

**Meeting Note DRAFT**

**Eastern Hertfordshire/West Essex  
Planning Policy Development Meeting**

**2 pm Monday 6 January 2014  
CR6  
Harlow Civic Centre**

**Present**

[Redacted list of attendees]

**1. Introductions**

**Comments**

**2. Apologies**

[Redacted list of apologies]

Noted

**3. Meeting notes**

Comments on the draft notes of the previous meeting had not yet been received from all members of the group to enable sign off.

**4. Harlow Sub-Regional Transport Advice – 2013 Local Plan Testing using HSGTM**

[Redacted] a presentation on the latest East Herts/West Essex PPD Forecast 2036 Traffic Assessment. This sought to assess current housing and jobs growth aspirations to 2036, reflecting potential growth that will be set out in emerging local plans across the study area and to identify the impacts and any additional infrastructure requirements. Following the previous

test runs Test 5 assessed a growth in dwellings in the study area to 48,538 and 20,463 jobs. This included 10,000 dwellings north of Harlow and 2,300 jobs. The test included assumptions about additional infrastructure to those considered in Test 4, including a modified Eastwick Junction, Hammarskjold Rd/First Ave/Velizy Ave "Longabout" and Second Ave/Velizy Ave "Throughabout."

The key outcomes suggest that

1. an additional 5000 households at Harlow North would cause journey times to increase and worsen congestion on the A414 in the vicinity of Eastwick would still be congested despite junction improvements. In addition there would still be significant congestion across the Harlow network with the Second Stort Crossing also becoming significantly congested.
2. a Second Stort crossing, as with Test 4, would still make a significant contribution to alleviating congestion in central Harlow although congestion would appear along this route in peak times, despite junction improvements. Additional traffic would cause stress on the A414 through Edinburgh Way/Cambridge Way and the A414/First Ave junctions.
3. In the Bishops Stortford area local congestion would occur in the central part of the town and on the A120. However, additional Harlow North traffic does not significantly influence network stress issues in Bishops Stortford,

Arising from the assessments the Consultants concluded that additional Harlow North traffic would cause additional congestion in Harlow and some congestion issues on the Second Stort Crossing. However, a Second Stort Crossing does have significant benefits in the north Harlow area with more traffic using the primary rather than the secondary road network.

Significant problem areas would remain at:

1. A414 Edinburgh Way/Cambridge Way
2. A414 First Ave
3. Eastwick Junction
4. Gilden Way/East Harlow development access
5. Second Ave
6. A1184 congestion between High Wych Road and Sawbridgeworth

In conclusion and in response to these issues the consultants suggested some additional tests including grade separation at Eastwick Junction, as well as further capacity enhancements within Harlow including on Edinburgh Way/A414/Gilden way, latest Junction 7 a designs and on Second Ave/Southern Way.

In addition further lanes on the Second Stort Crossing should be considered as well as a possible western alignment. Finally an assessment would be needed of the phasing to understand the level of development that could be accommodated with lower levels of infrastructure provision.

Following the presentation a number of points were made by those at the meeting.

█ noted that the outputs should be considered as drafts until ECC and HCC highway Officers had an opportunity to review and comment on them.

█ advised that the HA were happy with the model in the strategic context but that more detailed work would be required in respect of the proposals for junction 7a.

█ advised that following the current public consultation exercise ECC would review the responses and liaise with the HA. It is thought it was unlikely there would be any showstoppers.

█ also that there was nothing unexpected arising from the latest iterations of the Traffic Assessments.

█ pointed out that the intention was to manage traffic movement on the strategic network and that it would be impossible to relieve all congestion in Harlow, in any event some congestion helped to manage traffic flows.

█ noted that ECC were preparing a technical paper to set out the case for a new Junction 7a especially as it was acknowledged that Junction 7 is already at capacity.

█ acknowledged, however, that it might be possible to achieve some limited headroom at Junction 7 though minor improvements but this would require further work to establish the position.

█ made the point that the LPA's in the area need to have some confidence when we next consult on emerging development strategies in respect of traffic impacts of the growth being considered and the mitigation measures needed.

█ said that ultimately developers will need to demonstrate that their schemes work via the model.

█ noted that it was necessary to establish headroom available at the local level.

█ suggested it was important to identify key mitigation measures that developers would be expected to contribute towards.

█ noted that ECC were working on costing the various mitigation measures currently referred to. There will be a need to identify funding gaps and to work to secure such funding through developer contributions, funding bids etc.

█ considered that the LEP's have an important role to play in securing funding.

█ B said there was a twin track approach needed to secure funding through developer contributions and funding bids.

█ noted that European funding should be explored.

█ said that a story needs to be told about aspirations across the wider area in order to secure funding.

█ stated that a shopping list of mitigation measures had been circulated as part of the funding bid to the LEP.

█ asked for a copy of this.

■■■■ also sought clarification on how “severe” impacts are measured.

It was also proposed that arising from the discussion and a general agreement on the robustness of the model that it would be made available to third parties to test their schemes subject to an appropriate protocol being drafted by the consultants and circulated for agreement by members of the group. This would ensure a consistent approach to the testing of development schemes and options at the strategic level. LPAS’s would be responsible for undertaking detailed testing at the local level.

## **6. Development Plan timetable update**

■■■■ advised details of the emerging planning strategy for E Herts had just been published and the options proposed were shown on plans presented to the Group.

■■■■ advised that they were hoping to have identified their housing growth options in July.

■■■■ advised that the Panel meeting on Wednesday will consider a technical paper to be referred to Cabinet that will be used to inform the preparation of a planning strategy consultation document. This will set out a housing target of around 12,000 to 15,000 with some of the unmet need being accommodated in adjoining LPA areas. It is intended that this will be consulted upon in the Spring.

■■■■ advised that their local plan will identify the need to provide for an additional 2,800 dwellings.

## **7. Actions**

1. ECC to circulate a list of mitigation schemes they intend to bid for.
2. HCC to circulate mitigation schemes they intend to bid for.
3. ECC to write to the group setting out their recommended approach in relation to the final output of the modelling work
4. 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?).

## **8. Date of Next Meeting**

TBC