

**PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL CHAMBER -  
COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on  
TUESDAY, 17 APRIL 2018 at 7.00 pm**

Present: Councillor H Rolfe (Chairman)  
Councillors S Barker, A Dean, P Lees, J Lodge, J Loughlin,  
A Mills and E Oliver

Officers in attendance: A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy  
Manager), G Glenday (Assistant Director - Planning) and  
S Miles (Planning Policy Team Leader)

Also present: T Clarke and M Young

PP25 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting on 14 December 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

PP12 – Councillor Lodge said the legislation was there for development corporations to take on **an area of** new town development.

This line was to be changed to read: Councillor Lodge said the legislation was there for development corporations to take on **all** new town development.

The Chairman said officers would write to all members of the working group to follow up on the action points raised at the last meeting.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers were currently drafting the Regulation 19 local plan and would be bringing it to the working group on 31 May. All actions from the previous working group would be considered.

Councillor Mills said an additional action point from the previous meeting was that further work should be carried out regarding how appropriate the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy in the local plan would be.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers had been considering how to incorporate the Community Infrastructure Levy into future decisions on planning in Uttlesford. This would entail developing a regulation 123 list and consulting upon it. In order to do this, officers were looking into whether it was appropriate to include reference to the levy in the draft local plan.

The Chairman said the issue of the Community Infrastructure Levy would be raised at the next group leaders meeting and then officers' work on the matter would be brought back to the working group. There would then be clarity around the decision-making and the final conclusion.

Councillor Lodge said members needed an opportunity to have another discussion on planning policies. The Chairman said another session on this matter could be arranged.

PP26

## **WEST ESSEX AND EAST HERTFORDSHIRE ASSESSMENT OF EMPLOYMENT NEEDS**

In response to statements by public speakers, the Chairman said the number of houses Uttlesford District Council was working towards in its local plan was 14,100, and this figure had been examined a number of times. This was in comparison to the number generated by central government's new methodology which was 16,200. If the Council's plan went through on time, then Uttlesford would only need to build 14,100 houses.

In response to a statement from Tony Clarke, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the purpose of the report was to inform the local plans for Uttlesford and other councils in the FEMA area. Evidence used in the local plan had to be as up to date as possible, but there would always be new evidence emerging. The evidence in the report was recent and was appropriate to base the local plan on. The industrial land space requirement was 22ha and office requirement of 2-5ha, which was not a large requirement in the context of 16,000 jobs, but it was only taking into account the B-use elements of the forecast. The local plan would identify the land to meet this requirement. He would respond to Tony Clarke's question about how many jobs there were in Uttlesford District at present and how many there would be in 2033.

In response to a statement from Michael Young, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the jobs growth figure for Stansted Airport related to a high level of growth. The estimated growth of jobs at the airport by the end of 2030 was about 10000, including direct on-airport, direct off-airport and indirect and induced jobs.

The working group considered the report.

Councillor Barker said there was a discrepancy between the moderated and preferred baseline figures for total FEMA jobs created between 2011 and 2016, despite the fact that this period had already passed. She asked who had decided what the preferred scenario was and what the rationale was behind the large difference in the moderated baseline figure and preferred baseline figure between 2011 and 2033.

In response to Councillor Barker, the Planning Policy Team Leader said he would speak to the consultants for an explanation on Councillor Barker's point. This explanation would be circulated to the working group.

Councillor Dean said housing needed to be planned for. The process of working out the total number of jobs needed to be reconciled with the total housing number.

The Chairman said there needed to be the right amount of employment space in Uttlesford to match the planned number of houses. The report indicated the

balance of employment space to houses. Employment would be a key aspect of the new communities.

Councillor Lodge said he would like to see further analysis of the figures in the report. He asked what the real effect of employment in new towns on commuting in Uttlesford would be.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said that garden community principles aimed to make the proposed new towns as self-contained as they could be. They would give people the opportunity to live and work in the same place, or to commute by sustainable means.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said the report was a piece of evidence which would be used to inform the local plan. The plan would need to monitor the implementation and impact of its key policies including employment provision. Officers would report annually to the Council on this once the plan had been implemented, examining the number of jobs that had been created in Uttlesford, whether that number reflected the planned growth of jobs and if not, what steps could be taken to resolve the issue.

The Chairman said one of the advantages of garden communities was that the balance of houses took account of the need for accommodation to be affordable for all residents of Uttlesford.

The Chairman said proposed new site allocations would be provided to members in advance of the meeting on 23 May. The Chief Executive had recommended there should be political group discussions with planners. Those discussions would be a good opportunity to talk about new site allocations before they were brought to the working group.

*Tony Clarke and Michael Young spoke on this item. A copy of Michael Young's statement is appended to these minutes*

PP27 **ESSEX, SOUTH-END ON SEA AND THURROCK GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE ACCOMMODATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY 2016-2033**

The working group considered the report.

In response to a question from Councillor Dean, the Planning Policy Team Leader said he would look into an explanation to why the response rate to the survey in Uttlesford was so low.

In response to a question from Councillor Dean, Councillor Barker said there were no responses in South End because there were no pitches in South End

PP28 **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was 23 May 2018.

The meeting finished at 9.15.

## **ACTION POINTS**

PP25	To amend PP12 of the minutes of 14 December 2017 as agreed.
PP25	To write to members of the working group to explain how action points from the meeting on 14 December 2017 had been followed up. This is to include work examining policy SP10.
PP25	To consider the Community Infrastructure Levy at a Group Leaders meeting before bringing the work back to the working group.
PP25	To arrange another member session regarding planning policy with the Development Management Leader
PP26	To respond to T Clarke's question about how many jobs there were in Uttlesford District at present and how many there would be in 2033.
PP26	To follow up the discrepancy between moderated and preferred baseline figures for total FEMA jobs created between 2011 and 2016, and to respond to members about this.
PP26	To give members sight of proposed new site allocations in advance of the publication of the agenda for the next meeting of the working group.
PP27	To respond to members with an explanation for why the response rate to the survey was low in Uttlesford.

## **PPWG 17 April 2018**

This report takes into account the latest East of England economic forecasts. These forecasts were prepared in 2016 and the report is dated October 2017, so it has taken a little while to reach us.

The essential point is that the latest economic forecasts show a much lower figure for job creation over the plan period. The report shows that after allowing for commuting patterns, a further 20,000 jobs would still be needed in the SHMA area in order to match the proposed housing growth.

It is suggested that much of this shortfall could be made up for by expansion at Stansted airport. A figure of 10,000 extra jobs, taken from a 2015 report by the airport owners, was put forward. The consultants were never asked to check the validity of the calculation and it has been repeatedly challenged, but inexplicably it's still being used.

However, the recent planning application by MAG shows a changed picture. If passenger growth continues according to government forecasts, then it is estimated that there will be an extra 3,000 airport jobs. If planning permission is granted and numbers increase well above government forecasts then a further 3,000 jobs will be created. So, we are looking at 3,000 or maybe 6,000 jobs rather than 10,000.

But we need to remember that the airport is notorious for exaggerating employment prospects. Based on recent experience a more accurate figure would be about half of these latest projections.

The result is the provision of more homes than we have jobs for. Allowing for other minor factors, this could mean about 10,000 additional new residents without local jobs, who would have to commute out the area to find employment. As the report states we would be creating dormitory towns, but also putting massive additional pressure on road and rail systems.

This issue is not new. It was raised initially in October 2015 and has been repeated by me alone on at least six separate occasions. Now there is a difference. The problems have been highlighted in this consultant's report and the airport have come up with much lower, and slightly more realistic, employment forecasts.

We are now faced with a serious imbalance – after allowing for commuting ratios there are still far more homes planned than available jobs. Having ignored the issue for two and half years I believe that urgent action is now needed to bring the two factors into balance and to be assured that there really is a need for three new settlements in the district.

Michael Young

April 2018

This page is intentionally left blank