

# Harlow Local Development Plan Examination

## Matters 1 & 2 – Thursday 28 March 10am

### AGENDA

#### Matter 1 - Duty to co-operate and other legal requirements

1. Duty to Co-operate:

For each strategic matter, how has the engagement been carried out, what has been the outcome and how has this addressed the strategic matter:

- (i) distribution of objectively assessed housing need
- (ii) distribution of objectively assessed employment needs
- (iii) highways & transportation infrastructure across HMA area
- (iv) impact on Epping Forest SAC
- (v) infrastructure across Harlow & Gilston Garden Town

Overall, has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with the relevant bodies in maximising the effectiveness of the HLDP in relation to the strategic matters? Has the duty to co-operate thus been met?

- 2. Has the preparation of the plan complied with the Statement of Community Involvement? (Harlow Alliance Party concerns)
- 3. Have the likely environmental, social and economic effects of the plan been adequately addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal? Does the appraisal test the plan against reasonable alternatives for the spatial strategy of the plan and the distribution of housing and employment land?
- 4. Can an adverse effect on Epping Forest SAC as a result of the plan be ruled out (either alone or in combination with other plans/projects)? When will the HRA be updated and the comments of Natural England on it be available?
- 5. Might further HRAs be required at Garden Town or major planning application level? If so, should this be a policy requirement?
- 6. Do visitor surveys show many visits to Epping Forest by Harlow residents, or traffic surveys show many vehicle movements through the forest to/from Harlow? On the basis of the currently available information, would mitigation measures be necessary to protect the SAC from (a) recreational pressure and/or (b) air pollution as a result of the level of development proposed in the plan?
- 7. Do the HRA findings so far have any specific implications for (a) the Garden Town as a whole, (b) the HS3 strategic housing site east of Harlow, (c) the HS2 housing allocations or (d) any other proposals in the plan? If Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) is necessary, how and where would it be delivered?
- 8. How would any necessary mitigation measures be secured? What policies should be included in the plan to ensure this happens? If necessary, in the absence of agreed mitigation measures and delivery mechanisms, is the plan sound?

9. Recreational effects on Harlow Woods SSSI and Hatfield Forest SSSI/NNR – have these been assessed and, if necessary, addressed?

## **Matter 2: Housing - Quantitative Requirements, Overall Provision and Five Year Supply**

1. Is the Full Objectively Assessed Need for housing between 2011-33 determined by the 2017 SHMA - 51,700 dwellings for the HMA and 7,400 for Harlow – robust?
  - (i) Use of the 2016 based household projections
  - (ii) Use of a 10 year migration trend
  - (iii) Use of the 14% uplift
2. Relationship of the housing requirement of 9,200 dwellings to be delivered in the plan period with the objectively assessed need of 7,400 dwellings. Justification for the extra 1,800 dwellings - to meet Harlow's affordable housing and regeneration needs or to meet needs from elsewhere in the HMA (Epping Forest?), or both?
3. Does the plan provide for a five year supply of deliverable housing sites against the housing requirement of 9,200 dwellings?
  - (i) 20% buffer?
  - (ii) Allowance for the non-implementation of commitments and trajectory for their implementation
  - (iii) Housing trajectory for allocated sites, individual and combined
  - (iv) Windfall site allowance?
  - (v) Should there be a stepped requirement to allow for the East of Harlow site to come on stream?
4. Will the allocations and policies in the plan deliver 9,200 dwellings over the full plan period to 2033?
  - (i) Will the strategic housing site east of Harlow be built out given the total of about 16,000 dwellings proposed in and around Harlow during the plan period?
  - (ii) Will the HS2 allocations be built out?
  - (iii) Will there be windfall sites?
  - (iv) Does the plan provide for sufficient flexibility - paragraph 7.31 states the allocations in the plan exceed the requirement by just 105 dwellings
5. Viability and its implications for policy:
  - (i) Findings of BNP Paribas report March 2018
  - (ii) Garden Town Strategic Viability Assessment
6. Housing provision for travellers - Policies HS4 and H10

# Harlow Local Development Plan Examination

## Matter 3 – Friday 29 March 10am

(may run over until Tuesday 2 April)

### Overall Strategy; Harlow & Gilston Garden Town - General Principles & Infrastructure

#### AGENDA

##### Overall principles

1. The principle of the overall spatial vision and spatial development strategy for Harlow to form the focus of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. Is it the most appropriate strategy against the reasonable alternatives for accommodating development in the HMA?
2. Does this comprise the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify deletion of Green Belt designation from the land involved?
3. Policy HGT1:
  - (i) Should this refer to the Garden Town as whole rather than four strategic garden town communities? (Essex CC concerns)
  - (ii) Does this inappropriately set policy for areas beyond the plan boundary? Should it refer to the East of Harlow site only, or alternatively set out how Harlow Council, as consultee, expects the wider garden town to be delivered?
  - (iii) Is it consistent with the equivalent or complementary policies for the Garden Town in the East Hertfordshire and Epping Forest local plans?
  - (iv) Detailed criteria (concerns of Miller Homes, Pegasus Group, Boyer)

##### Strategic Infrastructure Requirements

4. Have the overall infrastructure requirements for the overall Garden Town been adequately assessed? When will the joint Garden Town Infrastructure Delivery Plan & Garden Town Viability Plan be published? Will these have implications for policy?
5. Overall transport implications of the Garden Town. What transport improvements would be required, and how would these be delivered? How would costs be apportioned between the new developments? How does the development of the Garden Town relate to the new M11 Junction 7a and improvements at Junction 7? Do these need to be in place prior to any completions? Should the 60% target for sustainable travel be included as an objective of Policy HGT1?

6. Are the infrastructure requirements listed in Policy SIR1 necessary and justified? How would they be delivered and funded? Would there be any adverse impacts? Are the routes for the sustainable transport corridors sufficiently well defined to be shown on the policies map? (The routes on p15 of the Transport Strategy and p17 of the STC strategy appear to be different)
  - (i) North-South Sustainable Transport Corridor and River Stort Crossing to Eastwick Roundabout
  - (ii) East-West Sustainable Transport Corridor
  - (iii) Second River Stort Crossing at River Way
  - (iv) Access Route for Strategic Housing Site East of Harlow – covered in Matter 4
  - (v) Cemetery Extension
  - (vi) New Allotment Provision
 Alternative western crossing? apportionment of costs? Four-tracking of West Anglia Mainline (plan para 5.36) (Quod concerns)
7. Should water/wastewater infrastructure, new schools and hospital provision be included in this Policy? (Thames Water/Essex CC/PAH representations)

### Green Infrastructure

8. Implications of the HRA process for the overall Garden Town strategy. Is a strategic approach to the provision of SANG required? How might this affect the proposed allocations?
9. Omission of a specific policy to designate & protect the Green Belt in the plan area
10. Paragraphs 79 & 83 of the NPPF state that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence, and that once established, their boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Are there exceptional circumstances to justify deletion of Green Belt designation from the following sites? (numbering from document EX0003)
 

sites aii, aiii, bii, di, ei, fiv, gii and hi

sites ci and cii and woodland south of Flex Meadow in relation to Water Lane area

(sites fi, fii and fiii are covered in Matter 4)
11. Green Wedges and Green Fingers:
  - (i) The Green Wedge Review. Are the proposed deletions from the Green Wedges justified?
  - (ii) Are the additional areas proposed for Green Fingers justified?
  - (iii) Would the policies to protect Green Wedges and Green Fingers be effective?
  - (iv) Is the definition of permissible development in Policy PL4 justified and is it sufficiently clear? How should it relate to the policy for development in the Green Belt? (concerns of Miller Homes & Barton Willmore on behalf of De Merke Estates)

## **Matter 4 – Tuesday 2 April 10am**

### **Strategic Housing Site East of Harlow**

#### **AGENDA**

1. The 2,600 dwelling allocation is effectively part of a single proposal with the allocation for 750 dwellings in Epping Forest District. How has the planning of the site been co-ordinated and how will this be continued in future?
2. Are there exceptional circumstances to justify deletion of the Green Belt to the East of Harlow to facilitate this development? Should this include the area proposed for a Green Wedge within the site? Is the precise location of the Green Wedge flexible, if so, should this be indicative on the policies map?
3. Historic England objection and lack of Heritage Impact Assessment to inform allocation. Heritage impacts. Should there be a criterion in Policy HS3?
4. Ecological impacts on existing habitats/species. Have these been assessed, and are there any implications for the allocation? Should there be a criterion?
5. Potential off-site recreational or air quality effects on the Epping Forest SAC & Hatfield Forest SSSI/NNR. Are there any implications for the development?
6. Landscape and visual impacts. Should there be a criterion?
7. Are the main elements of the development clear, including the elements required in Harlow as opposed to Epping Forest? Does the recent decision of the hospital to relocate affect the proposals, in particular the transport links required?
8. What health, education, retail and community facilities, open space and sports facilities would be provided as part of the development? Should these be specified more clearly in the policy? How would these be delivered?
9. Has the assessment of the overall transport impacts of the development been robust?
10. What public transport, cycling and walking links would be required to maximise sustainable transport options? Are these adequately secured in the plan?
11. Access strategy for the site. Three points of access? Miller Homes concerns re Garden Town Vision & Design Guide. How does the development relate to the new M11 Junction 7a, improvements to Junction 7 and the east-west sustainable transport corridor? Do any of these need to be in place prior to any completions?
12. Should Policy HS3 require certain highway and transport improvements alongside development of the site (Essex Matter 3 Question 3.7 statement para 18). Should the 60% target for sustainable travel be included as an objective of the Policy?
13. Given the overall infrastructure requirements, is the strategic housing site viable?

14. Does Policy HS3 provide sufficiently clear guidance for the development of the site? If not, how should it be amended? Is the policy consistent with the equivalent or complementary policy in the Epping Forest District Local Plan?
15. Is it realistic for all 2,600 dwellings, plus 750 in Epping Forest, to be built out during the plan period given all the other development planned in and around Harlow in the plan period, about 16,000 dwellings in total?

# Harlow Local Development Plan Examination

## Matter 6 – Wednesday 3 April 10am

### Other housing allocations – Policy HS2 sites

#### AGENDA

Are the housing allocations listed in Policy HS2 justified in the light of the current use, site constraints, infrastructure requirements and potential impacts?

Was the SHLAA and site selection process robust?

Should any other sites be allocated?

When an area of open space is concerned, what evidence is there that it is surplus to requirements or unused, and the impact of development on the visual amenity of the area would be acceptable?

Does the plan provide sufficient guidance to secure suitable development on each site?

In turn:

1. Princess Alexandra Hospital
  - In the light of the recent decision to relocate, should this now refer only to the redevelopment of the site? Is the site capacity 450 dwellings?
2. The Stow Service Bays
3. Last east of Katherine's Way, west of Deer Park
4. Lister House, Staple Tye Mews, Staple Tye Depot and The Gateway Nursery
5. South of Clifton Hatch
6. Riddings Lane
7. Kingsmoor Recreation Centre
8. The Evangelical Lutheran Church, Tawneys Road
9. Land east of 144-154 Fennells (Ms A Parish)
10. Pollard Hatch plus garages and adjacent land
11. Land between Second Avenue and St Andrew's Meadow
12. Coppice Hatch and garages
13. Sherards House
14. Elm Hatch and public house
15. Playground west of 93-100 Jocelyns (Ms A Turvill)
16. Fishers Hatch
17. Slacksbury Hatch and associated garages
18. Garage blocks adjacent to Nicholls Tower
19. Stewards Farm
20. Land between Barn Mead and Five Acres
21. Pypers Hatch

# Harlow Local Development Plan Examination

# Matters 7 & 5 – Thursday 4 April 10am

## AGENDA

### Matter 7: Development Management Policies

Are the development management policies in the plan positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy? In turn:

#### Placeshaping

PL1 Design Principles for Development

PL2 Amenity Principles for Development

PL3 Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy Usage (objectors)

- Is this policy consistent with national policy and sufficiently clear to be effective?

PL4 Green Wedges and Green Fingers – dealt with under Matter 3

PL5 Other Open Spaces

PL6 Trees and Hedgerows

PL7 Green Infrastructure and Landscaping – Natural England

PL8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets (also Policy WE3) - Natural England

PL9 Pollution and Contamination

PL10 Water Quality, Water Management, Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems (objectors)

- Is criterion 4 c too prescriptive?

PL11 Heritage assets and their settings (also Policy WE4)- Historic England

PL12 Advertisements

#### Housing

H1 Housing Allocations (objectors)

- Is this policy necessary?

H2 Residential Development

H3 Houses in Multiple Occupation (Ms Sullivan)

- What is the justification for this policy and the one in five restriction proposed?

H4 Loss of Housing

H5 Accessible and Adaptable Housing (objectors)

- Is this policy consistent with national policy and sufficiently justified? Have the effects on viability been assessed?

H6 Housing Mix (objectors)

- Is the policy sufficiently clear to be effective? Are the percentages in Figure 14.1 the most appropriate for use and how would they be applied site by site? Have the effects on viability been assessed?

H7 Residential Annexes

H8 Affordable Housing (objectors)

- Is the policy justified and sufficiently clear to be effective? Have the effects on viability been assessed?

H9 Self-build and Custom-build Housing (objectors)

- Is the policy justified and would it be effective? Viability implications?

H10 Travellers' Pitches and Plots – dealt with under Matter 2

#### Prosperity

PR1 Development within Employment Areas

PR2 Development within Neighbourhood Service Areas

PR3 Employment Development outside Employment Areas and Neighbourhood Service Areas

PR4 Improving Job Access and Training (objectors)

PR5 The Sequential Test and Principles for Main Town Centre Uses



- Is the 500 sq m threshold for impact assessments outside the town centre justified?

PR6 Primary and Secondary Frontages in the Town Centre

PR7 Sub-division and Internal Alteration of Town Centre Units

- Is the requirement for two years of marketing evidence justified?

PR8 Frontages in Neighbourhood Centres

PR9 Development in Hatches

PR10 Development in Retail Parks

PR11 Evening and Night Time Economy

### Lifestyles

L1 Open Spaces, Play Areas and Sporting Provision and Facilities in Major Development (objectors)

L2 The Provision and Loss of Recreational, Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities

L3 Development involving the Provision or Relocation or Loss of Public Art (objectors)

- What is the definition of major development, and is this policy justified in all cases?

### Infrastructure

IN1 Development and Sustainable Modes of Travel (objectors)

- Is the requirement for electric charging points for vehicles justified?
- Is the policy sufficiently ambitious? Should there be a requirement for travel plans in certain cases?

IN2 Impact of Development on the Highways Network including Access and Servicing (objectors)

- Is the policy consistent with NPPF paragraph 32

IN3 Parking Standards

IN4 Broadband and Development – HBF & Essex CC concerns re ED2

IN5 Telecommunications Equipment

IN6 Planning Obligations – Essex CC suggested policy, Natural England, Quod re apportionment of costs

## **Matter 5: Employment and Retail Issues**

1. Is the requirement for up to 20 ha of employment land in Policy ED1 justified and in an appropriate balance with the likely workforce generated by the proposed level of housing development? Are the ED1 sites suitable to accommodate this?
2. Is the requirement in Policy RS2 for up to 18,100 sq m of comparison floorspace and up to 3,200 sq m of convenience floorspace in Harlow up to 2026, and up to 40,200 sq m of comparison floorspace and up to 5,500 sq m beyond that date, justified by the evidence? Does the policy provide a suitable basis for delivering this development in the town centre, existing local centres and new centres to serve the new neighbourhoods in the Garden Town?
3. Essex CC concerns re Broadband if not covered under IN4
4. Amendment to policies map to exclude Pearson House and it's car park from area covered by Policy ED2 (representation from Weston Homes)