

Supplementary Committee Agenda



Planning Services Scrutiny Standing Panel Monday, 11th October, 2010

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Committee Secretary: Mark Jenkins - Office of the Chief Executive
Email mjenkins@eppingforestdc.gov.uk Tel: 01992 564607

**5. EAST HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND
OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT (Pages 3 - 22)**

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) The internet link below takes you to the East Hertfordshire District Council Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document. To consider the attached officers' report.

<http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=13688>

**6. BROXBOURNE BOROUGH COUNCIL PRE-SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY
(Pages 23 - 28)**

(Director of Planning and Economic Development) The internet link below takes you to the Broxbourne Borough Council Pre-Submission Core Strategy. To consider the attached officers' report.

http://www.broxbourne.gov.uk/environment_and_planning/planning_policy.aspx

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to Planning Services Scrutiny Standing Panel

Date of meeting: 11 October 2010

Portfolio: Leader

**Subject: East Hertfordshire District Council Core
Strategy Issues and Options consultation document**

Officer contact for further information: Sarah King, Information & Technical Officer (01992 564493)

Committee Secretary: Mark Jenkins (01992 564607)



Recommendations/Decisions Required:

- (1) To consider the potential impacts of the proposals within the East Hertfordshire Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document as set out in the Appendix to this report; and**
- (2) That the Panel agree the draft response to the consultation.**

Report:

Background

1. East Hertfordshire District Council have, over the past few years, amassed a detailed evidence base for their Local Development Framework, including technical studies on topics such as transport, employment, climate change, landscape and housing. East Herts Council has also conducted community stakeholder sessions, designed to engage local people in plans for the future of the District, and to gather local opinion on future planning policy. All of this groundwork has led to the preparation of an Issues and Options stage consultation document for their future Core Strategy, the subject of this report. The consultation period runs from 2 September 2010 to 25 November 2010.
2. Epping Forest District Council, as an adjacent local authority, could be affected by decisions made in the future East Herts Core Strategy, and as such, should respond to the consultation document. The consultation document has thus been brought before the Scrutiny Standing Panel for its consideration.
3. The consultation document addresses the proposed growth of housing and jobs, in East Herts District itself (as set out in the now revoked East of England Plan (EEP)), and also in and around Harlow (as also set out in the revoked EEP) particularly the mooted development to the North of Harlow and urban extensions to the east, south and west of Harlow. Although it is acknowledged within the consultation document that at the time of writing, it seemed that the EEP was likely to be revoked, East Herts Council chose to write the consultation document on the basis of the targets within the EEP which existed at the time, allowing that the document would be revisited following any change in the EEP's status. It should also be noted that Chapter 3 makes reference to Previously Developed Land (PDL), as defined by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3), but using the old definition which included residential gardens. A revised version of PPS3 was published this year, altering the definition to exclude residential garden land.

4. Several mentions of potential strategic Green Belt Reviews, (particularly to the north of Harlow) are also made in the document. It should be noted that East Herts District Council's area is approximately one third Green Belt; this is mostly in the southern part of the district, lining the borders with Welwyn/Hatfield, Broxbourne, Harlow, Epping Forest and Uttlesford districts.

Suggested response to consultation questions

5. The suggested response to the consultation, prepared by Forward Planning officers, is shown at Appendix 1. The main issues are briefly discussed below, by section. Please refer to the proposed response for more detail.

Background and Context - Questions 1 and 2

6. These questions concern the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken on the consultation document. Both are thought to be, in general, adequate, however, the suggested response raises the issue of water infrastructure for any new development to the north of Harlow, and raises a concern regarding the impact of further development at Harlow on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

Key Issues and Vision - Questions 3 to 21

7. These questions cover the strategic objectives and policy options for each of the themes in the consultation document. For example, for theme 3 'Housing East Herts', strategic objectives such as 'To achieve sustainable mixed communities by ensuring the delivery of sufficient affordable housing, either social rented or intermediate housing' are given, along with policy options to deliver the objectives, such as 'Provision of and approach to affordable housing including tenure split'.
8. The objectives and policy options are thought, in the main, to be appropriate, except for one which still refers to the now-revoked East of England Plan housing target, which should be rewritten. It is also suggested that the objectives covering climate change are amended to encourage renewable energy generation, and that an extra objective is included in the 'Green East Herts' theme, to safeguard existing nationally and internationally important habitats and areas of biodiversity (such as the SAC area of Epping Forest).

Development Strategy - Questions 22 and 23

9. These two questions concern the main options for East Herts' own housing growth. This section is, again, predicated on the now-revoked East of England Plan targets. The suggested response reflects this. Of the six development strategy options offered, the suggested response states a preference for options which locate growth in and around existing urban areas/towns, rather than in more rural areas, where services and infrastructure may be lacking.
10. Six potential housing distribution options are then offered, which, depending on which development strategy is chosen, seek to distribute the total housing needed over the different areas. These range from proportional distribution (allocating an amount of housing based on the existing size of each settlement), to reversed proportional distribution (where the smallest settlements receive the most housing). The suggested response states a preference for proportional distribution, as this allocates the growth to areas which already have local services and infrastructure, and are likely to be sustainable locations.

Bishop's Stortford - Questions 24 to 26

11. These questions relate to proposals for localised development in and directly around Bishop's Stortford. As this town is some distance from Epping Forest District's borders, it is very unlikely that any choice of one option over another will affect EFDC. Therefore it is suggested that no response is made to these questions.

Buntingford - Questions 27 to 29

12. As above, this town is some distance from Epping Forest District's borders, and so it is suggested that no response is made to these questions.

Hertford - Questions 30 to 32

13. As above, this town is some distance from Epping Forest District's borders, and so it is suggested that no response is made to these questions.

Sawbridgeworth - Questions 33 to 35

14. These questions relate to proposals for localised development in and directly around Bishop's Stortford. Of the options available, the suggested response states a preference for development within the existing settlement or to the south west. It is felt that the other options, to the west and north, and more likely to affect Lower Sheering, which is extremely close by, across the District and County border. Any large scale development nearby could place pressure on services and infrastructure in Lower Sheering. It is also suggested that a preference for higher rather than lower, density development is given, as this should prevent any coalescence of Sawbridgeworth with Lower Sheering.

Ware - Questions 36 to 38

15. These questions relate to proposals for localised development in and directly around Ware. Of the options available, the suggested response states a preference for development to the north or east. It is felt that the other options, to the south east, south west and within the town, are more likely to affect Roydon, which is fairly close by, across the District and County border. Any large scale development nearby could place increased pressure on services and infrastructure in Roydon. It is, again, suggested that a preference for higher rather than lower, density development is given, as this should prevent the need for higher land-take, and thus keep large scale development further from Roydon.

Villages - Questions 39 to 42

16. These questions relate to proposals for localised development in and directly around the remaining, smaller, villages and settlements in East Herts, not covered above. It is suggested that of the options available, a preference for higher density development is given, as this will prevent the coalescence of settlements, protect the Green Belt and protect greenfield land, and encourage sustainable communities.
17. The villages and settlements are then classified into 'Larger Service Villages', 'Smaller Service Villages' and 'Other Villages/Hamlets'. The proposed categories are thought to be reasonable, and correctly applied. It is noted however that the 'Other Villages/Hamlets' are not listed in the consultation document.

North of Harlow - Question 43

18. Given that, again, the revocation of the East of England Plan has rendered the options in

this question out of date, it is suggested that a detailed response to each option is not worthwhile. The suggested response advises that the 'Consultants Suggested Approach' (from the Harlow Options Appraisal which was jointly commissioned by East Herts, Harlow and Epping Forest District Councils) should be revisited, and that the evidence leading to the proposals is re-examined in light of the revocation. The suggested response also advocates discussions between senior manager and Members from the three authorities, to find a way forward. It is understood that such a meeting is being scheduled currently.

19. The final part of this question asks whether the north of Harlow should be considered a suitable location for East Herts' own development, in lieu of the East of England Plan development. The suggested response explains that it is not possible to comment on this issue at present, before representatives from each authority have met to discuss the future of development around Harlow, as above.

Reason for decision:

To respond on the proposals within the consultation document, in order to ensure that Epping Forest District's interests are considered as development proposals are refined.

Options considered and rejected:

Not to respond to the consultation, however, this would risk any potential impacts of the proposed development to Epping Forest District being overlooked by East Herts Council.

Consultation undertaken:

The consultation document has been discussed by Forward Planning officers, and is being brought to the Scrutiny Standing Panel for consultation with Members.

Resource implications:

Budget provision:

It may be necessary to fund joint working arrangements regarding growth around Harlow in future, but this depends upon decisions which Executive Members make on how to proceed following the revocation of the East of England Plan.

Personnel:

Not applicable for the purposes of this report; the consultation document was prepared by East Herts Council staff.

Land:

Potential growth in the district, or near to the district, could potentially affect land owned by the Council, but this cannot be known this early in the consultation process.

Community Plan/BVPP reference:

GU1, HN1, EP3

Relevant statutory powers:

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning

Background papers:

East Hertfordshire DC Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document, 2010
East Hertfordshire DC Local Development Framework Core Strategy Supporting Document, 2010

East of England Plan 2008 [now revoked]
Rye Meads Water Cycle Strategy, 2009
Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Study 2009
Harlow Area Appraisal of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure Options 2010
Report to Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee 17/06/10, LDF-004-2010/11

Environmental/Human Rights Act/Crime and Disorder Act Implications:
The potential growth discussed in the document could have significant environmental implications, however, these are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal prepared by East Herts Council, accompanying the consultation document itself.

Key Decision reference: (if required)
Not applicable.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 - Proposed Response to East Herts Core Strategy Issues & Options consultation document

The consultation questions are presented in 10 sections, relating to the chapters of the document. Those which could potentially affect Epping Forest District the most are starred** below:

Background and Context (General Questions & 9 Themes)	Q1 and 2
Key Issues and Vision (First part, LDF Vision)	Q3 to 21 **
Development Strategy (Second part,, LDF Vision)	Q22 and 23 **
Bishop's Stortford	Q24 to 26
Buntingford	Q27 to 29
Hertford	Q30 to 32
Sawbridgeworth	Q33 to 35 **
Ware	Q36 to 38
Villages	Q39 to 42 **
North of Harlow	Q43 **

General questions

Q1. Sustainability Appraisal

Do you have any comments on the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal?

Yes / No

The Sustainability Appraisal appears, in general, to be detailed, and to assess the appropriate topics. Obviously it is expected that appraisal of the development options would become more detailed in further stages of the Core Strategy.

This Council is however concerned that the 'Summary of likely significant effects of the development strategy options' highlights likely severe additional stress on water resources in the local area, especially on the River Stort, and significant impacts on road and passenger rail capacity. It does not appear that significant mitigation measures have been identified.

Q2. Habitats Regulations Assessment

Do you have any comments on the Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment?

Yes / No

The habitats Regulation Assessment appears, in general, to be detailed, and to assess the appropriate topics.

This Council is pleased to note that existing problems regarding the high level of NOx in and around the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation have been recognised, particularly the fact that much of this is a result of road traffic. It is therefore assumed that this issue, and the potential impacts of increased traffic caused by large scale development in and around Harlow, will be carefully considered in future iterations of the Core Strategy.

However, this Council is concerned to note that in Table 9 – Development to north of Harlow, it is stated that ‘Impacts on the three European sites considered within the scope of this HRA are unlikely to be more affected by one of the five spatial options over any of the others’. Surely it is more likely that large scale development in Epping Forest District is more likely to affect the Epping Forest SAC, as the development will be physically closer to the SAC than say, if it were located to the north of Harlow. We are concerned that this issue has not been investigated sufficiently.

Theme 1: East Herts Energy and Climate Change

Q3. Theme 1: LDF Strategic Objectives

Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 1 correct?

Correct /
Incorrect /
Partly Correct

Yes, these seem appropriate, but could be more explicit in encouraging renewable energy generation.

Q4. Theme 1: Policy Options

Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 1 correct?

Correct /
Incorrect /
Partly Correct

This seems appropriate.

Theme 2: East Herts People and Community Safety

Q5. Theme 2: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 2 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Q6. Theme 2: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 2 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 3: Housing East Herts

Q7. Theme 3: Housing East Herts	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 3 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	The more general objectives seem appropriate, but HOU2, relating to the now-revoked East of England Plan, should be removed, and replaced by an evidence-led local target.
Q8. Theme 3: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 3 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 4: East Herts Character

Question 9. Theme 4: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 4 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Question 10. Theme 4: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 4 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 5: East Herts Economy, Skills and Prosperity

Question 11. Theme 5: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 5 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Question 12. Theme 5: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 5 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 6: East Herts On the Move

Question 13. Theme 6: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 6 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Question 14. Theme 6: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 6 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 7: East Herts Health, Wellbeing and Play

Question 15. Theme 7: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 7 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Question 16. Theme 7: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 7 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 8: Green East Herts

Question 17. Theme 8: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 8 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	In general these seem appropriate, however, it is suggested that an additional objective GRE5 be added, 'To safeguard existing nationally and internationally important habitats and areas of biodiversity (SACs, SPAs and SSSIs) from negative impacts associated with development'.
Question 18. Theme 8: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 8 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

Theme 9: East Herts Monitoring and Delivery

Question 19. Theme 9: LDF Strategic Objectives	Have we got the LDF strategic objectives for Theme 9 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	Yes, these seem appropriate.
Question 20. Theme 9: Policy Options	Is our approach to dealing with the policy options for Theme 9 correct?	Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct	This seems appropriate.

East Herts LDF Vision

Question 21. LDF Vision

Is our emerging LDF vision for what East Herts will be like in 2031 correct?

Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct

Yes this seems to cover all the pertinent issues.

Question 22. Broad Locations for Growth

Which development strategy do you think is the most appropriate to meet the challenges facing East Herts and achieve sustainable development?

- Option A: Towns
- Option B: Towns and Larger Service Villages
- Option C: Towns, Larger Service Villages, and Smaller Service Villages
- Option D: Towns, Larger Service Villages, Smaller Service Villages and Other Villages/Hamlets
- Option E: Towns, Stevenage and Welwyn Garden City
- Option F: Settlements within Transport Corridors

Please rank in order of preference.

Is there another option we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Preference 1					✓	
Preference 2	✓					
Preference 3		✓				
Preference 4			✓			
Preference 5						✓
Preference 6				✓		

It is noted that the targets this section are predicated on were in the now-revoked East of England Plan, and it is assumed that appropriate amendments will be made before the next iteration of the Core Strategy.

The 'land-take' diagrams are thought to be very helpful in visually demonstrating the effect of using different densities.

Options E and A are preferred, as these concentrate growth to existing urban areas, and extensions to existing towns, thereby locating development in a sustainable location, with facilities, services and transport links nearby.

Options B and C are less preferred, as these would result in a more dispersed pattern, locating development in many places where local services and transport would be insufficient or even non-existent. Option F is seen as unsustainable, as although concentrated along transport links, many of the settlements would be too small to have the services required to support development. Option D is the least favoured, as it is even more dispersed than option F, and with lower accessibility.

Question 23.
Approaches to
Housing Distribution

Which housing distribution approach to you think is the most appropriate to meet the challenges facing East Herts and achieve sustainable development?

- Approach I: Proportional Distribution
- Approach II: Adjusted Proportional Distribution
- Approach III: Reversed Proportional Distribution
- Approach IV: Equal Distribution
- Approach V: Distribution by Land Availability
- Approach VI: Distribution by Settlement Type

Please rank in order of preference.

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Approaches					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Preference 1	✓					
Preference 2		✓				
Preference 3						✓
Preference 4					✓	
Preference 5				✓		
Preference 6			✓			

Options I and II are preferred, as these allocate growth to settlements based on their existing size, thus concentrating development near existing services and infrastructure, which is sustainable.

Option VI is fairly reasonable, as it allocated growth on the basis of the category of settlement. This categorisation takes into account existing size and infrastructure, and would be a more sustainable approach.

Option V does not seem sensible, as this will allocate land purely where it is available, based on a call for sites exercise. This exercise, while useful, does not provide the definitive record of real land availability, and may well suggest areas of land which are very unsuitable.

Option IV is not favoured, as it allocates equal growth to each settlement, regardless of that settlement's infrastructure or services, or its ability to support growth, this is unsustainable.

Option III is the least favoured, as it allocates the most housing to the smallest settlements and vice versa, despite the fact that this will allocate growth where there is insufficient infrastructure and services, and it will not make use of the existing infrastructure and services within larger urban areas.

Bishop's Stortford

Question 24. Growth Options for Bishop's Stortford

Please rank the growth options for Bishop's Stortford in order of preference.

- Option 1: Town Centre/Within the Existing Urban Area
- Option 2: To the Northeast
- Option 3: To the East
- Option 4: To the Southeast
- Option 5: To the South

Please comment on the suitability of these options. Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Growth Options				
	1	2	3	4	5
Preference 1					
Preference 2					
Preference 3					
Preference 4					
Preference 5					

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District's boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 25. Approach to Development in Bishop's Stortford

Please rank the approaches to development in Bishop's Stortford in order of preference.

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			
Preference 2			
Preference 3			

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District's boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 26. Bishop's Stortford Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF vision for Bishop's Stortford?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District's boundaries to have any significant effect.

Buntingford

Question 27. Growth Options for Buntingford

Please rank the growth options for Buntingford in order of preference.

- Option 1: Town Centre/within Existing Built-up Area
- Option 2: To the South and West
- Option 3: To the North
- Option 4: To the Northeast
- Option 5: To the East

Please comment on the suitability of these options. Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Growth Options				
	1	2	3	4	5
Preference 1					
Preference 2					
Preference 3					
Preference 4					
Preference 5					

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 28. Approaches to Development in Buntingford

Please rank the approaches to development in Buntingford in order of preference.

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			
Preference 2			
Preference 3			

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 29. Buntingford Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF vision for Buntingford?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect.

Hertford

Question 30. Growth Options for Hertford

Please rank the growth options for Hertford in order of preference:

- Option 1: Within the Existing Built-up Area
- Option 2: To the West
- Option 3: To the North
- Option 4: To the South

Please comment on the suitability of these options. Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Growth Options			
	1	2	3	4
Preference 1				
Preference 2				
Preference 3				
Preference 4				

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 31. Approach to Development in Hertford

Please rank the approaches to development in Hertford in order of preference.

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			
Preference 2			
Preference 3			

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect, no matter which option is chosen.

Question 32. Hertford Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF Vision for Hertford?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

No response proposed – this settlement is too far from Epping Forest District’s boundaries to have any significant effect.

Sawbridgeworth

Question 33. Growth Options for Sawbridgeworth

Please rank the growth options for Sawbridgeworth in order of preference.

- Option 1: Within the Existing Built-up Area
- Option 2: To the Southwest
- Option 3: To the West
- Option 4: To the North

Please comment on the suitability of these options. Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Growth Options			
	1	2	3	4
Preference 1			✓	
Preference 2		✓		
Preference 3				✓
Preference 4	✓			

Option 3 is preferred, as this directs development towards an area near to services, and where land has been identified as available. Option 2 would also benefit from nearby services.

Option 4 is not favoured as it is removed from services. Option 1 is the least favoured as no land has been found available, and the town centre is already congested. Options 4 and 1 are likely also to put increased strain on services and infrastructure in Lower Sheering, which is just the other side of the District/County border.

Question 34. Approach to Development in Sawbridgeworth

Please rank the approaches to development in Sawbridgeworth in order of preference:

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			✓
Preference 2		✓	
Preference 3	✓		

A higher density is preferred, in order to effectively concentrate homes near services, and to minimise take up of Greenfield land, and land with natural conservation value. It would also make use of the available land in the most efficient way.

Question 35. Sawbridgeworth Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF vision for Sawbridgeworth?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

This seems appropriate.

Ware

Question 36. Growth Options for Ware

Please rank the growth options for Ware in order of preference:

- Option 1: Town Centre/Existing Urban Area
- Option 2: To the North
- Option 3: To the East
- Option 4: To the Southeast
- Option 5: To the Southwest

Please comment on the suitability of these options. Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Growth Options				
	1	2	3	4	5
Preference 1		✓			
Preference 2			✓		
Preference 3	✓				
Preference 4				✓	
Preference 5					✓

Options 2 and 3 are preferred as these are on land near to existing services, where land is available for development, and where transport links are nearby.

Option 1 would be a sustainable location, but it seems that little land is available.

Options 4 and 5 are the least favoured, as these are in a flood plain, could cause coalescence, and could also place increased strain on services and infrastructure in the village of Roydon, which is nearby to the south west.

Question 37. Approaches to development in Ware

Please rank the approaches to development in Ware in order of preference:

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Development Strategy Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			✓
Preference 2		✓	
Preference 3	✓		

A higher density is preferred, in order to effectively concentrate homes near services, and to minimise take up of Greenfield land, and land with natural conservation value. It would also make use of the available land in the most efficient way.

Question 38. Ware Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF vision for Ware?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

This seems appropriate.

Villages

Question 39.
Approach to Development in the Villages

Please rank the approaches to development in the villages in order of preference:

- Option 1: Lower density - therefore higher land-take
- Option 2: Medium density - therefore medium land-take
- Option 3: Higher density - therefore lower land-take

Is there another approach we have not considered?

	Approach to Development Options		
	1 Lower Density	2 Medium Density	3 Higher Density
Preference 1			✓
Preference 2		✓	
Preference 3	✓		

A higher density is preferred for new development, in order to effectively concentrate homes near services, and to minimise take up of Greenfield / Green Belt land. It would also make use of the available land in the most efficient way. It has been shown that higher density does not have to mean a less pleasant living environment.

Question 40.
Identifying Types of Villages

Is our approach to identifying three types of village (Larger Service Villages/Smaller Service Villages and Other Villages / Hamlets) correct?

Correct / Incorrect / Partly Correct

This seems reasonable, as those larger settlements, with more facilities, have been classified as such.

Question 41. Village Identification

Have we identified the correct villages under each village type?

What changes (if any) would you make?

	Yes	No
Larger Service Villages	✓	
Smaller Service Villages	✓	
Other Villages/Hamlets		

The identification of Larger and Smaller Service Villages seems reasonable. However, this Council cannot comment on 'Other Villages/Hamlets' as these have not yet been listed.

Question 42. An Emerging Vision for the Villages

Subject to whichever development strategy with our emerging vision for the villages?

Agree / Disagree / Partly agree

The visions for each scenario seem to fit the development strategies proposed.

North of Harlow

Question 43.
Consultants
Suggested Approach

Do you agree with the consultants' Suggested Approach in respect of growth to the north of Harlow?

Agree / **Disagree** /
Partly agree

The Consultants Suggested Approach should be reviewed given the revocation of the East of England Plan, and the policy HA1 therein.

If not, how would you distribute development in accordance with Policy HA1 of the East of England Plan and why?

Given the revocation of the East of England Plan, there may be a case to revisit the issue of the growth of Harlow, including reviewing the evidence in the Harlow Options Appraisal. There is still scope at this point for coordinated working between the three local planning authorities involved, through senior management/Member discussions on the future direction of travel.

If development to the north of Harlow is no longer required by the East of England Plan, should we consider north of Harlow as a broad location to meet some of the East Herts district wide housing requirement?

Yes / No

Again, as the East of England Plan has been revoked, this issue would need to be revisited. It is not possible to comment further at this time.

Report to Planning Services Planning Scrutiny Panel

SCRUTINY



Date of meeting: 11 October 2010

Portfolio: Leader

Subject: Broxbourne Borough Council Pre-Submission Core Strategy

Officer contact for further information: Lewis McGann (01992 564493)

Committee Secretary: Mark Jenkins (01992 564607)

Recommendations/Decisions Required:

- (1) To consider the potential impacts of the proposals from the Broxbourne Borough Council Pre-Submission Core Strategy and formulate a response to the Consultation based on officers' comments.**

Report:

1. Broxbourne Core Strategy is a planning document covering the period 2010-2026, which sets out a vision for the future of Broxbourne Borough as a prosperous and sustainable community. It explores the unique features of the Borough and identifies the main challenges and key drivers of change over the next 15 years. It sets out plans to guide new development, regenerate neighbourhoods, improve services and facilities and protect the environment.

2. In the short-term the strategy will look for development to focus on suitable urban sites to make the best use of land and help achieve neighbourhood regeneration. The Council will also use the presence and legacy of the 2012 Olympic Games to raise prosperity in Waltham Cross and elsewhere. The development of Greater Brookfield as a strategic allocation is intended to provide high quality shopping and leisure facilities and housing development.

3. In the medium and long term, Broxbourne Borough Council's strategy is to complement suitable urban sites with Green Belt sites in order to deliver more family and large homes. With regards to future employment, Broxbourne Borough Council state that there are no specific job targets for the borough. Land will therefore also be released at West of Hoddesdon, Goff's Oak, Bury Green and/or Albury Farm East for new housing and at Park Plaza West and/or Maxwells Farm West for new employment opportunities depending on what is required in the future. The Council will also seeks to bring forward proposals in accordance with comprehensive masterplans to help secure appropriate service and facilities.

4. All developments will place an emphasis on design in order to enhance surroundings and to reduce the impact on climate change. The Green Belt, Lee Valley Regional Park and other important open spaces, landscapes and historic areas will continue to be protected and enhanced.

5. Having gathered together a robust evidence base and used this in consultation with local people and other interested parties to identify the most important planning-related issues in the area, Broxbourne Borough Council set out a vision for the borough and consulted on the alternative ways of addressing the issues and achieving the vision in their "Issues and

Options Core Strategy Document” (May 2007). Having taken account of responses, a preferred option was chosen by the Council and consulted on with the public once more in the “Preferred Options Core Strategy Document” (November 2008).

6. Having considered all public comments made at the preferred option stage, Broxbourne Council have now prepared a finalised Core Strategy which is subject of a final six week consultation period to give local people and other interested parties a final opportunity to comment on the document. This ‘pre-submission publication’ stage began on Friday 29 August 2010 and will conclude on Friday 15 October 2010.

7. In light of this opportunity, the following comments have been prepared by the Council’s Forward Planning Team with a view for these to be accepted by the Panel as the official response of Epping Forest District Council. Two issues stand out as being of particular interest to Epping Forest District Council, the first of these is the proposed redevelopment of Hazlemere Marina.

8. Broxbourne Borough Council’s housing trajectory indicates that 840 new dwellings are to be built within Waltham Cross. This is the largest designation of houses within Broxbourne Borough. Given the close proximity of the area to Epping Forest District, and Waltham Abbey in particular, there may be benefits to the local economy through increased trade within the town centre. There is however the possibility that any gains to be had from this significant increase in local consumers will be countered by commercial developments elsewhere, in particular, the proposed expansion of the large retail outlet at Greater Brookfield just to the north of Waltham Cross.

9. Of particular interest to Epping Forest District Council is the redevelopment of Hazlemere Marina along Lea Road. Lea Road is a designated employment area and runs along the border with Epping Forest District adjoining Highbridge Street to the north, which then travels into Waltham Abbey town centre. Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy seeks to “retain and improve” such areas. Broxbourne Borough Council are therefore seeking to bring forward the redevelopment of Hazlemere Marina, and have drafted a Development Brief to support the general policies in the Core Strategy. This was published for consultation between 20th August and 20th September, notification of which was placed in the 17th September edition of the Members Bulletin. As identified in the Development Brief, Broxbourne Borough Council view Hazlemere Marina as an opportunity for a significant mixed use development which they believe will be a catalyst for the wider regeneration of the area and the delivery of Waltham Cross Renaissance Strategy, a strategy which seeks to utilize the economic and social benefits of the Olympic White Water Canoe Course planned in the immediate vicinity.

10. Officers at Epping Forest District Council believe that the development of Hazlemere Marina will clearly have an impact on the surrounding area. A primary concern will be whether the main entrance along Station Road will remain here during redevelopment or whether a currently proposed new entrance along Lea Road will be built before this takes place. Station Road is a key route into the west of the District and especially Waltham Abbey town centre which is close by. Should redevelopment works result in the closure of the road or significant delays along this route then this could potentially disrupt the function of Waltham Abbey’s town centre. Epping Forest District Council officers therefore require assurance from Broxbourne Borough Council that appropriate consultation has been undertaken with Essex County Council as the adjacent highway authority.

11. The development at Hazlemere Marina also poses an issue to the prosperity of Waltham Abbey town centre. Whilst new homes close to Waltham Abbey town centre potentially could encourage new consumers into the area, the location of a major hotel, restaurant and an element of ancillary retail on the proposed site could take away consumers from the already established services located in Waltham Abbey. It is a priority for Epping Forest District Council to ensure the future vitality and viability of Waltham Abbey and its other town centres. Waltham Abbey town centre has experienced difficulties in recent years given the current

economic climate as well as increasing competition from higher order centres. It is a concern that this proposal could therefore exacerbate those problems.

12. EFDC is committed to realising the tourism development potential of the Waltham Abbey area and capturing the maximum benefit for Waltham Abbey town centre. The new Lee Valley White Water Centre is set to further enhance the area's already strong visitor offer. Officers at Epping Forest District Council therefore require further assurances from and ongoing co-operation with Broxbourne Borough Council that any new development at Hazlemere Marina aimed at the visitor economy (i.e. visitor moorings, hotel, pub/restaurant) will be well integrated with existing attractions in the area and contribute towards the regeneration ambitions of both Waltham Abbey and Waltham Cross. Epping Forest District Council and partners are working to deliver enhanced visitor orientation and signage within the local area and would seek that any new provision of visitor facilities should comprise complementary wayfinding signage as appropriate. Such linkages are particularly vital at this site given its location between two town centres.

13. Officers at Epping Forest District Council furthermore find it questionable that the inclusion of a hotel within the proposed development mix of Hazlemere Marina is justified solely by reference to a low supply within the administrative Borough of Broxbourne. Operator interest will instead be determined by a more holistic demand assessment within a true geographic catchment from the site. It should be noted that this would therefore include a supply of approximately 260 bedrooms within Waltham Abbey.

14. The second issue of interest to Epping Forest District Council is the proposed development to occur within Essex Road Gateway. Within their pre-submission Core Strategy, Broxbourne Borough Council's housing trajectory anticipates that approximately 3,840 new homes will be required within the Borough up until 2026 at a rate of 240 per year. This is the same figure as the minimum number of new houses Broxbourne Borough Council were required to build per year under the now withdrawn East of England Plan. Of the new homes required, 790 are scheduled for the Hoddesdon area. The Essex Road Gateway Development Brief was published for consultation between 20th August and 20th September indicated that at least some of these new homes will be provided to the east of Hoddesdon. Whilst this brief is mentioned within the pre-submission Core Strategy, no further details are provided within Broxbourne's Pre-Submission Core Strategy Document.

15. The Essex Road Gateway Brief sets out that any development in this area would commence with works to widen the existing Essex Road Alignment as the area is already prone to peak hour congestion. The creation of a new access road to one of two proposed land parcels targeted for new housing and commercial development within the location is also planned. Both of these road work developments have the potential to create road closures and delays whilst they are being carried out. Given that the site is located close to the border with Epping Forest District, there is therefore the potential for delays and increased traffic along Dobb's Weir Road. Officers at Epping Forest District Council therefore wish to seek assurances from Broxbourne Borough Council that these suggested road works, are completed before development begins on two land parcels scheduled for housing and commercial development.

16. In addition to this, council officers also require assurance from Broxbourne Borough Council that consultation with regards to these proposals has been undertaken with Essex County Council as the adjacent highway authority. More detailed discussion with Essex County Council should also consider whether the proposed improvements may cause more east-west traffic movements beyond the Essex Road industrial area, onto roads in Epping Forest district that are unsuited to heavy traffic. Measures to avoid any such increase should be incorporated into detailed redevelopment schemes.

17. Finally, policy CS6 of the Core Strategy states Broxbourne Borough Council's intention to deliver the objectives of the Waltham Cross Town Centre Strategy. This seeks to increase the amount of supermarket floorspace, the number of value/discount anchor stores and the number of eating/drinking places within the town centre. This again has the potential to take consumers away from Waltham Abbey town centre and therefore will be closely monitored by officers.

18. The proposal to increase the capacity of the bus station in Waltham Cross however may be beneficial to Waltham Abbey in increasing the frequency of services between the two towns. Broxbourne Core Strategy also mentions the Highways Agency plans to widen the northern quadrant of the M25 and to introduce peak period use of the hard shoulder between Junction 23 (A1(M)) and Junction 27 (M11) from 2012 onwards. The document highlights that this will be beneficial to Broxbourne Borough although specific details are not given. It stands to reason however that when these works are complete they will likely also be beneficial to Epping Forest District given that the works include Junction 26 at Waltham Abbey.

Reason for decision: To ensure that the comments and concerns raised by the Forward Planning officers with regards to Broxbourne Borough Council's consultation on its Pre-Submission Core Strategy (August 2010) are noted and approved by members. Once approved these comments and concerns will then be sent to Broxbourne Borough Council.

Options considered and rejected:

To not respond to the consultation period.
Not to accept the comments made by Council officers

Consultation undertaken:

None undertaken by Epping Forest District Council

Resource implications: None

Budget provision:
From within existing resources

Personnel:
Consultation documentation analysed & response prepared within existing Forward Planning team

Land: N/A

Community Plan/BVPP reference:
GU1, HN1, EP3

Relevant statutory powers:
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning

Background papers:
Broxbourne Borough Council Pre Submission Core Strategy (August 2010)
Broxbourne Borough Council Preferred Options Strategy (November 2008)
Broxbourne Borough Council Issues and Options Strategy (May 2007)

Hazlemere Marina Development Brief (August 2010)
Essex Road Gateway Development Brief (August 2010)
Theobalds Grove West Development Brief (August 2010)

Environmental/Human Rights Act/Crime and Disorder Act Implications:
Any implications are assessed in Broxbourne Borough Council's Pre Submission Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.

Key Decision reference: (if required)
N/A

This page is intentionally left blank