

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL: Examination of the District Local Plan, 2011 – 2033.

Inspector: Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

Programme Officer: Louise St John Howe, louise@poservices.co.uk

HEARING AGENDAS – WEEK 3

The third week of hearing sessions will take place from **Tuesday 19 – Thursday 21 March 2019.**

This document includes the agendas for the sessions to be held on 20-21 March, concerning Matter 6 and Matter 8 respectively. The agenda for the Matter 5 session on 19 March has been sent separately.

On both 20 and 21 March, the morning sessions will start at 10am and the afternoon sessions will start at 2pm. Please see the latest programme on the examination website for further details and a list of participants in each session.

Participants should be aware of my Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) (Document **ED5**) as they will provide the framework for discussion at the hearings. They should also be aware of the statements submitted in response to my MIQs by the Council and others. These are available on the website.

Some of my questions have been adequately answered in the statements so that limited discussion should be needed at the hearings themselves. Others require further discussion and I have sought to identify the key areas on the agendas below. The hearings will focus on these outstanding matters.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR

14 March 2019.

DAY 7: WEDNESDAY 20 MARCH 2019

MORNING SESSION (10AM) & AFTERNOON SESSION (2PM)

MATTER 6: Housing Supply, including Sources of Supply; the Housing Trajectory; and the Five Year Supply.

Issue 1: Will the Plan provide a land supply sufficient to deliver the housing requirement of at least 11,400 dwellings over the Plan period?

- Suggested modification to Table 2.3 on page 29 of the Plan to reflect the housing land supply position to 31 March 2018.
 - Will further modifications be required after 31 March 2019?
- The overall supply.
 - Double counting of commitments and/or of expired permissions in the trajectory?
 - Justification for the windfall allowance.
 - Contribution of specialist forms of housing (e.g. for the elderly) to the supply? Has this been taken into account or would it represent an additional source of accommodation? Availability of LOU.R14 for the type of development proposed? (19LAD0094/5 & 6).
 - Site densities – have they been over-estimated e.g. in Ongar?

Issue 2: Will the Plan ensure that there is a reasonable prospect of a five-year land supply being achieved upon adoption and throughout the lifetime of the Plan as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF?

- The five-year supply requirement and the trajectory.
 - Justification for the proposed stepped trajectory, to include discussion of the following:
 - The extent of reliance upon large, strategic sites. Demonstration of the use of smaller sites in the trajectory.
 - Clear justification for why it is not possible to allocate more smaller sites/increase the size of certain proposed allocations to boost early supply. Reference to Guildford examination.
 - A 5% or 20% buffer? Practical implications of increasing the buffer to 20% without also increasing the land supply.
 - Action to be taken if the annualised requirement is not met within the 5-year period. Discussion of para. 2.81 of the Plan.
 - Implications for decision-making under the NPPF February 2019 once the Plan is adopted.
 - Should the five-year requirement and the housing trajectory be reflected in the Plan's policies? Are modifications required, including to Appendix 5?

- The five-year land supply.
 - Delivery assumptions informing EB410B, including:
 - Evidence supporting lead-in times and build-out rates, particularly for larger sites. Discussion of assumptions for Water Lane and East of Harlow in the Garden Town.
 - The availability of sites with existing continuing uses e.g. LOU.R11; LOU.R4; EPP.R6; EPP.R7; BUCK.R2? Are there others?

Issue 3: Does the Plan meet the requirements of paragraph 10 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in respect of delivery?

- What is the five-year requirement from 2018/19 (and potentially 2019/20) and should this be reflected in policy? Are amendments required to the trajectory in Appendix 5?
- Which strategic sites are expected to make provision for travellers? How confident is the Council that delivery will happen in this way? Does the timing of anticipated delivery correspond correctly with that for the delivery of housing?

End.

DAY 8: THURSDAY 21 MARCH 2019

MORNING SESSION (10AM) & AFTERNOON SESSION (2PM)

MATTER 8: Garden Town Communities

Issue 1: What is the "Garden Town" concept as applied to proposed allocations SP5.1, SP5.2 and SP5.3 and is this significant for plan-making purposes?

- Background to the Garden Town designation, inc. the role of national government; access to funding etc.
- The Garden Town as a coherent concept.
 - Clarification that allocations are not interdependent in terms of delivery?
 - Are amendments required to strengthen the concept of coherence between the garden communities and Harlow itself? (See ECC's Statement 19STAT0024/8, para. 7).

Issue 2: Are the Garden Town allocations deliverable in respect of their impact on transport infrastructure?

- Infrastructure and Viability.
 - Progress with the IDP and Viability Study. Does the Plan contain adequate reference to these documents and is their intended status clear and justified?
 - New Junction 7A of M11 as a prerequisite of development.
 - Modification proposed in para. 27 Council Statement.
 - Should the "commencement" of development be contingent upon the provision of Junction 7A?
 - Funding of upgrade to Junction 7 of the M11 (cost £5m). Should any cost to developers be borne by Latton Priory alone?
 - Sustainable Transport Corridors.
 - Nature and purpose? East-west as well as north-south?
 - Should the requirement to contribute to their cost fall only to Latton Priory or be shared more widely within the garden community?
 - Feasibility and viability – and how fundamental/vital are they?
 - Proposed inclusion of map showing safeguarded routes – are the feasibility studies sufficiently well advanced to justify this?

Issue 3: Are the criteria in Policy SP4 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Historic Environment

- Clarify status of SoCG with Historic England.

- Modification proposed to SP4(C)(xvi) concerning protecting and enhancing the historic environment.
- Modification proposed to SP4(C)(xvii) to require Heritage Impact Assessments at the master-planning stage.
- Modification proposed to add "archaeological remains" to definition of heritage assets in the Plan's glossary in response to concerns raised by HE.

Other Issues

- Does Policy SP4 have sufficient regard for viability? Is it necessary to acknowledge that some viability assessment might be needed at the master-planning and planning application stages?
- SP4(C)(iii) – is the provision concerning community-led housing development justified?
- SP4(C)(iv) – justification for requiring governance and stewardship arrangements to be in place prior to the submission of outline planning applications rather than the determination of planning applications.
- SP4(C)(viii) – justification for requiring "adherence" to the Vision and Design Charter.
- SP4(C)(xvii) – justification for requiring "the highest standards of energy efficiency..."?

Issue 4: Are the site allocations (SP5.1, SP5.2 & SP5.3) in Policy SP5 sound and deliverable?

General Issues

- General overview of each allocation: land ownership; progress; known issues/constraints etc.
- Employment land provision.
 - Discussion of HDC and ECC contention that the scale of growth in the Garden Communities, particularly at Latton Priory, requires further assessment to understand whether more employment land is needed.
 - Justification for allocating an additional 1Ha of employment land at Dorrington Farm (RUR.E19) within the Latton Priory allocation.

Site-specific Issues

- Modifications proposed to SP5, parts F-H to refer to the land requirements for primary schools rather than the no. forms of entry.
- Modification proposed to Map legends 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 5.1 and 5.12 to clarify that the allocations are "strategic" allocations to provide a mix of residential, education and other uses as opposed to just "residential".
- Effect on Green Belt purposes.

- Discussion of the balance of harm vs. benefit in the context of whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify the GB alterations (para. 83 of NPPF).
 - Justification for the GB boundary at Latton Priory cutting across the masterplan area. Consistent with paragraph 85 of the NPPF?
 - Should the need to mitigate the effect of GB harm arising at Water Lane Area on Old House Lane be included in policy?
- Requirements for highway and transport improvements in Parts F-H. Are these too specific in relation to all allocations, or does the concern (and need for modification) relate only to East of Harlow?

Site SP5.1: Latton Priory

- Proposed modifications to part F(vi) concerning the historic environment. Clarification of relevant heritage assets; HE wording in respect of HIA necessary in light of discussion on SP4?
- Is a SANG required? Should it be referred to in policy?
- Proposed modification to Map 2.2 to show the indicative access on Map 2.1.

Site SP5.2: Water Lane Area

- Overview of progress on northern and southern parts of the allocation, including in relation to master-planning.
 - Remit of "The Consortium".
 - Engagement by and with smaller landowners.
- Proposed modification to part G concerning the historic environment. Clarification of relevant heritage assets; HE wording in respect of HIA necessary in light of discussion on SP4?

Site SP5.3: East of Harlow

- Cross-boundary working – any significant, outstanding issues?
- Proposed modification to part G concerning the historic environment. Clarification of relevant heritage assets? HE views?
- Discussion of Parts H(vi) and (viii) concerning the health campus and secondary school.
 - Re. hospital, clarify that present preferred location is within the EFDC part of the allocation?
 - Is it necessary to amend the policy in relation to the land area required for the hospital? (10Ha, 12Ha or 14Ha).
 - Progress in relation to secondary school?
 - What alternative uses are being considered if either the hospital or school do not come forward? Compatible with overall vision for area?

- Are modifications necessary to clarify that alternative uses are possible to avoid the potential for masterplans and planning applications to conflict with policy?
- Is it necessary to amend Map 2.4 to remove the BAP habitat designation; and to clarify the location of an Area Tree Preservation Order?
- Proposed modification to part H(xvi) to ensure that the volume of water discharging into Pincey Brook is managed.

End.