chair), Cllr Eric Buckmaster	Liz Watts, Claire Sime, Kevin Steptoe
Epping Forest DC	Cllr Chris Whitbread, Cllr John Philip, Cllr Richard Bassett	Glen Chipp, Alison Blom-Cooper, David Coleman, Sarah King
Essex CC		David Sprunt, Rich Cooke
Harlow DC	Cllr Jon Clempner, Cllr Danny Purton	Graeme Bloomer
Herts CC	Cllr Derrick Ashley	Jan Hayes-Griffin
LB Redbridge	Helen Coombe	
Uttlesford DC	Cllr Susan Barker	Richard Fox

1. Apologies

Brentwood BC - Cllr Roger McCheyne, Cllr Louise Rowlands, Phil Drane
 Broxbourne BC - Cllr Paul Seeby, Martin Paine
 Chelmsford CC – Claire Stuckey
 East Herts DC - Cllr Gary Jones, Cllr Bob Brunton
 Essex CC – Cllr Mick Page, Sean Perry
 Highways England – Nigel Allsopp
 LB Enfield – Ismail Mulla
 LB Havering – Martyn Thomas
 Natural England - Sarah Fraser

2. Draft notes of meeting of 12 September 2016 including review of action points

The draft notes were agreed as circulated.

Actions from previous meeting -

- *Epping Forest DC/East Herts DC officers to draft letter to Gavin Barwell MP introducing the Co-op. Board for circulation by mid-October – **not yet done***
- *East Herts DC officers to send Minister Gavin Barwell MP's letter about exceptional circumstances re: GB to Sarah King. Sarah to circulate this to the Co-op. Board – **done, circulated to Board***
- *East Herts DC officers to circulate a note from the meeting with CLG – **East Herts DC will send this***
- *Harlow DC to submit final joint response from West Essex/East Herts HMA to Broxbourne BC's Local Plan consultation – **done, submitted on 16th September***
- *AECOM to contact site promoters for the two potential relocation sites for PAH – **done***
- *AECOM to circulate a draft report on potential relocation of PAH to officers by end of September - **done, AECOM has written report on PAH, meeting took place between West Essex/East Herts, Essex CC, Herts CC, PAH and AECOM last week, workshop is planned for the New Year***
- *Sarah King to circulate the final Highways and Transportation Infrastructure MoU and Managing the Impacts of on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation MoU to the relevant authorities for taking through governance processes - **done***
- *All relevant authorities to take the relevant MoUs through their governance processes for signing – **in progress***
- *Herts CC to raise any issues with the Highways and Transportation Infrastructure MoU asap – **done, David Sprunt has amended the MoU and re-circulated for signing***

- *East Herts DC/Epping Forest DC officers to liaise with James Farrar from ATLAS to finalise the bid for timely submission – done, bid was submitted on 20th September*

3. Update on recent contact between West Essex/East Herts authorities and the Planning Inspectorate

Richard Fox explained that Simon Emerson of PINS had visited Uttlesford in November. The key points were:

- a. With regard to identifying OAHN, the clear message was that the starting point should be the 2014-based projections.
- b. With regard to the AECOM work for the SHMA on strategic spatial distribution options - PINS acknowledged that the 2012-based projections and 2014-based projections were different, but were not clear as to how the 51,100 dwellings figure was derived rather than the figure of 54,600 (based on the 2014-based projections) or the original SHMA figure. Note: It was acknowledged that the reason for this is that the 2014-based figures had been published towards the end of the AECOM work and that a fuller explanation was required.

The Board was advised that officers had met with AECOM to discuss these matters and had agreed to commission a technical addendum to the original report to explain in detail the working and process for arriving at the 51,100 figure taking 54,600 as the starting point.

- c. PINS advised that it would be important for the MOU on the spatial distribution to be signed prior to examination as otherwise the default position would be a requirement for each individual LPA to be required to meet the 2014 based OAHN as a starting point.

Cllr Barker (Uttlesford) commented that the Inspector had also advised with regard to proposals for inclusion of a site on the border with Braintree of the need for Braintree to agree to its inclusion and that it was important for it to be included in the Braintree Local Plan as well in order to ensure delivery.

Addendum Note: Officers have also discussed the need to undertake a similar exercise to consider the distribution of employment growth across the Housing /Functional Economic Market Area and ensure that this was taken into account in the overall growth planned as it could have transport infrastructure implications.

4. Update on current/recent consultations on Local Plans –

a. East Herts DC

The six week period for representations on the Pre-Submission Plan (Regulation 19) had closed at 5pm on Thursday 15 December 2016. The Council had received several thousand comments. Many of these had been received through the consultation portal but there were also many hard copies and emails. There was considerable opposition to the proposed allocation of sites to the North of Harlow (Gilston). A fuller analysis will be possible for the next meeting.

b. Epping Forest DC

The Regulation 18 consultation on the Draft Local Plan closed on 12 December 2016. About 3,000 to 3,500 responses had been received (duplicates are still being checked) with about 50% received electronically and the rest by email, hard copy questionnaire or letter. Main concerns were about loss of managed open space, green belt and infrastructure. EFDC will be able to provide more detail at the next meeting.

Councillor Philip expressed disappointment that Harlow's formal response to the EFDC consultation had raised the issue of affordable housing provision across the SHMA area – a

matter that had not been raised previously by Harlow informally or discussed by the Board. The Board was the appropriate forum for such matters in order that agreement could be reached where possible.

Cllr Purton replied that within the 2015 SHMA a high level of affordable housing for Harlow had been identified and that due to the nature of Harlow constraints, there was insufficient sites to provide their required level of affordable housing. He acknowledged that the growth areas around Harlow would help to meet this affordable housing need but felt that he needed to make the point that there would need to be some provision for affordable housing to be provided outside Harlow and in the wider SHMA area.

Cllr Haysey noted that the concern was that these comments had not been raised earlier but had been raised in public for the first time. Cllr Philip said that these comments would no doubt get scrutiny by an Inspector. EFDC is moving forward quickly with a tight timetable, and is aiming for publication of the Regulation 19 Pre Submission Plan in Autumn 2017. Issues such as this needed to be dealt with in a timely fashion and the reason for the Coop Board was to be able to talk about them in a constructive way. The Draft Local Plan makes provision for a greater quantum of affordable housing within EFDC than that identified in the 2015 SHMA.

Cllr Barker asked about the Housing White Paper and whether this had any implications for the SHMA. Alison Blom-Cooper (EFDC) advised that the Housing White Paper was due to be published in January 2017. It was understood that it will take forward the recommendations made by the Local Plan Expert Group and prescribe a methodology for undertaking the calculation of the objectively assessed housing need.

Cllr Purton will take on board that they may not previously been explicit about affordable housing, but it is in technical papers. Can only apologise if not done that well.

Cllr Haysey noted the importance of being seen as a model area for co-operation and an example of best practice. In future when such matters arise these should be handled in the first instance through email or telephone calls.

5. *Update on the three draft final Memoranda of Understanding for the Housing Market Area (HMA)*

a. *Distribution of Objectively Assessed Housing Need across the West Essex/East Herts HMA*

Still on hold pending resolution of matters.

Graeme Bloomer noted the feedback that Uttlesford had provided on the importance of signing this MoU. The current MoU does acknowledge that the issue of affordable housing will be dealt with but does not say how. Harlow would be happy to work with colleagues to prepare a paper to come back to the next meeting of the Board.

Action: Harlow (Graeme Bloomer) to draft a paper for circulation and discussion at the next officer meeting on 19 January 2017.

b. *Highways and Transportation Infrastructure for the West Essex/East Herts HMA*

David Sprunt (Essex CC) noted that this had now been amended and circulated for signature with relevant authorities.

c. *Managing the Impacts of Growth across the West Essex/East Herts HMA on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation*

Circulated for signing by relevant authorities.

Noted Sarah King (EFDC) is the coordinating the finalisation of the two MoUs (b and c above).

6. Update on Junction 7A of the M11 (and other Highways matters)

A report went to Essex CC Cabinet on 13 December 2016 following evaluation of the consultation. Cabinet had resolved to take forward the scheme with preferred route status, and also are proposing to submit a planning application in January 2017 with a decision in about June 2017. Since the last meeting of the Board, ECC had met with the Director of Highways England who was due to meet the Minister last week. A decision was expected in January 2017 confirming the switch of funding from Junction 7 to Junction 7A. ,

Action: David Sprunt (ECC) to circulate approved route status report

Essex CC were undertaking further work to look at the sites to the West and South of Harlow and the transport impacts of the allocation of these sites on Harlow and the surrounding area. A report on this would be available shortly and would provide the basis for a further discussion by Harlow Council scheduled for 23 February 2017.

Transport modelling – the VISSUM model is signed off and available and has been used to run the current Harlow tests.

Jan Hayes-Griffin (Herts CC) asked about the relationship between the Co-op. Board and the West Essex Transport Group. Although the West Essex Transport Group had not met for a while she enquired whether some of this modelling work and the transport study should be discussed at that meeting as well? David Sprunt advised that the West Essex Transport Group meets roughly quarterly – the last meeting had been in late October/early November. The Primary purpose of that Group is to look through schemes being taken forward and seek agreement as to way in which they are taken forward. The two meetings should dovetail. The Transport Group is due to meet again in February 2017.

Cllr Barker enquired about the impact on the A1060? David Sprunt advised that all modelling to date showing drop in traffic through Sheering, so would then commensurately drop on A1060, small drop but is good.

7. Update on the expression of interest for capacity funding to DCLG re: the Locally Led Garden Villages, Towns & Cities Prospectus, for 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town'

James Farrer (ATLAS) explained that ATLAS has been supporting officers on the joint bid. Not much they can say until a final announcement is made which is expected in January 2017. He had met with officers from the three authorities recently and was supporting them in preparing for a positive outcome to the bid. He advised that from April 2017 the Homes and Communities Agency in which ATLAS is based would be restructured and that the ATLAS team would cease to exist with functions being distributed across the HCA.

Cllr Haysey said that the first task would be to ask officers to work together to come up with proposed governance arrangements. Officers from the three authorities were asked to continue the work already initiated with ATLAS support. James advised that DCLG were realistic about potential for spend this financial year. Cllr Barker advised that Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Districts had recently established a special purpose delivery vehicle and had done a lot of work in this area and lessons should be learnt from their experience. Note: ATLAS are setting up a meeting with this group for officers to meet so that experiences can be shared.

Action: James Farrer agreed to prepare a paper with input from the three authorities for discussion at Next Board.

8. Update on work regarding potential relocation of Princess Alexandra Hospital

Officers met with Phil Morley (Chief Executive) and Marc Davis (Director of Pathways and Partnerships) from PAH on 15 December 2016. The Price Waterhouse Coopers report on the future for PAH had considered four options for the hospital. These were:

1. Do the minimum required to keep the hospital going for 4-5 years (£27m)
2. Full refurbishment of the existing site (£150m)
3. Replacement and rebuild on the existing site (£450m)
4. New site – seen as preferred option and best value for public purse

However their Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) managers had advised that could only fund up to £150m of capital which meant that site replacement and rebuild, or a new site, were not feasible. As a result PAH, with Rt. Hon. Robert Halfon MP (for Harlow), had met with Ministers last week to discuss the future of the hospital. Their proposal was to undertake a phased build over two funding cycles, involving building premises for elective procedures etc. first, which would help to raise funding. It was agreed that there was scope for a bid, subject to the preparation of a Strategic Outline Case, for relocation and a new hospital.

At the meeting It was agreed that:

1. PAH would supply Essex CC with the current information they have on trips to and from the hospital (staff, visitors, patients) and ECC will identify what data might be required.
2. PAH, the two Counties and ATLAS should meet to agree what was required in order to undertake the necessary transport assessment on the sites.
3. Representatives of the Co-op. Officer group would meet with PAH to develop the brief for the preparation of the Strategic Outline Case the w/c 9 January 2017, in order that this could feed into a report to the new Health Partnership group for West Essex/East Herts due to meet at the end of January.

Members asked whether it would be sensible to reschedule the meeting with the Health Minister, which had been previously cancelled. It was agreed that further consideration should be given to this following the meeting of the new Health Partnership meeting scheduled for the end of January.

9. A.O.B.

Cllr Haysey reported on the recent wider London summit with GLA. East Herts and others had provided comments on behalf of the members of the Coop Board on the current stance by the Mayor on 'no loss of green belt' within the GLA and that this was unreasonable when authorities outside London were being required to review and release Green Belt.

Cllr Haysey and other wider London authorities have a meeting scheduled with Gavin Barwell in January 2017. .

Jan Hayes-Griffin (Herts CC) advised that the LSCC had organised a workshop about review of the Green Belt on 31 January 2017.

Cllr Helen Coombe (Redbridge) advised that the authority were continuing with submission of their Local Plan for examination despite the fact that the Council had received a letter from the Mayor of non compliance with the London Plan due to the proposed alterations to the Green Belt to provide for Housing.

10. Date of next meeting:

To be confirmed (dates being canvassed)

DRAFT

Affordable Housing Provision across the Housing Market Area (HMA) - Interim Update

When preparing Local Plans, and to ensure that they are found sound at Examination, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) must ensure they meet, in full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (HMA). This is informed through the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Local Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.

A joint SHMA was prepared by Opinion Research Services on behalf of the four districts. The original study, September 2015, set out the OAHN for the four HMA districts, and specifically on affordable housing, stated;

The highest level of need is in East Hertfordshire (4,128 households) compared to 3,142 in Epping Forest, 3,289 in Harlow and 2,724 in Uttlesford. However, whilst the proportion of affordable housing need is 34% in Epping Forest, 31% in East Hertfordshire and 27% in Uttlesford, the percentage in Harlow is markedly higher at 67%.

Work undertaken since the December DtC meeting would indicate, in broad terms, that the putative affordable housing policies proposed in respective emerging Local Plans within the HMA is likely to produce a net surplus of affordable housing, possibly in the region of 5,000+ units, after taking account of the estimated deficit in Harlow of around 370 – 400 units.

This is of course a generalised calculation based on a theoretical assumption that all 'major' sites identified within the HMA come forward for development over the lifetime of the respective plans and that affordable housing policies within each plan are effective in securing the required proportion of affordable housing from each development. In reality, it is unlikely that all sites will be developed or that all sites will achieve the maximum proportion of policy requirement.

However, such is the apparent quantum of the provisional surplus over the provisional deficit that even after refining the calculations to take account of (inter alia) viability assessment, deliverability deviation and possible market fluctuation, it is unlikely that the overall HMA will be deficient in its provision for affordable housing needs and this, by and of itself, may be satisfactory and sufficient evidence for Inspectors at Examinations In Public to be satisfied with the soundness of respective plans on this issue.

Next Steps.

The SHMA officer group is seeking to meet with CLG officers/PINS to discuss whether meeting the affordable housing need across the SHMA area is sufficient to meet the PPG requirements for a sound plan or whether additional measures need to be put in place. A date is being sought for late January/early February 2017.

Work is continuing and, with the inclusion of advice/discussion from CLG, a full paper will update Members at the meeting on 27 February and make any recommendations for an amended Memorandum of Understanding on the Distribution of Objectively Assessed Housing Need across the HMA.

**Draft Note - Co-operation for Sustainable Development Member Board
Thursday 23 January 2017**

Attendance

Organisation	Councillors	Officers
ATLAS		James Farrar, Dinah Roake
East Herts DC	Cllr Linda Haysey (Chair), Cllr Bob Brunton	Liz Watts, Kevin Steptoe, Claire Sime
Epping Forest DC	Cllr Chris Whitbread, Cllr John Philip, Cllr Richard Bassett	Derek Macnab, Alison Blom-Cooper, David Coleman, Sarah King
Essex CC		David Sprunt, Rich Cooke
Harlow DC	Cllr Jon Clempner	Paul MacBride
Herts CC	Cllr Derrick Ashley	Jan Hayes-Griffin, Roger Flowerday
LB Redbridge	Cllr Helen Coombe	
Uttlesford DC	Cllr Susan Barker	Gordon Glenday

1. Apologies

- Broxbourne BC – Cllr Paul Seeby, Douglas Cooper, Martin Paine
- East Herts DC – Cllr Gary Jones
- Epping Forest DC – Glen Chipp
- Essex CC – Cllr Mick Page, Cllr John Spence, Sean Perry
- Harlow DC - Cllr Danny Purton, Graeme Bloomer
- Highways England – Nigel Allsopp
- Natural England – Sarah Fraser

2. Draft notes of meeting of 19 December – including review of action points

The draft notes were agreed subject to the following minor changes being made -

- Item 6 - amend the last sentence of paragraph 1 to, 'A decision was expected in January 2017'
- Item 7 - amend the last sentence of para. 1 to 'The HCA is currently reviewing its future enabling offer, taking into account available resources.'

Actions from previous meeting -

- *Epping Forest DC/East Herts DC officers to draft letter to Gavin Barwell MP introducing the Co-op. Board* – not yet done. It was agreed that the Board would await publication of the Housing White Paper, and then respond if appropriate to do so
- *All relevant authorities to take the relevant MoUs through their governance processes for signing* – in progress, Sarah King is chasing those who have not yet sent signatures
- *Graeme Bloomer (Harlow DC) to draft a discussion paper on distribution of affordable housing* – done, this paper is on the agenda this evening
- *David Sprunt (ECC) to circulate M11 J7A 'Preferred Route Status' report* – done. David Sprunt noted that an announcement had been made that M11 J7A will receive funding (see <http://www.theplanner.co.uk/news/%C2%A312-billion-roads-funding-allocated>). The definite amount has not yet been announced by the Department for Transport
- *James Farrar (ATLAS) to prepare a scoping paper on governance etc., for Harlow & Gilston Garden Town with officers* - done, this paper is on the agenda this evening. It was noted that CLG announced a £0.5m award for Harlow & Gilston Garden Town in January 2017
- *Various actions re: PAH relocation feasibility* – PAH has now supplied some data on existing trips to and from current site, to feed into transport modelling. Officers have not yet seen PAH's brief for the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) for the relocation of the hospital [Note – since this meeting, the brief for the SOC has been sent, and circulated to HMA officers]

3. Update on current/recent consultations and Local Plan progress

a. East Herts DC

There were ~2,470 overall respondents to the regulation 19 publication Plan, who made a total of ~3,780 comments, of which ~1,830 were from Stop Harlow North, regarding the Gilston

area. These are now all in the online system, and analysis will be presented to the Executive Panel on 9 March 2017. East Herts DC intend to submit the Plan to PINS on 31 March 2017.

b. Epping Forest DC

There were ~3,300 responses to the regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. Roughly 50% came in online, with most of the rest being received by email, and relatively few in hard copy. Coding of these responses is underway, preliminary analysis will be reported to Cabinet in March 2017. Dates for regulation 19 publication are not yet known as the timetable is being assessed.

c. Harlow DC

Harlow DC officers are working on resolving outstanding issues with transport infrastructure and Thames Water etc. A Full Council debate is planned for the end of February 2017 on outstanding issues, particularly on the sites to the south and west of Harlow in Epping Forest District. Essex CC officers are working with Harlow DC on the particular transport issues. Harlow DC plans to publish a regulation 19 Plan in summer 2017, with submission later in 2017.

d. Uttlesford DC

Uttlesford DC has chosen to 'pause' the Local Plan timetable while considering evidence, particularly on housing numbers and new settlement options, and has taken advice from PINS/CLG. It was noted that PINS/CLG felt that notes of the Member Board may be more helpful if organised by theme, e.g. discussions on affordable housing etc. Cllr Barker noted the clear message from PINS/CLG that the 2014-based projections should be the starting point, and that there should be more explanation on apportionment of HMA OAHN. Uttlesford DC is likely to publish its regulation 19 Plan towards end of 2017, and submit in March/April 2018.

4. Distribution of affordable housing (paper from Harlow DC)

- Harlow DC's paper was circulated prior to the meeting. Cllr Haysey thanked officers for producing this
- Officers will be arranging a meeting with CLG arrangements regarding affordable housing, to take this forward

5. 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town (H&GGT)' (scoping paper from ATLAS)

- James Farrar (ATLAS) introduced the scoping paper which builds on the H&GGT bid, and on feedback from each of the Councils involved
- ATLAS recommended recruiting a Project Director asap, and using the officer workshop which ATLAS will facilitate (booked for 8 February) to think about a potential joint delivery team
- Initial priorities for H&GGT were flagged in the scoping paper, and the need for a realistic, staged approach to priorities in this financial year was stressed. Work on the sustainable transport corridors and the potential for PAH relocation, are already underway. Other priorities include delivery before 2020, and longer term thinking on future spatial vision
- Cllr Linda Haysey highlighted the need for community engagement for H&GGT. East Herts DC have already planned an early meeting with the local community, also including Places for People and the Neighbourhood Planning team, to discuss the Gilston area
- Epping Forest DC has contacted SELEP to engage them regarding the proposed green corridors, as recommended by the Co-op. Officer Group. Herts LEP is already aware
- Cllr John Philip stressed the importance of recruiting a Project Director swiftly, to maintain momentum and to help sort through the priorities for H&GGT
- All agreed that **Epping Forest DC should start recruitment process for Project Director**
- It was noted that the award from CLG would not cover every workstream, and that the budget in the original bid would need careful consideration. David Sprunt noted that PAH had offered to contribute to the costs for the work on PAH relocation, but they, and Essex CC, would not be able to fund all of the work, so the H&GGT budget would need to contribute

6. Verbal update on Princess Alexandra Hospital (PAH) relocation feasibility work

- David Sprunt explained that officers met with PAH last week to talk about data they hold on transport movements. This, and information on future aspirations for a campus-style site, will be worked into the model
- Essex CC is **working on a brief to be finished by the end of this week**. Essex CC has some funding to help pay for this but not enough, contributions from PAH and the H&GGT

budget will be needed as this is relatively expensive, but essential, transport modelling work. It could help with decisions on sites as it may indicate the merits of one site over the others, and the results will impact all three Council's Local Plans, and the PAH relocation business case

- The HMA authorities had not yet received a copy of the brief for the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) for the relocation of the hospital. It is due to be discussed at the Partnership Board meeting in January [*Note – since this meeting, the SOC brief has been sent, and circulated*]. The authorities also had not yet seen the Price Waterhouse Coopers PAH report. It was agreed that **Epping Forest DC would draft a letter from the Co-op. Member Board to PAH requesting copies of these documents**, cc'ing the Health Minister, local MPs etc.
- Harlow DC officers noted the importance of considering the wider functions of PAH, e.g. employment provision, relationship to other businesses, and social care. They queried whether the LEPs might contribute to the study costs, given the economic and employment factors, e.g. Public Health England relocating to Harlow

7. Verbal update on Memoranda of Understanding

- Alison Blom-Cooper explained that an officer workshop was planned for 10 February to discuss HMA employment distribution, and to scope out the need for a fourth MoU, on this topic.
- Sarah King noted that most of the relevant authorities had sent their electronic signatures to sign the 'Impacts on Epping Forest SAC' and 'Highways & Transportation Infrastructure' MoUs, but that some were yet to do so. **All remaining signatories to please secure agreement for signing asap, and forward electronic signatures to Sarah King.** Swift signing is essential, especially given East Herts DC's intent to submit by 31 March 2017.

8. Any other cross-boundary/strategic matters

- Herts CC officers are commissioning technical work relating to a possible Harlow northern bypass, and intended to take a paper to their Members after May 2017. They are also considering how this would link in with the rest of the A414, and they are considering a possible bypass for Hertford as well
- Uttlesford DC has now received a planning application for a new arrivals terminal at Stansted Airport. A further application, to increase passenger numbers from 35 million per annum to 43 million per annum, is also expected this year
- Essex CC has been awarded some funding for the interim scheme for M11 J8 from SELEP, and is waiting for a decision from a Highways England (HE) scheme, which could add up to £5m. This, plus other funding already secured, should be enough to take forward the interim scheme for J8. Essex CC is also working on the model to test strategic future intervention options for J8, and will meet with HE and Stansted Airport soon on how to take this forward
- Cllr Linda Haysey referred to the 'Wider South East Member Briefing Note' which was prepared for the meeting with Gavin Barwell MP on 19 January 2017, which had been circulated. She explained that the meeting had been positive, and that **the notes would be shared asap**. The GLA representative from the Mayor's office (Jules Pipe) was very effective in supporting the London-bordering local authorities present, and pushing for London to engage in a meaningful cross-border relationship with these authorities. Mr. Pipe is keen to receive any information on why any extant planning permissions aren't being implemented. **All attendees to please send any data/insight on this to Cllr Haysey**
- Cllr Susan Barker noted the extreme difference in dwelling prices in the HMA, having spoken with a constituent who had moved to take advantage of the difference in prices and availability between Takely and Ware. This further highlights the pressure for housing in some places

9. A.O.B.

- It was noted that Sarah King would be leaving Epping Forest DC. All attendees thanked her for her efforts for the Board.

10. Dates of next meetings (confirmed):

- Monday 27 February 2017 - (6:30pm Harlow DC)
- Monday 20 March 2017 - (6:30pm Harlow DC)

**Draft Note from Co-operation for Sustainable Development (Officers') Group
Thursday 19 January 2017**

Attendance

Brentwood BC	Jill Warren
East Herts DC	Claire Sime
Epping Forest DC	Glen Chipp, Derek Macnab, Alison Blom-Cooper, David Coleman, Sarah King
Essex CC	Mary Young, David Sprunt, Rich Cooke
Harlow DC	Graeme Bloomer, Dianne Cooper
Highways England	Andy Jobling
LB Redbridge	Ciara Whelehan
Uttlesford DC	Gordon Glenday, Richard Fox

*** Actions are in bold**

1. Apologies

Broxbourne BC – Martin Paine
Chelmsford CC – Claire Stuckey
Conservators of Epping Forest – Jeremy Dagley
Essex CC – Sean Perry
Herts CC - Jan Hayes-Griffin, Roger Flowerday
Highways England - Nigel Allsopp
Natural England – Sarah Fraser

2. Draft notes of meeting of 15 December – including review of action points

Draft notes from November and December meetings were agreed. Actions from previous meeting -

- All to send any comment on draft notes from Co-op. Officer Group 15 November 2016 to Sarah King – *no comments received, notes agreed as circulated*
- Harlow DC to share retail study asap – *consultants are feeding updated figures into the draft, then the revised draft will be issued, and can then be shared*
- Epping Forest DC to commission AECOM (on behalf of HMA) to do a technical addendum to the Strategic OAN Spatial Options report – *ongoing*
- Book an HMA/counties etc. workshop to discuss employment distribution across the HMA/FEMA – *done, booked for 10 February 2017*
- Harlow DC to draft paper on affordable housing provision in the HMA – *paper drafted and circulated to HMA officers*
- Various actions re: PAH relocation feasibility – *PAH has now supplied some data on existing trips to and from current PAH site, to feed into transport modelling. Officers have not yet seen PAH's brief for the Strategic Outline Case (SOC) for the relocation of the hospital [Note – since this meeting, the SOC brief has been sent, and circulated to HMA officers]*
- Future Member Board dates to be arranged – *done, Monday 23 January 2017, Monday 27 February 2017 and Monday 20 March have been booked (all at Harlow DC at 6.30pm)*

3. Update on current/recent consultations on Local Plans

a. East Herts DC

All representations to the recent regulation 19 publication are now in the online portal. There were ~3,500 comments, of which ~1,900 were about the Gilston area. Analysis will be presented to the District Planning Executive Panel in March 2017, along with an updated Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP), position statements etc. East Herts DC is committed to submit to PINS by the end of March 2017, and is working on MoUs, topic papers etc.

b. Epping Forest DC

The regulation 18 Draft Local Plan consultation finished in December, there were ~3,500 responses, which are currently being assessed. A number of new sites were put forward, so further work on site selection is taking those into account. Epping Forest DC is also collating additional evidence on transport assessment, IDP, employment, viability etc. to

inform the Pre-Submission Plan. Officers are working on a programme for Member engagement before Pre-submission, and timescales for the Local Plan are being reviewed.

c. Chelmsford CC

Chelmsford CC has paused publication of its Preferred Options Local Plan pending publication of the Housing White Paper and completion of key evidence base reports. The Preferred Options document is now scheduled to go to Committee in early March, and to be published in late March. This should not affect later stages of the Local Plan timetable.

d. LB Redbridge

Regulation 19 representations were completed last summer, resulting in ~1,200 comments, the majority of which concerned the 4 parcels of Green Belt which LB proposes to release. A letter of non-conformity with the London Plan has been received from the Mayor, questioning whether exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated, suggesting building at a higher density and more on brownfield land. LB Redbridge intends to submit their Plan (as drafted) in February 2017, with hearing sessions expected in the summer.

e. Uttlesford DC

Uttlesford DC had intended publish a Regulation 19 Pre Submission Plan and seek representations before Christmas 2016, but decided to 'pause' the timetable while considering the evidence, and advice from PINS/CLG. They have now taken an in principle decision to do a further regulation 18 consultation in summer 2017, then regulation 19 representations towards end of 2017.

f. Brentwood BC

Brentwood BC has been successful in their bid for funding to support a garden village at the southern end of the borough. This has caused a 'pause', officers/Members are now considering a revised LDS with a focussed, housing and site-based regulation 18 consultation in summer 2017.

4. Distribution of affordable housing (paper from Harlow DC)

Graeme Bloomer presented his draft paper on distribution of affordable housing within the West Essex/East Herts HMA. It was noted that Harlow DC's future deficit for affordable housing, according to the HMA wide figures, will be more than offset by the surplus in the other three Districts. It was queried whether it was sufficient to agree this, or whether further detail would need to be within the Distribution of OAHN MoU about how it would work in practice. Graeme Bloomer has contacted CLG who are happy to discuss this, they also advised that the Housing White Paper is 'imminent' and may affect the discussion.

It was noted that the three District Councils would need to see evidence of Harlow DC's affordable housing deficit, and the attempts that have been made to address it, as part of these discussions. Harlow DC has also taken legal advice on the matter which has been shared confidentially. All agreed that getting the Distribution of OAHN MoU into a form that can be signed by all the authorities was essential, particularly given East Herts DC's commitment to submitting their Local Plan to PINS by the end of March 2017. There was a discussion about the Harlow DC resolution not supporting the sites to the south and west of Harlow, within Epping Forest District, and that this would need to be resolved before detailed agreement about affordable housing could be reached. Graeme Bloomer explained that Essex CC and Harlow DC officers had been working together on potential transport mitigation measures regarding these sites which would be presented to Harlow DC Members at a Full Council meeting on 23 February 2017. **Graeme Bloomer to refine draft paper into a shorter précis then send this to Sarah King, who will circulate it first to HMA officers. On agreement, Sarah King will circulate this to Members for the January 2017 Member Board. Graeme Bloomer will organise meeting with CLG for officers, including PINS and counties, in late January 2017.**

5. Scoping of work on Sustainable Transport Corridors

Claire Sime explained that East Herts DC had set up a recent meeting on the Stort crossing with the Herts LEP, which was then widened to cover the future sustainable transport corridors which are a key part of the Harlow & Gilston Garden Town bid. All at that meeting agreed that the corridors and the Stort crossing were a key piece of work needed to move forward. James Farrar and Karl Fitzpatrick from ATLAS also attended, and will be involved with the scoping work. The

Herts LEP were positive in that the project is on their radar for funding opportunities. It was agreed that a task and finish group would be set up as part of the Garden Town work. David Sprunt noted the importance of sorting out funding for the work on the corridors, as the amount of funding Essex CC has in their budget will not fund it all. The Garden Town budget would need to help fund it. It was also agreed that Amanda Thorn would approach the South East LEP.

6. Update on other cross-boundary/strategic matters:

a. 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town'

The joint bid from East Herts/Epping Forest/Harlow Councils for 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town' was successful, CLG awarded £0.5m. An officer/Chief Executive workshop with ATLAS is being set up for 8 February 2017. James Farrar (ATLAS) is working up a scoping paper with officers, to bring to the next Co-op. Member Board. Officers will seek approval to start looking for a Programme Manager /Director (2-year post); they would like to advertise ahead of the workshop to keep momentum. The three authorities will need to scope out how to spend remaining funds. **ATLAS will circulate draft scoping paper to officers from the three authorities, and Glen Chipp will also write to the other two Chief Executives.** Claire Sime noted the importance of community engagement though the Garden Town project - East Herts DC officers are already set to meet with the Gilston community on 28 January 2017, and are keen to engage them proactively in the process.

b. Princess Alexandra Hospital relocation feasibility work

Essex CC is preparing the brief for the PAH work – it should be ready next week.

c. Discussions with TfL re capacity on the Central Line

Epping Forest DC met with LB Redbridge, LB Waltham Forest and TfL in late 2016. TfL is working up a brief for additional work on capacity of the Central line. Epping Forest DC sent the information requested but heard nothing from TfL, neither has LB Redbridge. **Epping Forest DC/LB Redbridge to chase TfL re: a follow-up meeting** in early February 2017.

7. Update on Memoranda of Understanding re: the West Essex/East Herts HMA:

a. Distribution of Objectively Assessed Housing Need across the HMA

This MoU will be redrafted in due course.

b. Highways and Transportation Infrastructure for the HMA

This is currently being signed. David Sprunt noted that an announcement had been made that M11 J7A will receive funding (see <http://www.theplanner.co.uk/news/%C2%A312-billion-roads-funding-allocated>). The definite amount has not yet been announced, the Department for Transport has only written to the MPs so far. Essex CC's planning application for J7A should be submitted by the end of January 2017, with determination in June/July 2017. There was a discussion as to whether the MoU should be signed as it is now, or whether it should be amended regarding J7A/J7 funding and signed later. It was agreed that the group should sign the MoU now, as is, and amend it in future.

c. Managing the Impacts of Growth across the HMA on Epping Forest SAC

This is currently being signed.

8. Items for Co-op. Member Board 23 January 2017

- Draft paper on distribution of affordable housing in the HMA (Harlow DC to draft)
- Scoping paper on Harlow & Gilston Garden Town governance etc. (ATLAS)
- Verbal update on PAH relocation issues
- Verbal update on the 'Highways & Transportation Infrastructure' and 'Impacts on Epping Forest SAC' MoUs, and on ideas re: workshop and possible MoU on employment distribution

9. A.O.B.

None

10. Future Co-op. Officer meeting dates:

- Thursday 16 February 2017 - (10am, Committee Rm 1, Epping Forest DC)
- Thursday 16 March 2017 - (10am, Committee Rm 2, Epping Forest DC)

**Co-operation for Sustainable Development (Officers') Group
Agenda –Thursday 19 January 2017**

10am – Committee Room 1, [Civic Offices, Epping Forest District Council](#)

AGENDA

1. Apologies
2. Draft notes of meeting of 15 December – including review of action points
3. Update on current/recent consultations on Local Plans
 - a. East Herts DC
 - b. Epping Forest DC
 - c. Any others?
4. Distribution of affordable housing (paper from Harlow DC)
5. Scoping of work on Sustainable Transport Corridors
6. Update on other cross-boundary/strategic matters:
 - a. 'Harlow & Gilston Garden Town'
 - b. Princess Alexandra Hospital relocation feasibility work
 - c. Discussions with TfL re capacity on the Central Line
7. Update on Memoranda of Understanding:
 - a. Distribution of Objectively Assessed Housing Need across the West Essex/East Herts HMA
 - b. Highways and Transportation Infrastructure for the West Essex/East Herts HMA
 - c. Managing the Impacts of Growth across the West Essex/East Herts HMA on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation
 - d. Proposal to develop an MoU for distribution of employment across the HMA
8. Items for Co-op. Member Board 23 January 2017
9. A.O.B.
10. Future Co-op. Officer meeting dates:
 - o Thursday 16 February 2017 - (10am, Committee Rm 1, Epping Forest DC)
 - o Thursday 16 March 2017 - (10am, Committee Rm 2, Epping Forest DC)

Duty to Co-operate Meeting between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Uttlesford District Council

Uttlesford District Council Offices 10.00am 13 January 2017

Present: -

South Cambridgeshire District Council – Cllr Peter Topping (Leader), Stephen Kelly (Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development), Caroline Hunt (Planning Policy Manager)

Uttlesford District Council – Cllr Howard Rolfe (Leader), Cllr Susan Barker (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder), Gordon Glenday (Assistant Director Planning), Richard Fox (Planning Policy Team Leader)

GG outlined the status of the draft Uttlesford Local Plan. It had been intended to undertake a Regulation 19 Consultation in November last year but a combination of factors relating to the need to gather further evidence, new population projections and some Member's concerns led the Plan to be "paused". It was now proposed to pursue a preferred options Regulation 19 Consultation in summer 2017, with submission anticipated in Spring 2018.

GG explained that he had attended a conference where Communities and Local Government (CLG) officials had said that the forthcoming Housing White Paper would emphasise the importance of joint working.

HR said that the Council's housing target had increased and may increase further.

SK enquired about Uttlesford's overarching strategy for their Plan.

SB explained that there were various givens and outstanding commitments. The focus was on the A120 corridor as a priority with some development targeted at the villages and Saffron Walden.

HR explained that most residents wanted to keep the District rural in character but he recognised the need for growth, particularly in relation to the "airport in the countryside" which employed 18% of Uttlesford residents. There was a current application which had been submitted for an arrivals hall. There was logic to development along the A120.

PT explained about economic activity in South Cambs and the biomed cluster. He referred to a number of emerging proposals for growth in the south of South Cambs.

RF said that the recent increase in population projections meant that a proposed new settlement at Great Chesterford had been brought into play.

SK felt that sub-regional planning was coming back into vogue being supported by the LEPs and the LSCC corridor. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devloution Deal included a non-strategic spatial plan for the combined authority, recognising the interplay between Greater Cambridge and other authorities. Cambridge Ahead 2050 was also preparing a future vision for the area. The South Cambs Plan was

submitted in 2014 and it was anticipated that the Examination Hearings would finish in the summer.

HR had a long term vision for a greater Saffron Walden.

PT explained that the Genome Campus was a global level research facility with a thirty year agenda. They have emerging plans for major expansion of the campus including approximately 1,200 houses and to divert the road. It was envisaged that the houses would be “tied” to the campus. Whilst there had been presentations by the Wellcome Trust the proposals were not in the Local Plan or the call for sites.

SK felt it was important that the Biomed cluster reconnected with local communities over the next few years and delivered up amenities and transport improvements. There was a major issue with roads in South Cambs and the work that needed to be done hadn't yet been done. In terms of a potential new settlement at Great Chesterford, all the necessary transport modelling hadn't been undertaken, including key junctions in South Cambs.

CH emphasised the importance of sound evidence to support any new settlement proposal, in particular to demonstrate how sustainable transport provision would be made and that the transport network could cope with the proposed growth.

RF stressed that it was important that any further modelling work did not hold up progress on the UDC Local Plan.

SB felt that it was important that ECC met CCC to make the highways work.

PT considered that the modelling work was at a very embryonic stage and needed to be undertaken properly.

SK identified need to consider long term aspirations for the area.

HR thought that there was a group of landowners looking at a new town in the area.

PT believed that there was a proposal for a service station in the area.

HR agreed that the service station at Junction 8 would need to move in the long term when the Junction improvement works were undertaken.

SK believed that there would be challenges by local residents around congestion.

PT felt that there were more general infrastructure concerns not just highways.

SK agreed and stated that Sawston Sub Station was inadequate.

RF stressed the need for regular meetings to be established under the Duty to Co-operate.

CH explained that there had been bids to the Growth Deal and the government's Local Majors fund for a strategic scale study into the A505.

HR felt that there was a need to set out a vision for the area.

CH referred to a highways meeting that was being arranged between ECC/CCC/SCDC and UDC to discuss transport issues in the south of South Cambridgeshire.

CH set out the issues to be considered at the forthcoming South Cambs Examination Hearings. The most significant proposal outside the new settlements was for 500 houses east of Sawston.

GG said that UDC should attend some of the Hearings.

ALL agreed that it was important to meet on a regular basis under the Duty to Co-operate.

Meeting between Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils 21st November 2016

Attendees

- Nicola Beach
- Jon Hayden
- Emma Goodings
- Dawn French
- Roger Harborough
- Gordon Glenday

Uttlesford DC explained that the pause in the Local Plan process was to allow its members more time to reflect on the evidence being used to shape officers' recommendations and members' final decisions. A revised timetable for the Local Plan is currently being worked on and is expected to be presented to Members once officers have explored the options available. A revised LDS will also be prepared.

Work is continuing on evidence base documents including work on the West Essex housing market area.

Braintree DC updated that the timetable continued to be unchanged and the final elements of work were being completed on the evidence base.

Highway consultants for both authorities have agreed to liaise directly to ensure the cross boundary strategic highway issues, particularly relating to the A120 and M11 are being considered.

Update on the AECOM work and that local authority officers and Councillors from both sides have been involved in the current round of work. A discussion was held on additional work that may be needed from AECOM on the West of Braintree garden community to fully explore all the options across the potential whole area. It was agreed that a further brief with implications for costing and timings would be agreed for AECOM to work to

An update on the direction of travel for the garden community project was given by BDC and it was agreed to circulate links to the latest committee report on LDV and deliverability to Uttlesford. The brief with regards to the Peer Review which is currently underway on the garden communities project would also be shared.

The potential of an MOU between the authorities and ECC was discussed and considered to be appropriate. This was to be drafted and signed shortly.

It was agreed that a co-ordinated position should be taken with regards to the press and that officers from the comms team in both authorities should work closely together on this in the short term. In the more medium term a specific comms and marketing person is to be appointed by the garden communities project and it is to be ensured that they liaise with Uttlesford officers.

It was agreed that a Member to Member meeting would be helpful to have just before Christmas, prior to the publication of the Braintree submission Local Plan. A further high level officer meeting would also be arranged for just after Christmas for the same reason.

Further meetings would continue to take place between policy officers.

Local Plan Master

ID	Task Name	Start	Finish	21 January		11 June		01 November		21 March
				19/12	27/02	08/05	17/07	25/09	04/12	12/02
	Milestone: Yes	Wed 01/02/17	Thu 29/03/18							
142	Full Member Briefing - Reasonable Alternatives	Wed 01/02/17	Wed 01/02/17	◆ 01/02						
143	PPWG	Wed 22/02/17	Wed 22/02/17	◆ 22/02						
144	Promoter Member Briefings x 3	Wed 08/03/17	Mon 27/03/17	◆ 27/03						
145	PPWG	Thu 06/04/17	Thu 06/04/17	◆ 06/04						
146	PPWG	Tue 09/05/17	Tue 09/05/17	◆ 09/05						
147	Regulation 18 Evidence Base collection complete	Fri 19/05/17	Fri 19/05/17	◆ 19/05						
148	Full Member Briefing	Mon 22/05/17	Mon 22/05/17	◆ 22/05						
149	PPWG	Tue 06/06/17	Tue 06/06/17	◆ 06/06						
150	Full Member Briefing	Thu 22/06/17	Thu 22/06/17	◆ 22/06						
152	PPWG to consider Reg 18 Draft Plan	Mon 03/07/17	Mon 03/07/17	◆ 03/07						
153	Cabinet consider recommendation of PPWG to go out to Reg 18 Consultation	Thu 06/07/17	Thu 06/07/17	◆ 06/07						
154	Full Council consider recommendation of Cabinet to go out to Reg 18 Consultation	Tue 11/07/17	Tue 11/07/17	◆ 11/07						
155	Reg 18 - Consultation	Mon 17/07/17	Tue 29/08/17	◆ 29/08						
159	PPWG - feedback on number of reps and types of reps received etc	Tue 17/10/17	Tue 17/10/17	◆ 17/10						
160	Full Member briefing - what changes are proposed if any	Tue 28/11/17	Tue 28/11/17	◆ 28/11						
161	PPWG to consider reps and any alterations	Thu 14/12/17	Thu 14/12/17	◆ 14/12						
162	Cabinet consider reps etc and recommend Reg 19 Consultation	Tue 19/12/17	Tue 19/12/17	◆ 19/12						
163	Full Council consider reps etc inc delegated authority to submit plan subject to no MAJOR modifications	Wed 03/01/18	Wed 03/01/18	◆ 03/01						
165	Reg 19 consultation	Mon 08/01/18	Fri 16/02/18	◆ 16/02						
168	Full Member Session - feedback on consultation responses and note of any MINOR modifications prior to submission	Thu 22/03/18	Thu 22/03/18	◆ 22/03						
169	Delegated decision to submit	Wed 28/03/18	Wed 28/03/18	◆ 28/03						
171	Submit	Thu 29/03/18	Thu 29/03/18	◆ 29/03						

Critical		Task Progress		Baseline		Summary		Inactive Task	
Critical Split		Manual Task		Baseline Split		Manual Summary		Inactive Milestone	
Critical Progress		Start-only		Baseline Milestone		Project Summary		Inactive Summary	
Task		Finish-only		Milestone		External Tasks		Deadline	
Split		Duration-only		Summary Progress		External Milestone			

**UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP FORWARD PLAN
FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Item	Date	Brief information about the item and details of documents submitted for consideration	Part 2?	Lead officer
Update on Housing White Paper	22.2.17	To review implications for the emerging local plan (subject to publication date of White Paper)	N	Richard Fox
Process up to Regulation 18 Consultation	22.2.17	Commentary on key issues and approach to formulating the Draft Plan	N	Gordon Glenday
Key Milestones and Dates of Meetings	22.2.17	Overview and Update of Project Plan for Local Plan	N	Ann Howells
Water Cycle Study Report	22.2.17	Part of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Sarah Nicholas
Evidence Base Update	22.2.17	Overview and Update of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Action Plan from PAS/IPE Review	22.2.17	Update on implementing action plan	N	Roger Harborough
Duty to Co-operate	22.2.17	Update on Progress with Duty to Co-operate issues	N	Richard Fox

Item	Date	Brief information about the item and details of documents submitted for consideration	Part 2?	Lead officer
Feedback from Promoters of Strategic Sites Presentations	6.4.17	To review member feedback after the event	N	Richard Fox
Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment	6.4.17	To consider report	N	Richard Fox
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	6.4.17	Part of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Key Milestones and Dates of Meetings	6.4.17	Overview and Update of Project Plan for Local Plan	N	Ann Howells
Evidence Base Update	6.4.17	Overview and Update of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Action Plan from PAS/IPE Review	6.4.17	Update on implementing action plan	N	Roger Harborough
Duty to Co-operate	6.4.17	Update on Progress with Duty to Co-operate issues	N	Richard Fox
Transport Update	6.6.17	Part of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Alan Gillham
Viability Update	6.6.17	Part of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox

Item	Date	Brief information about the item and details of documents submitted for consideration	Part 2?	Lead officer
Sustainability Update	6.6.17	Part of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Key Milestones and Dates of Meetings	6.6.17	Overview and Update of Project Plan for Local Plan	N	Ann Howells
Evidence Base Update	6.6.17	Overview and Update of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Action Plan from PAS/IPE Review	6.6.17	Update on implementing action plan	N	Roger Harborough
Duty to Co-operate	6.6.17	Update on Progress with Duty to Co-operate issues	N	Richard Fox
Draft Local Plan for Regulation 18 Consultation	3.7.17	Key Stage of Process	N	Gordon Glenday
Local Development Scheme	3.7.17	(If not previously adopted)	N	Simon Payne
Key Milestones and Dates of Meetings	3.7.17	Overview and Update of Project Plan for Local Plan	N	Ann Howells
Evidence Base Update	3.7.17	Overview and Update of Evidence Base for Local Plan	N	Richard Fox
Action Plan from PAS/IPE Review	3.7.17	Update on implementing action plan	N	Roger Harborough

Item	Date	Brief information about the item and details of documents submitted for consideration	Part 2?	Lead officer
Duty to Co-operate	3.7.17	Update on Progress with Duty to Co-operate issues	N	Richard Fox