

Meeting Note

Eastern Hertfordshire/West Essex Planning Policy Development Meeting

**2 pm Wednesday 30 April 2014
CR6
Harlow Civic Centre**

Present

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Apologies**

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- 3. Meeting notes**

Notes of the previous meeting (6 January 2014) were agreed subject to the need to address the outstanding actions of that meeting.

- 4. Harlow Sub-Regional Transport Assessment**

Model sign off and Protocol for the use and distribution of model.

[REDACTED] advised that the model had been agreed that it is fit for the purpose of testing local plan options by the Highways Agency for use at the strategic level. Traffic impact assessments would, however, be needed to provide more detailed assessments of the impact of individual development sites. This more detailed model is currently being constructed by ECC. Baseline will be available in September with completion expected in December.

[REDACTED] to agree with [REDACTED] what the strategic model can and cannot be used for and details of this and the associated criteria will be circulated to members of the

Group.

█ confirmed that their consultants had been asked to provide a final summary note including assumptions and to draft a protocol on the use of the model by third parties that would be circulated.

█ sought confirmation that the HA were happy with this.

█ advised that the HA were happy with this in principle.

█ sought clarification on the conclusions of the latest phase 5 model regarding the acceptability of 10,000 dwellings to the north of Harlow. █ sought ECC and HA assurance that the predicted additional stress that may pose operational issues is acceptable. It was not clear that the model gave a steer in respect of how development could be accommodated.

█ advised that the model provided a strategic assessment that included some mitigation assumptions but that more detailed assessments would be required on a site by site basis. An on-going process of assessment is being undertaken in order to have information available to bid for limited funds. The funds will increase existing highway capacity to serve committed development.

█ will circulate a list of current mitigation measures identified together with their costings. This is to include the costs of all schemes proposed to junctions in Harlow, together with cost and known funding stream (if funding is known).

█ advised he was not sure if █ had signed off the model on behalf of HCC

█ suggested that as a priority ECC/HCC need to meet to resolve outstanding matters and to circulate the outcomes with other colleagues in the group as the LPA were entering a critical phase in the plan making process and there was a need to ensure progress was being made. This includes the list of mitigation schemes costed by ECC to mitigate the impact of the development. This is critical as all parties are subject to the provisions of the Duty to Cooperate as set out in the Localism Act.

█ noted that inspectors were not comfortable on assessments being made on too broad a range of options.

█ made reference to recent comments from a planning Inspector that development would be acceptable if there were reasonable prospects of infrastructure coming forward.

Capacity of junction 7

█ understood junction 7 was at capacity following detailed work undertaken on Harlow's EZ. This does not take into account any capacity that may be needed to accommodate growth in Epping Forest.

█ confirmed that junction 7 is very close to capacity and that routes to the junction are also reaching capacity. Only a small amount of future growth could be accommodated without improvements to the junction and network. J7 could be improved to allow some small additional growth to be provided but the costs of the improvements to J7 necessary to facilitate all of the strategic housing development proposed is probably not viable and would undermine the case for J7a.

asked whether as part of the evidence base, had other options to junction 7a been explored and ruled out. It was important to show all options had been explored.

acknowledged and said alternatives are being considered.

implied that junction 8 had some capacity but that future growth in and around 8 may necessitate further works including new slip roads.

advised that junction 7a may provide headroom at junction 8 as well as at J7.

suggested that at future Examinations Inspectors will wish to understand how the wider strategic networks work and that it will be important to scope the interrelationships between junctions 7, 7a and 8.

advised that POD funding was available for a study of the headroom capacity of junction 7, and how this might be improved but a brief would need to be prepared. HDC to provide ECC with a copy of the successful POD project brief.

advised that ECC would prepare the brief.

5. Junction 7a update

advised that the consultation was completed at the end of March 2014. Analyses of the reps were now underway, but no great surprises so far. ECC are intending to build a more detailed model by the Autumn but probably this won't be ready until January 2015.

advised that ECC will promote the application for a new junction and that ECC will be the decision making body. However, the application cannot be submitted until local plans are in place (and the growth confirmed).

asked had there been any discussions at the political level about the scheme.

understood that was engaging with political leaders in the area.

advised that it was anticipated that the scheme would be in place by 2020.

asked if it was possible to have a plan showing how the junctions would be designed.

asked how likely would it be, that the more detailed modeling would identify more problems.

advised that the forecast model would be ready by Christmas 2014. The findings would be useful in the preparation of a joint IDP.

6. Duty to Cooperate and future role of group

█████ advised that the scope of the group may need to be reviewed having regard to the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. There have been joint training sessions with members and officers in some of the districts in the area. It is clear, from advice given by PAS and PINs, that there will need to be more proactive discussions between members in respect of the strategic development needs in the area, as well as between the districts and the counties, if the infrastructure requirements are to be delivered. It is unlikely, however, such discussions can be commenced until after the local elections and the consideration of the matters identified arising from the consultations currently taking place in E Hertfordshire and Harlow. It is unlikely consultation in Epping Forest will commence before the summer.

█████ also advised he had been asked to examine possible governance arrangements if members in the area considered there was scope for closer cooperation on strategic matters in the wider Harlow area. This could result in the establishment of a panel that would be served by smaller technical groups that would consider specific areas such as infrastructure where these had a strategic dimension.

█████ suggested that in the interim a short report could be compiled that collated transport infrastructure information across the four districts that could provide the basis for a strategic IDP [for the purposes of testing the feasibility of large-scale development options in the area](#). If this could be done May/June, it would support EH and EFDC in viability work on their plans. It might then be submitted to the group currently known as the "SHMA/DtC Group", whose name and ToR are under review, which is currently chaired by the EFDC CEO

There was a general feeling that S106 agreements were the best way to secure key infrastructure with CIL being used to mop up smaller sites.

█████ reminded the group of the need not to lose sight of the need to consider public transport infrastructure enhancements across the wider area.

Actions

1. By mid June 2014 ECC to circulate a list of mitigation schemes they intend to bid for together with their costs.
2. By mid June 2014 HCC to circulate a list of mitigation schemes they intend to bid for together with their costs.
3. By end of June 2014 MP to pull above information together in short report that could provide basis for a future IDP [for the purposes of testing the feasibility of development options](#).
4. As a priority but by end of May 2014 ECC to meet with HCC (and HA if appropriate) to resolve any outstanding issues relating to the modeling sign off and mitigation schemes being proposed..
5. By end of May 2014 ECC to prepare brief Consultants to circulate a protocol on use of the model by third parties for comment and agreement (It is assumed ECC would manage access to the model and collection of fees?).
6. █████ to supply the revised objectives of the "SHMA/DtC " Group to █████ for circulation, and to invite county representatives to next meeting.
7. █████ to circulate letter to group explaining sign-off for the HSGTM and stating that the model is suitable for use in plan-making.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

8. **Date of Next Meeting**
Mid June 2014

